

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