

(b) Unless otherwise ordered, measures referred to the Committee shall be referred by the clerk of the Committee to the appropriate department or agency of the Government for reports thereon.

14. Except as otherwise specified herein, the Standing Rules of the Senate shall govern the actions of the Committee. Each subcommittee of the Committee is part of the Committee, and is therefore subject to the Committee's rules so far as applicable.

15. *Powers and Duties of Subcommittees.*—Each subcommittee is authorized to meet, hold hearings, receive evidence, and report to the full Committee on all matters referred to it. Subcommittee chairmen, after consultation with Ranking Minority Members of the subcommittees, shall set dates for hearings and meetings of their respective subcommittees after consultation with the Chairman and other subcommittee chairmen with a view toward avoiding simultaneous scheduling of full Committee and subcommittee meetings or hearings whenever possible.

ACKNOWLEDGING STARTUP OF THE IDAHO NATIONAL LABORATORY

Mr. CRAPO. Mr. President, I rise today to acknowledge a new beginning with significance not only for the State of Idaho, but for the entire Nation. I am speaking of the February 1, 2005, formal launch of the new Idaho National Laboratory.

At the direction of the administration, the Idaho National Engineering and Environmental Laboratory and the Argonne National Laboratory-West, two esteemed research facilities that have served this country so well for over 55 years, are being combined to pursue even greater research and development heights as a single, cohesive enterprise. The new laboratory in Idaho has an unmatched foundation on which to pursue its Department of Energy-assigned vision of international nuclear leadership for the 21st century, compelling contributions in national and homeland security technology development, and execution of a broad supporting science and technology portfolio.

Idaho is the place where the first usable amount of electricity from nuclear energy was generated. It is where the propulsion system for the first nuclear-powered submarine was developed. And it is where 52 mostly first-of-their-kind, nuclear reactors were designed and constructed. Looking ahead, it is clearly a place well-qualified to implement the technology-based components of the national energy policy our Nation needs and that I hope this body will act on this year.

The new Idaho National Laboratory is being managed by a team that draws expertise from companies and academic institutions across the Nation. The Battelle Energy Alliance is led by Battelle Memorial Institute of Ohio. Its partners include BWX Technologies of Virginia, Washington Group International of Idaho, the Electric Power Research Institute of California and a Massachusetts Institute of Technology-led national consortium of universities

including North Carolina State University, Ohio State University, Oregon State University, the University of New Mexico, and Idaho's three research universities—Boise State University, Idaho State University, and the University of Idaho.

The competition for managing the lab brought out the highest caliber of teams. With the Battelle Energy Alliance, we have a truly extraordinary national team, committed to collaborating broadly to ensure our collective interests in energy security, homeland security and economic security are well served by the new Idaho National Laboratory.

LIEUTENANT COLONEL GABRIEL PATRICIO

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I welcome this opportunity to pay tribute to Lieutenant Colonel Gabriel R. Patricio, who is concluding a 24-year career of dedication and excellence in the United States Marines. At the Marine Corps Systems Command in Quantico, VA in recent years, he has had a leading role in modernizing combat clothing and equipment to make troops faster, more efficient, lighter and safer in battle. Colonel Patricio's talents have produced the most significant upgrade in individual clothing and combat equipment for Marines in more than 50 years.

Colonel Patricio's ability to think outside-the-box served him well in finding better ways to solve old problems. His innovative ideas have reduced the time it takes to move a product from concept to the field; so that life-saving equipment is being made available to Marines more quickly. As an example, he reached across the services to the Army's Research and Development Center in Natick, MA to take advantage of their cutting-edge technology, which is now saving lives in Iraq.

Most recently, Colonel Patricio spearheaded an initiative to develop and field a state-of-the-art, on-the-move water purification and hydration system. Under his leadership, Systems Command and two private companies pooled their resources and expertise to create a pen-sized device that troops are now using to make local water clean and drinkable.

Colonel Patricio has successfully managed programs to develop and field other products to enhance the safety and performance of our troops in Iraq and elsewhere, including new, lightweight and more protective body armor; new protection for the face and eyes; lightweight helmets; improved load-bearing backpacks; hot weather, lightweight "Jungle/Desert" boots; high performance lightweight and heavyweight Polartec fleece clothing; and specialized mountain and cold-weather clothing, including gloves, boots and jackets.

