

be there. If you wish to put conditions at all, you should vote with us. If you want no conditions, vote with him. But it is the same amount of money.

I urge that you vote "no" on the Lugar amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time has expired.

The question is on agreeing to amendment No. 382 offered by the Senator from Indiana [Mr. LUGAR]. The yeas and nays have been ordered. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. FORD. I announce that the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. DASCHLE] and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HARKIN] are necessarily absent.

I also announce that the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. DASCHLE] is absent due to a death in the family.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 25, nays 73, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 102 Leg.]

YEAS—25

Akaka	Jeffords	Lugar
Bingaman	Kennedy	Moseley-Braun
Boxer	Kerrey	Murray
Bumpers	Kerry	Reed
Chafee	Landrieu	Sarbanes
Dodd	Lautenberg	Specter
Durbin	Leahy	Wellstone
Feingold	Levin	
Glenn	Lieberman	

NAYS—73

Abraham	Faircloth	McConnell
Allard	Feinstein	Mikulski
Ashcroft	Ford	Moynihan
Baucus	Frist	Murkowski
Bennett	Gorton	Nickles
Biden	Graham	Reid
Bond	Gramm	Robb
Breaux	Grams	Roberts
Brownback	Grassley	Rockefeller
Bryan	Gregg	Roth
Burns	Hagel	Santorum
Byrd	Hatch	Sessions
Campbell	Helms	Shelby
Cleland	Hollings	Smith (NH)
Coats	Hutchinson	Smith (OR)
Cochran	Hutchison	Snowe
Collins	Inhofe	Stevens
Conrad	Inouye	Thomas
Coverdell	Johnson	Thompson
Craig	Kempthorne	Torricelli
D'Amato	Kohl	Thurmond
DeWine	Kyl	Torricelli
Domenici	Lott	Warner
Dorgan	Mack	Wyden
Enzi	McCain	

NOT VOTING—2

Daschle	Harkin
---------	--------

The amendment (No. 382) was rejected.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent, in accordance with paragraph 2 of rule VI of the Standing Rules of the Senate, that I be permitted to be absent from the work of the Senate for this afternoon and all day tomorrow to attend the funeral of Sebastian Daschle, the father of my colleague and good friend from South Dakota, Senate Minority Leader TOM DASCHLE.

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

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT

Mr. ASHCROFT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent I be allowed to speak for 8 minutes.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I do not know if it is appropriate to ask that might be amended so I ask to have an opportunity to speak for 10 minutes after the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. DOMENICI. Reserving the right to object—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Will the Senator from Missouri modify his request?

Mr. ASHCROFT. I am happy to.

Mr. DOMENICI. I object. I want to ask a question. I wonder if I might, someplace in this, without waiting to hear the eloquence of both of your remarks, if I might have 2 minutes.

Mr. ASHCROFT. I am happy to defer for 2 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request? Two minutes to the Senator from New Mexico.

Ms. MOSELEY-BRAUN. Mr. President, I look forward to sharing the 10 minutes with the Senator from Illinois, and I have no objection to the Senator from New Mexico speaking for 2 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Senator from Missouri's request is agreed to, and the Senator from New Mexico is recognized.

(The remarks of Mr. DOMENICI pertaining to the submission of Senate Resolution 100 are printed in today's RECORD under "Submission of Concurrent and Senate Resolutions.")

TRIBUTE TO CHARLES GENTRY

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, within a few short days, Charles Gentry will be leaving his post as my administrative assistant after many years of distinguished service in the legislative and executive branches of government and 11 years in the U.S. Army.

Charles has served on my staff twice. First as my legislative director and now as my administrative assistant.

During his first tour of duty on my staff Congress enacted the partial deregulation of natural gas. It was a major undertaking. It was complicated. It was contentious. Charles masters every aspect of this complicated piece of legislation. Looking back, natural gas deregulation proved to the country that our Nation has massive quantities of natural gas and that market forces would work to everyone's advantage.

Then, as now, no matter what the task, Charles has always been a leader. He has always excelled. I could count on him. He knows his substance. He knows his politics, and he knows New Mexico.

During the last 4 years Charles helped me with the critical issues facing New Mexico.

