

the Senate begin consideration of a Senate resolution submitted by Senator SNOWE regarding mammograms. I further ask unanimous consent that there be 30 minutes for debate equally divided between Senators SNOWE and MIKULSKI, with an additional 10 minutes under the control of Senator SPETER; further, no amendments be in order, and following the conclusion or yielding back of time the resolution be temporarily set aside with a vote to occur on the adoption of this resolution at 5 p.m. this afternoon.

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

Mr. CAMPBELL. Further, Mr. President, for the information of all Senators, in accordance with this agreement, the mammogram resolution will be debated this afternoon, with a vote occurring at 5 p.m.

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT—SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 1

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent that at 3 p.m. on Wednesday, February 5, the Senate begin consideration of Senate Joint Resolution 1, regarding a constitutional amendment on the balanced budget. I further ask unanimous consent that only opening statements be in order during Wednesday's session.

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

Mr. CAMPBELL. I announce this agreement will allow us to begin debate on the balanced budget amendment on Wednesday. Senators may make opening statements on Wednesday; however, no amendments will be in order.

I also ask the Senate not be in session late tomorrow to accommodate a number of Senator's schedules.

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

AUTHORITY TO APPOINT COMMITTEE OF ESCORT ON THE PART OF THE SENATE

Mr. CAMPBELL. I ask unanimous consent that the President of the Senate be authorized to appoint a committee on the part of the Senate to join with a like committee on the part of the House of Representatives to escort the President of the United States into the House Chamber for the joint session to be held at 9 o'clock p.m. this evening, Tuesday, February 4, 1997.

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

APPOINTMENTS BY THE VICE PRESIDENT

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair, on behalf of the President of the Senate, pursuant to Public Law 85-874, as amended, appoints the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. LOTT] and the Senator

from Alaska [Mr. STEVENS] to the Board of Trustees of the John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts.

APPOINTMENTS BY THE VICE PRESIDENT

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair, on behalf of the Vice President, pursuant to the provisions of 20 United States Code, sections 42 and 43, appoints the following Senators as members of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution: the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. COCHRAN] and the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. FRIST].

APPOINTMENT BY THE MAJORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair, on behalf of the majority leader, pursuant to Public Law 100-458, appoints William E. Cresswell, of Mississippi, to a term on the Board of Trustees of the John C. Stennis Center for Public Service Training and Development, effective October 11, 1996.

MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, there will now be a period for the transaction of morning business not to extend beyond the hour of 12:30, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

ROBERT MORRIS, PATRIOT WHO STOOD UP FOR AMERICA

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, one of the disappointing aspects of serving in the Senate is the inescapable and unintended detachment we so often unknowingly experience in our efforts to keep up with the joyful things happening to our friends back home and elsewhere. But it is downright discouraging to discover sometimes long after the fact, that sadness has come to our friends and their families.

For example, the death this past December 29 of a remarkable American, Robert J. Morris, who immediately earned my admiration when I came to Washington in 1951 as administrative assistant to a fine North Carolina Senator.

I had a note the other day from Bob Morris's widow, Joan, about his death. Mr. President, when I arrived in Washington years ago, Bob Morris was the very bright and talented chief counsel of the Internal Security Subcommittee of the Senate Judiciary Committee.

The New York Times on January 2 of this year reported Bob Morris's death. The headline read: "Robert J. Morris Is Dead at 82; Crusader Against Communism".

The opening paragraphs of the obituary read as follows:

Robert J. Morris, whose ministrations as counsel for a Cold War Senate Subcommittee bent on rooting out Communists marked a

long career devoted to conservative causes, died on Sunday at Point Pleasant Hospital in Point Pleasant, N.J. He was 82 and lived in Mantoloking, N.J.

The cause of death was congestive heart failure, said his son Geoffrey, who added that Mr. Morris had been suffering for more than a year from hydrocephalus, a condition that impedes brain function.

Mr. Morris was chief counsel to the Senate Judiciary Subcommittee on Internal Security from 1951 to 1953, and again from 1956 to 1958, a period when the country was tormented by the specter of Communist infiltration at every level of life.

A graduate of Fordham Law School, he had served on a New York State Assembly committee in 1940 that investigated New York's schools and colleges for Communist activities. He worked various aspects of the Senate hearings, appearing as a witness now and then and serving as a frequent spokesman and defender of its work.

After those somewhat objective paragraphs, Mr. President, the New York Times launched a full-fledged attack on Bob Morris because of his battles against communism.

I shall omit that part of the New York Times report regarding Bob Morris's death and pick up again when the obituary regains objectivity:

Mr. Morris's interest in politics was part and parcel of his upbringing in Jersey City, where his father was known for organizing opposition to Frank Hague, the entrenched Hudson County boss. That interest sharpened while Mr. Morris served in the Navy during World War II.