Colonel Patricio has served the Marines, and the Nation well. I congratu-

late him on his many outstanding contributions, and I wish him a long and happy and healthy retirement.

DARFUR

Mr. FEINGOLD. Mr. President, the United Nations' Commission of Inquiry on the crisis in Darfur reported to the Security Council on Monday of this week. Like every credible account of what has happened in Darfur, the report makes for grim reading. The Commission pointed to the "killing of civilians, torture, enforced disappearances, destruction of villages, rape and other forms of sexual violence" in its discussion of the violations of international law that have occurred in the area, and also found that there may have been Sudanese Government officials and others who acted "with genocidal intent."

This report stands in stark contrast to the positive news that emerged from Sudan last month, when a comprehensive agreement to end the decades-long, devastating north-south civil war was signed. I welcomed that agreement, and I hope it is successful. But the truth is that I have little confidence in the Government of Sudan, and I see no reason to believe that a north-south peace agreement will awaken that government to its responsibility to protect all of its citizens. Just days after the historic peace agreement was signed, I visited the refugee camps of eastern Chad and spoke to Sudanese citizens who had fled Darfur. They spoke of their desperate need for basic security back at home, and they are right. Consistent reports indicate that the violence in Darfur has continued. The Commission of Inquiry's recent report serves to remind all of us, Mr. President, that tragedy persists in Sudan, and the world has not done enough to stop it.

Much of the attention surrounding this report, Mr. President, has focused on the Commission's recommendation that the International Criminal Court, or ICC, take up the Darfur issue with the intention of trying those responsible for atrocities.

Just as the question of whether or not to use the word "genocide" was, for some time, a debate that distracted attention from the need to take meaningful action to bring security to the people of Darfur, I fear that a new issue—the question of whether or not the crimes committed in Darfur should be taken up by the International Criminal Court—may soon dominate the debate.

Mr. President, the administration is implacably opposed to the ICC. Frankly, this is a subject on which the President and I share some common ground. I have not supported joining the ICC as it stands. I want more protection for our troops to ensure that they will not be targets of unjust and politically motivated prosecutions.

But I do believe that it was a mistake to walk off in a huff as the ICC was taking shape. It is hard to protect

our troops from unfair prosecutions if we aren't at the table to win those protections.

I also believe that threatening our allies and trying to bully them into changing their position on the ICC, rather than sitting at the table to work these issues out, was a mistake. There are ways to protect our interests that do not involve infuriating the allies that we need to win the war on terrorism.

Certainly there are better ways to protect our interests than to stand in the way of trying people guilty of what our own administration has called genocide.

The American Servicemembers Protection Act, which Congress passed to give concrete form to the objections that many have to the ICC, contains a provision stating:

Nothing in this title shall prohibit the United States from rendering assistance to international efforts to bring to justice Saddam Hussein, Slobodan Milosovic, Osama bin Laden, other members of Al Qaeda, leaders of Islamic Jihad, and other foreign nationals accused of genocide, war crimes or crimes against humanity.

It seems to me that the crisis in Darfur may be precisely the kind of situation that such a provision was intended to cover. We have an interest—a moral interest and a political interest—in refusing to accept impunity for the grave abuses that have been committed in Darfur and in promoting long-term stability by insisting on accountability. There is no question of American troops or political figures being involved. The legitimate concerns that we have with the ICC simply are relevant to this situation.

The administration's position today, as I understand it, is that we should create an entirely new international tribunal for Sudan. If that is what it takes to bring some justice to the people of Darfur, so be it. But it is not really difficult to understand why other members of the international community would be resistant to creating an entirely new structure, potentially every time that serious crimes against humanity occur, when a structure already exists for the express purposes of dealing with these issues. Particularly when our own administration has been pressing existing ad-hoc tribunals to wrap up their costly but important work, it seems odd to create another ad-hoc mechanism when the ICC exists. Most worryingly, it gives those who would rather continue to wallow in endless reviews and deliberations while people in Darfur die another opportunity to delay reviews and meaningful action.

So I believe that the administration should think about what makes good sense in this case. Efforts to bring an end to the crisis in Darfur have faltered, time and again, due to a lack of multilateral political will. Security Council members were unable to do more than contemplate the possibility of sanctions in the face of a terrible

man-made catastrophe. We must continue to build a solid international coalition to pressure the Sudanese regime. I know that many of my colleagues and many in the administration share my frustration with the grace periods, the delays, the empty threats, and the hesitations. It is well past time, then, to do something about that. If we can send a former Secretary of State around the world to encourage others to relieve Iraqi debt, then we can appoint a very senior Presidential envoy to focus on this problem, to drum up support in capitals around the world, to squeeze every drop of potential cooperation from others with intense discussions and negotiations. The Government of Sudan should feel intense pressure every day, not hear mild scoldings and mixed messages every month or so. And the U.S. should not muddle our message by getting tangled up in our contorted position on the ICC.