When Kirtland Air Force base was included on the Base Closure Commission preliminary list, Charles rolled up his sleeves, and in typical Gentry analyt-

ical style found out the facts surrounding this recommendation. It didn't take him long to pinpoint the shortcomings in the Commission's evaluation of Kirtland, and to professionally get the facts to the Commission so they could correct their error. Kirtland was saved and the defense readiness of the country benefited from Charles' hard work.

The administration's grazing fee hike proposal threatened the way of life for hundreds of hard working ranchers in New Mexico. Charles worked diligently to educate members of the Senate about the folly of this proposal. I will always remember the warm welcome we received when we visited southeastern New Mexico and the entire region turned out to thank us for delaying the fees.

Charles has a keen mind for complicated issues, and in New Mexico dealing with Sandia and Los Alamos National Laboratories the issues don't get much more complicated. Charles was one of my key advisors on stockpile stewardship, inhalation toxicology, Nunn-Lugar, and Nunn-Lugar-Domenici initiatives to minimize nuclear proliferation. He worked particularly hard on the Industrial Partnership Program intended to provide economic development to Russia. More importantly, this program is designed to keep Russian nuclear experts from moving to Iraq or Libya. This is probably one of the most important defense initiatives since the Berlin wall came down.

He worked on minority contracting issues at Los Alamos and Sandia. When Lockheed Martin took over Sandia and initiated contract reform Charles ensured that small and minority contractors were able to maintain their relations with Sandia.

Two years ago, when I rewrote the energy title of the DOD authorization bill Charles initiated the negotiations with the Armed Services Committee and facilitated the friendly rewrite of more than 60 pages of this important legislation.

Charles has a big heart. New Mexico veterans are developing a beautiful Veterans' Memorial Park. When Charles heard about the effort during a meeting with me and the sponsors of the park, Charles opened his check book and bought the first commemorative tile.

Charles helped me start the Senate oil and gas forum. He is one of the most knowledgeable oil and gas lawyers in the country.

For the past four years, Charles has been my administrative assistant, but our association began many, many years ago. He was raised in Roswell, NM, where he attended the New Mexico Military Institute. While at NMMI, he was an extraordinary student and athlete. Charles was captain of the football team and the New Mexico Golden Gloves heavyweight boxing champion. Before earning his B.A. in science and mathematics at NMMI, he received

many academic and athletic honors. In fact, he graduated first in his class. He later received a B.S. in civil engineering from the University of Missouri and a J.D. from Texas Tech University's School of Law.

He previously served for 6 years as my legislative director, during which he became known for his special expertise in natural resources and energy issues.

In the private sector, he has practiced law in both Austin and Dallas, TX, specializing in oil and gas, public lands, natural resources and environmental law.

No recounting of Charles Gentry's life of public service would be complete without noting nearly 11 years in the U.S. Army, where he served with valor as a pilot of fixed and rotary-winged aircraft. When Charles's helicopter was shot down in combat in South Vietnam, he was severely wounded and ultimately medically discharged with the rank of major. His combat decorations include the Bronze Star, Air Medal, Army Commendation Medal with two Oak Leaf Clusters, and the Purple Heart.

Following his years of military service, Charles became a White House fellow and was assigned as a special assistant to the Attorney General of the United States, after which he became Director of the Office of Special Projects at the Environmental Protection Agency.

To summarize our work together in the years that Charles has served me, this institution, and the people of New Mexico is a tough job, especially since I know that our relationship will not end with his leaving my staff. This is not the end of a book, rather merely the close of another chapter rich with memories and packed with accomplishment. I wish him much success and happiness as he opens the door to his new chapter in his life.

My wife, Nancy, and I look forward to many more years of friendship and send our best to Charles and his wife Gerrie, his parents, the Roy Gentrys now retired in Albuquerque, his son Geoffrey and daughter Cheryl.

For his fierce intellect, his incredible capacity for hard work, his political insight and his faithful friendship for so many years, I say from the bottom of my heart, "Thank you, Charles, for a job well done."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Missouri is recognized for 8 minutes.

FOREIGN AFFAIRS REFORM AND RESTRUCTURING ACT OF 1997, ASHCROFT ANTITERRORIST PROVISION

Mr. ASHCROFT. Mr. President, the African nation of Sudan is a cradle and safe haven for the world's most vicious and violent terrorists. It is a country internationally renowned as a training base for terrorist groups.

