

said that he would only accept a solution on Cyprus that included a permanent division of the island into two states. "One state in the north, one state in the south and a confederation . . . this is what [Cyprus President] Papadopoulos should accept, otherwise we cannot reach an agreement," the Prime Minister stated. Most egregiously, Turkey and the "TRNC" have increased the number of Turkish troops on the island—from about 36,000 to more than 40,000—in the past year. Turkey also intensified the influx of Turkish settlers in the island and at the same time, both Ankara and the Turkish Cypriot leadership continued their policy of immense exploitation of Greek Cypriot properties in northern occupied Cyprus. These are not the actions of parties committed to a peaceful resolution to the division.

For more than 30 years, the United States has refused to reward Turkey's illegal invasion with an independent Turkish state on Cyprus. But the decision to extend to Mr. Talat unprecedented access to our government's most hallowed halls only serves to validate his and the Turkish Prime Minister's view that the "TRNC" should be treated as an independent entity. Because independent status is exactly what Turkey and the rump state seek, the meeting reduces the incentive for Turkey and Mr. Talat to engage in productive talks to resolve the division of Cyprus. And why should they negotiate if they are promised to be provided direct trade, direct flights, and separate treatment by the Secretary of State?

I call on the State Department to abandon this ill-conceived meeting with the self-declared president of the "TRNC," an illegal entity that, I repeat, the U.S. government does not recognize. The meeting will be viewed, and it will be used, as an elevation of the "TRNC" and a nod toward independent and separate status. The meeting is inconsistent with the United States' stated policy towards Cyprus, and it serves only to hinder efforts to resolve the division of Cyprus.

#### FOREIGN OPERATIONS APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. CHAMBLISS. Mr. President, first, I want Senator MCCONNELL and his staff for all the heavylifting and hard work to complete this important bill. As a committee chairman, I know how difficult it can be to pass legislation.

I am pleased that the House-Senate conferees considering the State and Foreign Operations appropriations bills have included language which withholds taxpayer dollars to those countries which refuse to extradite violent criminals to the United States for prosecution. While this is a positive step, I must express disappointment that the conferees saw fit to provide for the continued flow of tax dollars to these countries upon a mere certification by the Secretary of State that a cutoff

would not be in the national interest of the United States. My original amendment, which passed the Senate on July 20, 2005, by a vote of 86 to 12, contained no such loophole. The earlier passage of my original amendment and the House passage of a similar amendment by Representative NATHAN DEAL of Georgia, by a vote of 294 to 132, sent a powerful message to those countries which refuse to extradite murderers and other violent criminals. The passage of these earlier amendments represented a victory for law enforcement, for victims of violent crime, and for simple justice and the rule of law.

When an individual is charged with a crime and flees to a foreign country, it is the responsibility of the U.S. Department of State to seek extradition of the fugitive.

In some instances, countries refuse to extradite even defendants charged with violent crimes when the evidence is overwhelming. Some refuse when the defendant faces the possibility of the death penalty in this country and this issue represents a particular challenge to our ongoing relations with other countries.

However, even in instances in which the defendant does not face the death penalty, some countries have still refused to extradite—some for the articulated reason that they do not extradite their own nationals. Others—Mexico, Costa Rica, Spain, Venezuela and Portugal, for example—have refused to extradite because the defendant faces a possible life sentence if convicted in the United States.

Of course the possibility of life imprisonment reflects the seriousness of the offense and should result in a greater, not lesser, justification for extradition. Such policies stand common sense on its head.

These unjust policies by some countries came into sharp focus in connection with the brutal murder of the son of David Fulton, who is a constituent of mine in Hampton, GA.

On December 21, 2002, Mr. Fulton's son, CPL Joshia Fulton of the U.S. Marine Corps, was murdered right here, on the streets of Washington, DC.

At the time of his murder, CPL Fulton was a member of the elite Presidential Protection Program called Yankee White, an assignment through which he had the honor of traveling abroad with the President of the United States.