Turned down at first because of his inability to recognize the color red, an anecdote he repeated with delight through the years, he became a commander of counterintelligence and psychological warfare. At one point, his son said, he was in charge of writing the threats, printed in Japanese on what looked like money, that were dropped by the plane-load on Japanese cities.

He also interrogated prisoners, and began believing that Communism was a greater threat to world security than most leaders realized—an opinion that would influence the rest of his life.

Politics continued to attract him after he left the subcommittee. In 1958, he made a bid for the Republican Senate nomination from New Jersey, running on a conservative platform that stressed his subcommittee work. Like all but one of his attempts to win public office—he was elected a municipal judge in New York City in 1954, and resigned two years later to rejoin the Senate investigations—it was unsuccessful.

Turning his eye to education, Mr. Morris moved to Texas in 1960 to become president of the University of Dallas. He continued speaking out against Communism and on other issues, which became a source of friction at the university, which he left in 1962.

That summer, he founded the Defenders of American Liberties, a group he described as modeled after the American Civil Liberties Union, "but with emphasis on different positions." The group quickly gained public attention with its defense of former Maj. Gen. Edwin A. Walker, who was accused of inciting unrest at the University of Mississippi at Oxford as James Meredith, its first black student, was attempting to start classes there.

In 1964, he founded the University of Plano, now defunct, in Plano, Tex., which was intended to teach mildly disabled young people through "patterning," controversial at the time. It involved putting students through a series of physical exercises, including crawling and creeping, to stimulate nonphysical development in the brain.

Mr. Morris was prompted to do so by the difficulties of one of his children, William, whom he enrolled in the university. He remained at the university until 1977, and it closed a short time later.

He continued to be a vocal foe of Communism and to speak out against disarmament. While in Texas, he made two runs at the Senate, in 1962 and 1970, positioning himself as a conservative Republican. Both times he was defeated in the primary by George Bush.

He was the author of five books, all but one dealing with the prospective unraveling of the world order. One, "Disarmament: Weapon of Conquest," became something of a best seller after it appeared in 1963.

He also wrote a column, "Around the World," which was published from 1960 to the early 1980's in newspapers, among them *The Manchester (N.H.) Union Leader* and *The New York Tribune*. Among his interests were the politics of Africa, and he became a chairman of the American Zimbabwean Association.

In 1984, he made one last bid for the New Jersey Senate nomination, campaigning on the same platform as President Ronald Reagan but losing nonetheless. Until last year, his son said, he remained active, writing and giving lectures to groups in the New York area.

He is survived by his wife, Joan Byles Morris; a daughter, Joan M. Barry of Jackson, N.J.; six sons, Robert J. Jr., of Kauai, Hawaii, Paul E., of Montclair, N.J., Roger W., of Mantoloking, William E., of Mantoloking, John Henry 2d, of Bay Head, N.J., and Geoffrey J., of Armonk, N.Y.; two sisters, Alice Gougeon of Stone Harbor, N.J., and Kathleen Reinert of Point Pleasant Beach, N.J., and 12 grandchildren.

FUNDING FOR INTERNATIONAL FAMILY PLANNING

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, the Senate and House will soon vote on the President's finding that withholding disbursement of USAID family planning funds until July 1, 1997, will cause serious damage to the proper functioning of the program.

It is no surprise that the President reached this conclusion. It is beyond dispute that family planning services, including the provision of modern contraceptives, are the most effective way to prevent unwanted pregnancies and abortions. The examples that the President cites to support his finding should be read by every Member of Congress. They illustrate the harm these restrictions have already done to the program, and the further harm, measured in the numbers of women who will die from unsafe abortions that could be prevented, and children who will die from disease or starvation because their families could not care for them, as well as in added administrative costs, that a further delay in disbursement will cause. They also refute the flagrantly erroneous claim of the right-to-life lobby, that this vote is about whether or not to provide \$123 million to organizations that fund abortion. Not one dime of these funds can be used for abortion, and the vote is only about when, not whether, these funds will be disbursed.

I will have more to say about this at the time of the vote, but I want to be

sure that all Senators saw the editorial from this Saturday's *Washington Post*, and this Sunday's *Post* op-ed piece by David Broder, which make compelling arguments for upholding the President's finding. Perhaps most noteworthy is the quote from former Senator Hatfield, who was staunchly pro-life but an equally strong supporter of family planning. He said "it is a proven fact that when contraceptive services are not available to women throughout the world, abortion rates increase."

