

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KYL). Without objection, it is so ordered.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BENNETT). The Senator from Vermont is recognized.

Mr. LEAHY. I thank the Chair.

(The remarks of Mr. LEAHY pertaining to the introduction of S. 213 are located in today's RECORD under "Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.")

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I see my good friend from Washington State is on the floor. I yield the floor.

Mr. GORTON addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

#### ANTITERRORISM AND EFFECTIVE DEATH PENALTY ACT OF 1996

Mr. GORTON. Mr. President, this is to express my deep concern over a decision President Clinton made last year concerning the Anti-Terrorism and Effective Death Penalty Act of 1996, but it has only recently come to light.

When President Clinton signed the antiterrorism bill into law on April 24 of last year he made a promise to the American people—a promise never to give in to terrorism or to terrorist forces. The President vowed to stand firm against nations that support terrorism and use violence and bloodshed for political ends. The President was right in his resolve.

As the world's only superpower, the United States must set an example for all nations. We must not allow the cowardly responsibility for such atrocities as the downing of Pan Am Flight 103, the bombing of the World Trade Center, or the bombing of the Oklahoma City Federal building to gain from their actions.

That is why Congress included strict provisions in the Anti-Terrorism and Effective Death Penalty Act of 1996 to isolate terrorist organizations and those who support them. Section 321 of the law prohibits U.S. businesses from engaging in any type of financial transactions with countries known to support international terrorism. This is an important weapon in our arsenal against terrorism that must be rigorously enforced.

Doing business with state sponsors of terrorism provides such rogue nations with links to the outside world and means for financing their ugly agenda. Any such financial transaction may well return in the form of violence against the American people, our allies or other innocent victims.

President Clinton purported to support this policy. In his address to the Nation on signing the antiterrorism bill, the President announced that

America must resolve "to hold fast against the forces of violence and division \* \* \* guard against them, speak against them and fight against them." Unfortunately, the President has not lived up to his own words.

As reported in the Washington Post last week, only 4 months after signing the antiterrorism bill, President Clinton made a special exemption in the law for Sudan, one of the seven nations classified by the Department of State as a state sponsor of terrorism. The exemption was made specifically to allow California-based Occidental Petroleum Corporation to negotiate with the Sudanese Government for a stake in a \$930 million oil deal. The President made this decision despite the State Department's finding that Sudan is second only to Iran in its sponsorship of Islamic extremists engaged in terrorism against United States allies in the Middle East and against the United States itself.

Mr. President, I find these actions on the part of the President unconscionable, and I trust that most of my colleagues agree. This, unfortunately, is only the latest example of the flip-flopping on American foreign policy that marked the first term of President Clinton. Yet this particular change of heart may well be the most dangerous. The United States and our allies have known for decades that if we give terrorists an inch, they will take a mile. The more concessions we make, the more power we give to the forces of evil. It appears to me that our Commander in Chief engaged in the very practice he condemned in April.

The American people should not stand for such deception. President Clinton has an obligation to every American ever hurt by terrorism and every American who may be threatened by terrorism in the future to do what he said he would—stand firm. I truly hope the President will do just that and reverse his exemption of Sudan from the list of nations barred from doing business with American firms.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KYL). The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BOND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

The Senator from Missouri is recognized.

Mr. BOND. I thank the Chair.

(The remarks of Mr. BOND pertaining to the introduction of S. 208 are located in today's RECORD under "Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.")

Mr. BOND. Mr. President, I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ASHCROFT). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MURKOWSKI. I thank the Chair.

(The remarks of Mr. MURKOWSKI pertaining to the introduction of S. 210 are located in today's RECORD under "Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.")

Mr. MURKOWSKI. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

#### JEFFREY ST. JOHN KNEW THE MEANING OF AMERICA

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, a week or so ago—it was on January 13, 1997, to be exact—I was among those present at what proved to be a delightful memorial service for a gentleman whose life had demonstrated his understanding of, and his fidelity to, both the miracle and the meaning of America. His name was Jeffrey St. John who had died on January 3.

I attended the memorial service not because I was a close personal friend of Jeffrey St. John—I wish I could claim to have been, but because I admired so very much his remarkable talent and his unyielding courage in defending principles that deserve to survive. So just about everybody else present that afternoon had known Jeffrey St. John, and everybody else was equipped with personal anecdotes that more often than not demonstrated the good humor of their departed friend.

Mrs. St. John, Kathryn is her name, was there, of course—a charming lady who undoubtedly was a great source of strength to her husband during the years that he so unflinchingly stood in defense of conservative principles.

Mr. President, following this occasion, which Mr. St. John would have enormously enjoyed—and, who knows, there's a better than even chance that he was indeed sitting on a cloud up there somewhere—I asked Paul Weyrich, one of America's most effective defenders of conservatism and freedom, to prepare for me a brief personal history of Jeffrey St. John.

Mr. Weyrich readily agreed to do so despite his own hectic schedule as president of the Free Congress Foundation and its myriad of activities.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Weyrich's review of Mr. St. John's life be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows: