Again, I appreciate the help of Senators Kennedy and Enzi and their talented staff in getting this amendment included in this bill. They have been very helpful, and I look forward to providing them any assistance they need in order to keep this in conference.

Mr. GREGG. Mr. President, last week, the FDA just sent out a warning to American consumers regarding purchasing medications from certain Internet sites because the FDA cannot verify medications purchased over those sites are going to be safe or that they won’t be counterfeit. We need to give the FDA the authority and the resources to address the issue of unsafe Internet pharmacies and the Gregg Internet pharmacy amendment does just that. It creates a comprehensive framework to assure consumers that they can shop with confidence, knowing that the drugs they purchase online will be safe and effective. Hopefully, we will address this important and timely drug safety issue if not now, at least before this bill completes the whole process and comes back from the conference committee.

Mr. KENNEDY. I thank the Senator from New Hampshire for his interest and work on this important issue. Ensuring that people have access to safe and effective medications when purchasing prescription drugs online is an important part of our efforts in the area of drug safety. The Dorgan legislation in this bill includes some provisions on the issue of Internet pharmacies, but I am willing to work with my colleague and our colleagues in the Senate to enhance these provisions to address the important issues he has raised over the course of this debate.

Mr. ENZI. I would also like to take the opportunity to express my support for the need to address the issue of unsafe Internet pharmacies. We have worked very hard in other portions of this bill to ensure the safety of prescription drugs in the market, and as this bill advances, I look forward to working with you both to enhance the provisions in this bill relating to the safety of Internet pharmacies. The Presiding Officer. The Senator from Ohio is recognized.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. BROWN. I ask unanimous consent to have Ambassador Scheffer’s letter to which I referred printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the letter was to be printed in the Record as follows:

CENTER FOR INTERNATIONAL HUMAN RIGHTS, April 6, 2007.

Re lost opportunities to achieve international justice.

Senator Richard Durbin, Chairman, Subcommittee on Human Rights and the Law, Committee on the Judiciary, U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

Dear Senator Durbin: you have asked me to recount how limitations in U.S. federal law during the 1990’s prevented the Clinton Administration, in which I served as U.S. Ambassador at Large for War Crimes Issues (1997–2001), from ensuring the speedy apprehension and prosecution of the former Cambodian leader, Pol Pot, on charges of genocide, crimes against humanity, or war crimes (“‘crimes of the worst category’)” prior to his death in March 1998. Because such limitations in U.S. law remain, particularly with respect to the crime of genocide, it may be useful for Members of Congress to consider how devastating was this lost opportunity to achieve some measure of justice for the deaths of an estimated 1.7 million Cambodians under Pol Pot’s rule from 1975 to 1979.

In June 1997 the then two co-prime ministers of Cambodia, Hun Sen and Norodom Ranariddh, sent a letter to the Secretary-General of the United Nations seeking assistance to establish an international criminal tribunal that would prosecute the senior Khmer Rouge leaders, none of whom had been prosecuted with the sole exception of a highly dubious in absentia trial of Pol Pot, and his foreign minister, in a Cambodia in 1979 shortly after the fall of the Khmer Rouge regime. The jointly-signed letter in June 1997 opened two pathways of action by the Clinton Administration: the first continues to this day, namely how to investigate and prosecute surviving senior Khmer Rouge leaders and bring them to justice before a credible court of proper jurisdiction; the second interrelated issue dealt with effective measures to apprehend and hold suspects in custody until they could be brought to trial.

Since no international criminal tribunal existed in 1997 that was specially designed to