Mr. President, that should be the beginning and end of this debate. I ask unanimous consent that the two articles be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the *Washington Post*, Feb. 1, 1997]

A KEY FAMILY PLANNING VOTE

In the familiar and frazzling congressional argument over U.S. foreign aid for family planning, the side whose explicit purpose is to oppose abortion has been marking up notable gains. In the past two years, these funds have been cut by a full third, kept from being spent until nine months of the fiscal year have passed and then allowed to be spent ("metered") only in small monthly sums. Now an important vote is coming up that the family planning side hopes will halt and reverse this legislative harassment of a valuable program. The vote this month is not about funding abortions—something prohibited by law and policy anyway. It will simply determine whether funds already appropriated for family planning in fiscal 1997 will be held up until July or released in March.

Not a great issue, it could be said: a battle over crumbs in Congress. But it is a great issue if you believe as we do that American voluntary family planning programs—carefully drawn, executed and monitored to ensure that they will not be diverted to abortions—have made a central, proven, 30-year contribution to reducing poverty and enhancing human dignity around the world. The effectiveness of well-run programs, in fact, is no longer at issue. They work. It is demonstrable that when programs and funds are reduced—by cuts, delays and policy encumbrances—unintended pregnancies and abortions follow.

We now come to the large and continuing mystery of these programs. A strange belief that abortions can be made to end if family planning is restricted in what apparently has led antiabortion advocates to work for the denial and diminution of family planning services. "Chris," Sen. Mark Hatfield wrote not long ago to one of those advocates, Rep. Chris Smith (R-N.J.), "you are contributing to an increase of abortions worldwide because of the funding restrictions on which you insisted in last year's funding bill. It is a proven fact that when contraceptive services are not available to women throughout the world, abortion rates increase. . . . This is unacceptable to me as someone who is strongly opposed to abortion."

The global generation now coming of child-bearing age is the largest single generation ever to reach reproductive maturity, the Rockefeller Foundation reports. This is a sobering reminder of the need for the United States to resume its leadership in an important field.

[From the *Washington Post*, Feb. 2, 1997]

A VOTE FOR POOR WOMEN OVERSEAS

(By David S. Broder)

For 30 years, the United States has led an international effort to reduce the toll of ma-

ternal deaths and unwanted pregnancies by providing money and technical assistance for family planning programs in underdeveloped countries. Despite its dramatic successes and despite universal agreement that federal funds would not be used to pay for abortions, the program was severely cut and then temporarily suspended last year by antiabortion forces in the House of Representatives.

Now that issue is about to be revisited in a February congressional vote that will directly affect the life prospects of countless women and children—and provide an important test of the shellshocked House Republican leadership's ability to maintain a degree of cohesion in its fragile majority.

The background is this: Since the mid-1960s, the United States, through aid to foreign countries and to private, nonprofit organizations, has helped make contraceptive advice and supplies available to couples in poor lands so they can plan the size of their families. Its success is undeniable. A report released last week by the Rockefeller Foundation, a longtime supporter of family planning, noted that in the past three decades, the percentage of women in these countries using contraception has grown from 10 percent to 50 percent and the average number of children they have borne has been reduced from six to three.

The reduction in family size has helped millions escape from poverty and, for many women, enhanced the prospects for education and a richer life—to say nothing of better health. Fewer risky pregnancies and many fewer abortions are among the benefits.

No one seriously questions the efficacy of the program and, equally, no one has sought to upset the longstanding ban on U.S. government money paying for abortions. But when the Republicans won control of the House in 1995, they sought to write into law a policy that Presidents Reagan and Bush had imposed by executive order banning U.S. aid to organizations that used their own funds to pay for abortions. President Clinton ended that policy two days after he took office, and the House Republicans sought to overrule him.

Rep. Chris Smith (R-N.J.), whose opposition to abortion is as fervent as it is sincere, argued that since money is fungible, grants to groups such as the International Planned Parenthood Federation, which offers privately financed abortion counseling and services, were indirectly subsidizing the procedure he despised. But before he retired last month, Sen. Mark Hatfield (R-Ore.), as staunch an opponent of abortion as can be found, rejected Smith's logic.

In a letter to Smith last September, Hatfield wrote: "I have reviewed the materials you recently sent to my office in response to my request that you provide proof that U.S. funds are being spent on abortion through AID's [the Agency for International Development] voluntary international family planning program. Unfortunately, I do not see anything in these materials to back up your assertion." Hatfield said, "AID has a rigorous process," enforced by outside monitors, to carry out the abortion ban. "In the meantime, Chris," he added, "you are contributing to an increase of abortions worldwide because of the funding restrictions on which you insisted. . . . It is a proven fact that when contraceptive services are not available to women throughout the world, abortion rates increase."

In 1995 and 1996, the House majority followed Smith, the Senate Hatfield. To break the impasse and keep the program alive, Clinton agreed last year that if the House Republicans would not insist on reinstating the Reagan-Bush restrictions, he would accept a 35 percent cut in family planning funds and agree to the financing being suspended entirely for six to nine months.