

on its amendment, requests a conference with the House, and the Chair appoints the following conferees.

The Presiding Officer appointed Mr. BYRD, Mr. INOUE, Mr. LEAHY, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mrs. MURRAY, Ms. LANDRIEU, Mr. LAUTENBERG, Mr. TESTER, Mr. SPECTER, Mr. VOINOVICH, Mr. COCHRAN, Mr. GREGG, Mr. SHELBY, Mr. BROWNBACK, and Ms. MURKOWSKI conferees on the part of the Senate.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote and I move to lay that motion on the table on the last vote.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the Senate proceed to morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SUDAN ACCOUNTABILITY AND DIVESTMENT ACT

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, just before we left for the Fourth of July work period, U.S. diplomats hosted a forum in Washington to bring together representatives from 33 countries, a host of nongovernmental organizations, and others interested in Sudan. The purpose of the gathering was to reiterate their support for Sudan's 2005 Comprehensive Peace Agreement, CPA, and to develop an effective way forward on Sudan. During the forum, leaders from Sudan's southern region and the Khartoum Government agreed to a joint communiqué highlighting "the importance of credible, peaceful and transparent nationwide elections" in 2010 and to holding a referendum on the south's secession in 2011.

While this appears to be a positive step on north-south relations, like many of my colleagues, I remain deeply concerned about the situation in the south and about the policies of Sudanese President Omar Bashir in the Darfur region—policies that have led to the murder of hundreds of thousands of innocent people. So while I appreciate the significance of the communiqué I remain skeptical of the Khartoum Government's commitment to the north-south peace process, and to fair elections, and hope the Obama administration will maintain pressure on the government of President Bashir and hold that government accountable for a change in direction and real results. Following up on this event, I wish to discuss the Sudan Accountability and Divestment Act of 2007 and to update my colleagues on its recent implementation.

In October of 2007, after months of consulting with interested stakeholders, I was joined by Ranking Member SHELBY in introducing a bill that empowered our country's State and local governments to divest from companies with business operations in

Sudan. My colleagues, particularly Senators DURBIN and BROWNBACK, and I were very concerned about the ongoing violence in Sudan, especially in the southern and western regions such as Darfur where the Sudanese Government arms the militias which have ravaged communities and killed many innocent people. The international community has condemned President Omar Bashir for his role in authorizing this genocide, and he has been indicted by the International Criminal Court for these crimes. Given the developments in Sudan and a worsening situation there, we thought it was imperative that we help strengthen the growing movement in the United States of those interested in divesting from Sudanese businesses whose presence serves to bolster and support Sudan's Government, enabling its security forces, and those militias responsible to them, to continue to commit these atrocities.

By the time this bill was brought to the floor, 20 U.S. States had initiated some form of divestment from Sudanese firms, and divestment campaigns were underway in many other States. However, a Federal district court in Illinois had held the State's divestment law unconstitutional and permanently enjoined its enforcement. The Sudan Accountability and Divestment Act was written partly in response to these complications and designed to provide States and local governments, as well as businesses and investors, the authority and legal framework to proceed with divestment. The Senate passed the bill by unanimous consent, the House took it up and adopted it several days later, and the President signed it into law on December 31, 2007.

The law was deliberate in targeting four specific economic sectors widely recognized as key sources of revenue for the Sudanese Government: oil, power production, minerals, and military equipment. According to one former Sudanese Finance Minister, 70 percent of the Khartoum Government's share of oil profits was spent on military equipment used to bolster militias like the janjaweed.

According to the Sudan Divestment Task Force, since the enactment of our legislation, five more States have passed divestment laws targeting Sudan, with many State and local retirement funds divesting hundreds of millions of dollars in assets. Four States have prohibited contracting with corporations that provide support to the Sudanese Government, demonstrating broad-based support for the divestment movement.

The law also serves to enable acts of conscience in the private sector, allowing businesses and investors the right to divest from Sudan-related assets without violating their normal fiduciary responsibilities. The number of universities, companies, and investment funds, as well as international and religious organizations, engaged in divestment is growing. For example,

shareholders of Vanguard and Fidelity funds and pensioners from TIAA-CREF recently assembled to ask their managers to withdraw investments from Sudan.