Corporal Fulton was awaiting assignment for service as a guard in the West Wing of the White House when he was murdered.

After an investigation by the DC Police Department, a criminal complaint was filed charging a suspect named Carlos Almanza with the murder of Joshia Fulton.

Almanza, however, fled the United States to his home country, the Republic of Nicaragua, where that country's constitution prohibits extradition of its citizens. And so the person charged with this heinous crime is free to kill

again and to live the good life while the family of his victim endures the cruel consequences of their loss day in and day out, without justice and without closure to their suffering.

If a country refuses to turn murder suspects over to U.S. authorities so they can be brought to justice in the United States where the heinous crime occurred, then that country should not receive any financial aid from the United States under the appropriations bill now before the Senate. A country's constitutional ban on extradition of its citizens who are fugitives from justice is unacceptable. Quite simply, that law needs to change if they want to continue to receive American aid.

While I am disappointed in the final wording in the conference report, I take comfort that my amendment has already gotten the attention of these countries. Following passage of my amendment in July, I and my staff met with representatives of various countries, as well as representatives of the Departments of State and Justice. While we worked diligently to craft language to address legitimate concerns of these countries and our own Government, the final conference language, in my view, falls short of reflecting America's resolve to put a stop to refusals to extradite.

As I stated during debate on my original amendment in July, the intent of this language is not to deny aid to any country, but rather to provide a substantial incentive for recalcitrant countries to reform their extradition laws so that suspected criminals can be brought to justice in the United States. I hope that this experience will be a wake-up call to the State Department to redouble its efforts to encourage all countries to extradite murderers and other violent criminals to stand before the bar of justice. I will continue to work for the extradition of Corporal Fulton's killer.

#### AGRICULTURE APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, yesterday I voted against the Agriculture appropriations bill for fiscal year 2006 and I did so with some reservation. At the outset, I want to commend the managers of the bill, Senator BENNETT and Senator KOHL, for trying hard to keep the bill as close to the Senate bill as they could, but the House hijacked the bill on several important points.

I am grateful that the conference report included funding for Tufts University, working with local Connecticut farmers to develop more effective agricultural operational and marketing practices. Even though the physical university is in Boston, Tufts is using the funding exclusively in Connecticut so that our farmers can diversify their crops and market them more aggressively in local markets. Additionally, the University of Connecticut, in conjunction with the University of Illinois, received funding to continue a research program on therapeutic cloning

in cattle. Finally, language was included to again urge the Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, APHIS, to indemnify a Connecticut poultry producer who undertook a successful emergency vaccination protocol 2 years ago.

So while I am pleased that there are a few items specifically for my constituents, I remain deeply troubled by the path this Congress is taking as it tries to cut spending for programs that benefit our most vulnerable populations while at the same time planning for tax cuts for the most wealthy, who neither need nor, on the whole, seek the extravagance that the majority insists on heaping upon them.

The Senate conferees are to be commended for pushing hard for increases in food and nutrition programs, including the McGovern-Dole Food for Education Program, but at the same time, House conferees insisted on the option of privatization of the food stamp process. That is often code word for closing down local centers and relying more and more on remote call centers and the Internet. This puts a disproportionate burden on those people who need the services most. I know that in my State of Connecticut, this action could adversely impact 109,250 households and that number is likely to grow. Unfortunately, the Republican-controlled Congress often sees privatization as the panacea for saving money. Instead, studies often find that contracting out these services often costs more money. But the problem doesn't stop there. As Congress moves forward with the budget reconciliation process, we will have to come to terms with the fact that the House has insisted on draconian cuts of nearly a billion dollars in the food stamp program. If this number were to stand, nearly 300,000 low-income individuals could be denied benefits. The majority in Congress refuses to increase the minimum wage. It refuses to increase low-income heating assistance, despite dire predictions of record heating costs this winter. Now Congress is on the verge of cutting off 300,000 people from food assistance. Such a move is irresponsible, and it is unconscionable.