Now the Commission of Inquiry's report has the potential to prod other states into action. It would be a terrible shame if the United States, once at the forefront of urging action on Sudan, now became a part of the problem.

MEDICARE ENHANCEMENT FOR NEEDED DRUGS ACT

Mr. FEINGOLD. Mr. President, I am proud to join the Senator from Maine, OLYMPIA SNOW, and the Senator from Oregon, RON WYDEN as an original cosponsor of the bipartisan Medicare Enhancement for Needed Drugs (MEND) Act. This bill takes necessary steps to ensure that our seniors, and our taxpayers, receive the best price possible on prescription drugs under the new Medicare prescription drug benefit. One of the primary reasons I voted against the Medicare Modernization Act was because I felt that it did not go far enough in addressing the skyrocketing prices of prescription drugs. Without strong, proactive measures to keep the prices of prescription drugs in check, seniors will continue to struggle to afford their prescription drugs, even with Medicare's help, and the overall cost of the Medicare Program will continue to mushroom.

There is bipartisan agreement that by prohibiting the Medicare Program from negotiating the prices of prescription drugs, the Medicare Modernization Act is actually failing to utilize the purchasing power of the Medicare Program. The MEND Act will repeal this prohibition, and allow—and in some circumstances mandate—the Secretary to negotiate the prices of prescription drugs. This type of negotiation will save taxpayers' dollars while reducing the costs of prescription drugs for Medicare beneficiaries.

The MEND Act also provides Medicare beneficiaries and taxpayers with valuable information on the prices of prescription drugs under the new Medicare benefit. This reporting will ensure that the prices of the drugs most used

by seniors do not go up just as the Medicare prescription drug benefit goes into effect. It will also ensure that seniors and others who depend on Medicare have the complete, accurate information they need when deciding upon a prescription drug plan under Medicare.

It is important that we act now, in a bipartisan manner, to fix the flaws included in the Medicare Modernization Act before the prescription drug benefit begins next year. The MEND Act will help both those who depend on the Medicare Program, and those who have to pay for it, by acting to rein in the skyrocketing prices of prescription drugs.

HELPING TO PREPARE PROVIDERS TO CARE

Mr. AKAKA. Mr. President, so many of VA health care providers are truly dedicated to treating all of the ailments veterans face, including psychological ones. In an attempt to help VA providers understand the special needs of Operation Iraqi Freedom and Operation Enduring Freedom veterans, one particular VA health care region has made special efforts.

The Brockton Division of the VA Boston Healthcare System Continuing Education Committee hosted a conference, entitled "Preparing for the acute and long-term needs of Afghanistan and Iraq war veterans." Several experts in their respective fields served as speakers and made presentations to attendees. Brett Litz, Ph.D., of the National Center for Post Traumatic Stress Disorder, PTSD, discussed "Promoting Continuity of Care and Understanding: Putting the Long-Term Impact of the War in Afghanistan and Iraq in Context." Dr. Litz helped the crowd to appreciate the active-duty military mental health culture; understand the early intervention and the variety of interventions for acute trauma; and appreciate high probability themes to war-zone traumas in Afghanistan and Iraq veterans.

Lieutenant Colonel Chuck Engel, MD, MPH, of Walter Reed Medical Center, addressed "Quality of Post-Deployment Health Care in the Defense Health System—Steady Progress or Unified Promises?" Lt. Col. Engel informed attendees of the strengths and limitations of Deployment health initiatives in the Department of Defense; ways to improve the continuity of care from postdeployment to discharge and beyond; and the role of primary care in identifying and treating mental health problems caused by exposure to war.

Lieutenant Colonel Carl Castro, Ph.D., of Walter Reed Army Institute of Research, spoke about the "Impact of Combat on the Mental Health of Soldiers," focusing on the findings of the Mental Health Assessment Team's evaluation of Iraq War veterans mental health and well-being in the warzone; the findings of the psychological screening program in the U.S. Army; and the risk and resilience factors that