Finally, the act requires Federal Government contractors to certify that they are not conducting business operations in Sudan that bolster the Sudanese Government's capabilities. This provision was meant to ensure that U.S. taxpayers' money is not aiding, even indirectly, a regime that systematically murders its own population. Even so, some critics have suggested that the law's implementation at the Federal level has come up short, particularly regarding limits on U.S. Government procurement. It is critical that the U.S. Government enforces a fair and appropriate certification process on companies that are conducting certain business sanctionable under the act. Additionally, updated information must be maintained by relevant contracting agencies. Such a process requires a concerted, interagency effort, not an ad hoc approach. Some work remains to be done to coordinate such a policy. I have been in contact with various Federal agencies to address these concerns and will continue to work with them to get this right.

Meanwhile, various nonprofit organizations such as the U.S.-based Genocide Intervention Network and its newly initiated Conflict Risk Network are providing innovative solutions to investors who feel motivated to divest out of moral and prudential obligations. Thanks to such efforts, investors can make well-informed assessments of Sudan's conflict zones and understand the political and reputational risks associated with investments in Sudan. Moreover, States and local governments now have more credible information on which to base their divestment decisions. Save Darfur, another nonprofit organization, continues to educate millions of people around the world about the ongoing atrocities in Sudan and provides activists with effective tools and resources. Others are following suit.

In the end, these efforts are being made to maintain pressure on the Sudanese Government and to effect positive change there. But much work remains to be done. Actions, not words, must be the true test of progress there.

As State and local governments, businesses, and private investors continue to press the government in Khartoum through their divestment efforts, they should be applauded. But we must maintain the pressure and closely monitor the situation. And the Obama administration must stay actively and assertively involved. The President understands this, and I am pleased that he has appointed a new special envoy to Sudan, retired general Jonathan Scott Gration, to coordinate U.S. policy on Sudan. I look forward to working with him on these important issues. I hope that the many ways the international community is seeking to

press the Sudanese Government for real change, and the many ways our government is joining that effort—including by tough and thoroughgoing implementation of the Sudan Accountability and Divestment Act—will begin to bring critical change to this troubled region and to its suffering people.

HONORING OUR ARMED FORCES

SENIOR CHIEF PETTY OFFICER DANIEL HEALY

Mr. GREGG. Mr. President, it is my honor to rise today in special tribute to SCPO Daniel Healy of Exeter, NH. I am proud to recognize the dedication ceremony of the “SCPO Daniel Healy USN SEAL” Memorial Monument and Bridge in honor of his courageous service to the United States of America.

On June 28, 2005, Daniel lost his life when his helicopter was shot down during a rescue mission to save the lives of fellow soldiers in Kunar Province, Afghanistan. For his fearlessness under fire, Senior Chief Petty Officer Healy was posthumously awarded the Bronze Star with Combat “V” for Valor, the Purple Heart, and the Afghanistan Campaign Medal. In recognition of outstanding performance throughout his military career, Daniel was awarded the Navy and Marine Corps Achievement Medal, the Joint Meritorious Unit Award, the Meritorious Unit Commendation, the National Defense Service Medal, and the Good Conduct Medal.

On Sunday, July 19, 2009, the town of Exeter, NH, will honor Daniel by renaming the Guinea Road Bridge and Exeter Town Pool, in remembrance of his life and service. Although we can never truly do enough to honor his sacrifice, this bridge and monument will stand as a lasting testament to a dedicated individual that selflessly paid the ultimate sacrifice in support of his brothers in arms.

This dedication speaks volumes about Daniel’s character. At a time when we have two wars ongoing, it is an extraordinary reminder of the kind of person who serves this country and commits him or herself to the protection of others, even until death. I am sure that Daniel would be the first to say that although this bridge and pool will bear his name, the honor truly belongs to everyone who proudly wears the uniform of our great Nation.

Daniel’s kind and determined attitude will always be remembered by those who knew him and it is with the utmost respect that we remember his life with this entry into the official CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. On behalf of my wife Kathy, and myself, I want to express our deep gratitude and respect for a father, husband, son, brother, and true American hero. With this, I ask my colleagues to join me in thanking Daniel’s family for his service to the Nation and his devotion to our freedom.