Finally, the House conferees insisted on denying American consumers with simple information about the meat they eat. As our colleagues know, mandatory meat labeling was included in the 2002 farm bill, which I supported. The labeling of seafood already started but meat labeling, at the behest of a few powerful lobbyists and a few Members of Congress, continues to be delayed. Hundreds of organizations around the country, including farmers, producers, consumer groups, and individuals overwhelmingly support country-of-origin labeling, COOL. The fiscal year 2006 House appropriations bill effectively delayed meat labeling by refusing to allow any funds to be used to implement COOL, while the Senate bill did not change the requirement. During conference on this bill, the House,

with no consultation with the Senate and with no vote, unilaterally extended the COOL delay until 2008, beyond what even the House language did. Labeling would increase consumer confidence and assist agricultural producers.

So, while there are many laudable provisions in the agricultural appropriations bill, several provisions caused me to cast a vote against this bill.

#### MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Williams, one of his secretaries.

#### EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session the Presiding Officer laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(The nominations received today are printed at the end of the Senate proceedings.)

#### MESSAGES FROM THE HOUSE

At 9:35 a.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Ms. Branden, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following bill, without amendment:

S. 1285. An act to designate the Federal building located at 333 Mt. Elliott Street in Detroit, Michigan, as the "Rosa Parks Federal Building".

The message also announced that the House has passed the following bills, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 1691. An act to designate the Department of Veterans Affairs outpatient clinic in Appleton, Wisconsin, as the "John H. Bradley Department of Veterans Affairs Outpatient Clinic".

H.R. 4061. An act to amend title 38, United States Code, to improve the management of information technology within the Department of Veterans Affairs by providing for the Chief Information Officer of that Department to have authority over resources, budget, and personnel related to the support function of information technology, and for other purposes.

The message further announced that the House has agreed to the following concurrent resolution, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H. Con. Res. 281. Concurrent resolution congratulating the Chicago White Sox on winning the 2005 World Series.

The message also announced that the House disagree to the amendments of the Senate to the bill H.R. 2528 making appropriations for military quality of life functions of the Department of Defense, military construction, the Department of Veterans Affairs, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2006, and for other purposes, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon; and

appoints the following members as the managers of the conference on the part of the House: Mr. WALSH, Mr. ADERHOLT, Mrs. NORTHUP, Mr. SIMPSON, Mr. CRENSHAW, Mr. YOUNG of Florida, Mr. KIRK, Mr. REHBERG, Mr. CARTER, Mr. LEWIS of California, Mr. EDWARDS, Mr. FARR, Mr. BOYD, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. CRAMER, and Mr. OBEY.

The message further announced that the House disagree to the amendments of the Senate to the bill H.R. 2862 making appropriations for Science, the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2006, and for other purposes, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon; and appoints the following members as the managers of the conference on the part of the House: Mr. WOLF, Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina, Mr. KIRK, Mr. WELDON of Florida, Mr. GOODE, Mr. LAHOOD, Mr. CULBERSON, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. LEWIS of California, Mr. MOLLOHAN, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island, Mr. FATTAH, and Mr. OBEY.

The message also announced that pursuant to section 491 of the Higher Education Act (20 U.S.C. 1098(c)), the order of the House of January 4, 2005, and upon the recommendation of the Majority Leader, the Speaker reappoints the following member on the part of the House of Representatives to the Advisory Committee on Student Financial Assistance for a three-year term: Ms. Judith Flink of Morton Grove, Illinois.

#### ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

At 11:37 a.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Ms. Niland, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker has signed the following bill:

H.R. 2744. An act making appropriations for Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2006, and for other purposes.

The enrolled bill was signed subsequently by the President pro tempore (Mr. STEVENS).

At 12:46 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Ms. Chiappardi, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House disagree to the amendment of the Senate to the bill H.R. 889 to authorize appropriations for the Coast Guard for fiscal year 2006, to make technical corrections to various laws administered by the Coast Guard, and for other purposes, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon; and appoints the following members as the managers of the conference on the part of the House from the committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, for consideration of the House bill and the Senate amendment, and modifications