The Armed Islamic Group, Hamas, Abu Nidal, Palestinian Islamic Jihad,

Hezbollah, and the Islamic Group, all practice car bombing and hostage taking on the sands of Sudan's deserts.

Sudan also harbors and protects elements of Sheik Omar Abdel Rahman's Jihad network, the terrorist organization that was involved in the bombing of the World Trade Center.

Furthermore, Sudanese diplomats at the United Nations conspired with Jihad terrorists to bomb the U.N. complex. Sudan also reportedly provided false papers and weapons for assassins who attacked Egyptian President Hosni Mubarak.

There is no doubt that Sudan is a state sponsor of terrorism, and the State Department is right to classify it as such.

Along with this classification, the State Department should also enforce strict sanctions on financial transactions with Sudan, as it does with other officially recognized state sponsors of terrorism. Unfortunately, the State Department has taken steps to relax sanctions on financial transactions with Sudan. Congress passed legislation last year, the Antiterrorism and Effective Death Penalty Act, designed to prohibit all U.S. financial transactions with governments that support international terrorism.

Unfortunately, the manner in which the State Department implemented the law exempted at least two terrorist states, Sudan and Syria, from this ban. The State Department reads this seemingly clear legislation to prohibit only the financial transactions which might further terrorism in the United States. Transactions which furthered terrorism outside of the United States would be perfectly legal.

The bureaucrats at the State Department evidently believe that transactions which further terrorism against citizens of foreign countries or terrorism against Americans abroad—such as the Pan Am 103 flight which exploded over Scotland killing 270 people—should not be prohibited.

In our debate over foreign policy and foreign affairs reform, we need to clearly define a consistent antiterrorism policy. The United States should not allow financial transactions with state sponsors of terrorism, regardless of whether those financial transactions enhance terrorism in the United States or abroad.

Congress clearly intended to outlaw all financial transactions with these rogue nations. Yet for reasons that have never been clearly explained, the administration has chosen to allow U.S. companies to continue to do business with regimes that are intent on killing Americans and terrorizing people around the globe.

For example, only mounting public concern and increasing congressional pressure prevented this administration from allowing an American petroleum company to participate in a \$930 million oil deal with the Sudanese Government. This oil deal would have provided hundreds of millions of dollars to

this state sponsor of terrorism, money which could easily have funded attacks on U.S. citizens.

The State Department's implementation of last year's antiterrorism law leaves a loophole large enough to drive a truck bomb through, a truck bomb similar to the one that killed 19 American military personnel and injured approximately 500 more in Saudi Arabia last year.

One would expect the State Department to use every tool available to them to curtail and smother terrorism, especially since lives are at stake. The terrorist groups that operate out of Sudan are responsible for hundreds of attacks around the world and the deaths of thousands of people, and yet our State Department refuses to use the full scope of the law to aggressively isolate this criminal regime.

Abu Nidal alone has been responsible for 90 terrorist attacks in 20 countries, killing or injuring almost 900 people. As I mentioned earlier, this terrorist organization uses Sudan as a base of operations.

I have introduced legislation, Senate bill 873, to close the administration's loophole allowing most financial transactions with terrorist states to proceed. This legislation has been included in section 1605 of the foreign affairs reform bill we are debating today and specifically prohibits all U.S. financial transactions with regimes classified as state sponsors of terrorism, regardless of whether or not the terrorist attack might occur in the United States or abroad.

There are some exceptions in the provision which allow certain financial transactions to proceed: transactions for humanitarian assistance; traveling journalists; and a national security waiver for classes of financial transactions that are vital to the security interests of the United States.

As I mentioned earlier, this is unfortunately the second time the Senate has had to consider legislation to prohibit financial transactions with state sponsors of terrorism. If the Clinton administration had chosen to implement this law correctly the first time, all transactions between U.S. citizens and state sponsors of terrorism would already be illegal.

International terrorism is going to be a topic of discussion at the upcoming G-7 summit this weekend in Denver. The financial resources available to international terrorists will be one area of discussion for G-7 leaders. President Clinton will probably speak very forcibly on this issue. I sincerely hope that he will also direct the State Department to implement the provisions in this legislation which undermine the financial resources of terrorist states. I hope the President interprets this legislation in accordance with congressional intent and limits the ability of American firms to provide financial resources to state sponsors of terrorism.

State sponsors of terrorism provide critical refuge and support to nefarious