INDIA AND HONDURAS

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, today I would like to address America’s policies toward two nations. Each of these nations has strong democratic institutions. Each of these nations is a key trading partner of the United States. And each of these nations offers even more potential for cooperation in the future—if the administration makes the right choices going forward. These two nations are India and Honduras.

First, I would like to discuss America’s relationship with India. India is the world’s largest democracy—and one of the world’s largest and most dynamic economies. During this decade, India and the United States have cooperated more closely than ever before. America is now India’s largest trading and investment partner. Last year Congress authorized a new era in civil nuclear cooperation between our two countries—which I was proud to support. India has joined the United States and many nations in supporting the people of Afghanistan. India has committed more than \$1.2 billion to reconstruction efforts there. Our nations work closely together to fight terrorists—especially since the devastating attacks in Mumbai last year. And since 2004, India and the United States have built a strategic partnership—based on our common values—and committed to expanding opportunities in education, energy, and beyond.

As cochairman of the Senate’s India Caucus, I strongly support closer ties with our strategic partner in South Asia. Yesterday, several of my colleagues and I had breakfast with Secretary Clinton at the State Department. I am pleased that she sees India as a top priority for our Nation’s diplomatic engagement. I appreciate her determination to strengthen our strategic partnership with India in security, trade, and many other issues. I wished her well in her visit to India in the coming weeks.

I also took the opportunity to bend the Secretary’s ear on the subject of Honduras. Honduras and the United States have been good friends and neighbors for many years. We are trade partners through the Central American Free Trade Agreement. Our two peoples cherish our independence and liberty—and have helped others claim their freedom. Honduras joined the United States as one of the first contributors to Operation Iraqi Freedom. Most of all, the people of Honduras and the United States respect the democratic institutions we have built—and we honor the rule of law.

Honoring the rule of law means that no one is above the law—including the President. In Honduras, the President is limited to a single term in office. Their Constitution—like the U.S. Constitution—places strict limits on the executive power. These limits are important to the Honduran people because of the history of authoritarian rule in their country—including periods of military dictatorship.

Unfortunately, President Zelaya was not happy with the limits to his power—so he tried to get the Constitution changed. First he tried to do so legally. Then he tried to do so illegally. Eventually he tried to order the military to help him get his way. In short, President Zelaya saw himself as the Honduran Hugo Chavez. And he has relied on Chavez’s political and material support—including Venezuelan-owned media—in his quest for more power.

President Zelaya’s attempts to subvert the Constitution became too much for the people of Honduras. It was too much for their supreme court, for their Congress, and for their military—all of whom agreed that President Zelaya had acted way beyond the powers of his office. So the other branches of government acted and removed Mel Zelaya from office on June 28.

I met with representatives of the Honduran people yesterday. They included two former Presidents of Honduras, several Honduran Congressmen, and two leaders who helped draft their Constitution in 1982. They all agreed that the legislative and judicial branches of government acted properly. They acted justly. They acted constitutionally. I believe the United States should stand with the Honduran people and with the Constitution they wrote.

Unfortunately, the Obama administration has loudly taken the wrong view on Honduras. From day one, the White House and the State Department have issued strong statements in defense of Mel Zelaya and offered no support to all the other constitutional officers in Honduras.

Just this week in Moscow, President Obama again called for the return of Mel Zelaya to power—just as Hugo Chavez, Raul Castro, and Daniel Ortega are doing.

The United States should not be standing with the dictators and demagogues of our region—we should be standing with the people of Honduras and all who wish to live in freedom and under the rule of law.

So I told Secretary Clinton yesterday that she should rethink the administration’s approach to Honduras. I said I shared her hope that mediation by President Arias of Costa Rica would be successful. Yet I also made clear that America’s priority should be to nurture freedom and support the rule of law and not excuse or enable the ambitions of tyrants.

25TH ANNIVERSARY OF MINOR LEAGUE BASEBALL IN VERMONT

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, I rise today to commemorate the 25th anniversary of the return of professional baseball to Burlington, VT.

I recall that moment 25 years ago with great clarity, as it occurred when I was mayor of the city of Burlington. After a series of lengthy, but eventually productive, negotiations with the Eastern League and the owner of one of its teams, my administration with the