

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.

That agreement guaranteed Clinton an up-or-down floor vote in the House and Senate this month on resuming the program without the Reagan-Bush restrictions. But Smith is pressing House Majority Leader Dick Arme to break the deal Republicans made with the White House last September and allow Smith to bring up his restrictive amendment again, sweetened with a partial rollback of the funding cut. Arme's spokeswoman told me, "We're leaning toward" giving Smith what he wants.

That prospect has impelled many of the three dozen House Republicans who support the international family planning program to write Arme that, rather than yield to Smith and his allies, they are prepared to fight their own leadership and, if necessary, hand them an embarrassing defeat on the first major legislative test since Speaker Newt Gingrich was disciplined for ethics violations. The issue goes before the House Republican Conference later this week. But the women and children who have most at stake around the world will not have a vote.

TRIBUTE TO CHARLES A. "BILL" BISHOP

Mr. BAUCUS. Mr. President, I rise today to ask that this body honor a man whose life was an honor to Montana. And a man whose death is a loss to us all.

My friend, Charles A. "Bill" Bishop, died on Sunday, January 26. But his memory will continue to live on in all of us who remember him. His loss is sudden, and we are left now to remember this man who gave us so much. Throughout his life, he was a husband, a father, an advocate, a learner, a jokester, and a teacher. In everything he did, he attacked it with a passion—an unquenchable zest for life.

Family was everything to Bill. He idolized his wife and children, and they loved him dearly. One of his favorite things in the world was spending time with his family. I extend my deepest sympathies to them in this time of sorrow.

Bill's zest for life can easily be seen in his legacy of outspoken advocacy for the environment. With a heart as big as the Mission Mountains that he loved so much, Bill was committed to leaving this planet a better place for his children and grandchildren. On these issues, Bill was often an adviser to me. If he agreed with something I did, he would let me know. If he disagreed, I could expect to get an earful from him. Yet through it all, he was thoughtful, respectful, and eager to find solutions to the many problems that confront Montana.

I still have a hard time imagining Montana without Bill Bishop. In many ways, I will never get used to his absence. To say that I will miss him is not enough. His passing leaves my life with a little less laughter and a little less joy.

Those of us who knew Bill will make sure that the memories stay always fresh, renewed over and over again by our love for this great man. God bless you, Bill.

THE VERY BAD DEBT BOXSCORE

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, at the close of business yesterday, Monday, February 3, the Federal debt stood at \$5,297,382,328,731.42.

Five years ago, February 3, 1992, the Federal debt stood at \$3,795,010,000,000.

Ten years ago, February 3, 1987, the Federal debt stood at \$2,231,437,000,000.

Fifteen years ago, February 3, 1982, the Federal debt stood at \$1,036,317,000,000.

Twenty-five years ago, February 3, 1972, the Federal debt stood at \$423,272,000,000 which reflects a debt increase of more than \$4 trillion—\$4,874,110,328,731.42—during the past 25 years.

ADDRESS BY PEACE CORPS DIRECTOR MARK GEARAN

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, on December 16, 1996, Mark Gearan, the Director of the Peace Corps, delivered an eloquent address at the National Press Club on the current status of the Peace Corps. Mr. Gearan's address provides an excellent summary of the accomplishments of the Peace Corps and the extraordinary assistance that Peace Corps volunteers are providing to nations in all parts of the world. I know that President Kennedy would be proud of the way the Peace Corps is living up to its ideals, and I ask that Mr. Gearan's address be printed in the RECORD.

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

REMARKS BY MARK D. GEARAN, DIRECTOR OF THE PEACE CORPS

The job of Director of the Peace Corps affords those who are privileged to hold it a unique perspective on the world and our country, one that is shaped by the enduring values that the Peace Corps represents, and by the spirit of service that Volunteers embody.

When Sargent Shriver, the first Director of the Peace Corps, came to the National Press Club in 1962, he made this observation:

"It is a complex world we live in today," he said. "While one man orbits the earth in a space capsule, another man squats for hours beside an Asian rice paddy, trying to catch a fish only as big as your thumb. While some men manufacture computers, other men plow with sticks."

What my predecessor said then still holds true today. We have men and women orbiting the earth in space capsules. But we still have men and women plowing with sticks in many parts of the world.

Yet it goes without saying that the world is much different than it was in 1962. The disparities that Sargent Shriver described are still with us. But advances in science, technology, the media, the spread of freedom and democracy, and the end of the Cold War, have not only made our lives more complicated, they have also given us new opportunities and new reason for hope.

Much the same can be said about the Peace Corps. Since President Kennedy sent the first group of Volunteers to Ghana in 1961, we have remained true to the vision and goals that were set out for us from the very beginning. Today, nearly 7,000 Volunteers are working with ordinary people in 90 coun-

tries to encourage social and economic progress at the grass-roots level. Peace Corps Volunteers are young and older; they are black, white, Asian, Hispanic, and Native American; and they come from every social, economic, and religious background.

Yet for all of their diversity, our Volunteers still share a common purpose: to help make the world a better place.

And just as it was in the beginning, the Peace Corps is still much more than a development agency. Our Volunteers are still strengthening the bonds of friendship and understanding between Americans and the people of the developing world that are, in many respects, the foundation of peace among nations.

Yet the Peace Corps has also changed to meet the needs of our time. We have worked hard to strengthen the Peace Corps while remaining faithful to our mission. And I believe that the state of the Peace Corps is as strong as it has ever been, and that its prospects for the future are bright and promising. From the number of qualified and motivated people who want to become Volunteers, to the new countries we are entering, to the strong support we have among the American people, this Administration, and in the Congress, the Peace Corps is moving forward and is poised to enter the 21st century with confidence and energy.

With this future in mind, we decided to take a look at the past and see what we could learn from some of the men and women who have served as Peace Corps Volunteers over the years. We have conducted the first comprehensive survey of returned Peace Corps Volunteers who have served in each of the last four decades since 1961.

I'll tell you more about the survey in a minute. But let me give you just a few examples that demonstrate the vitality of an agency that continues to capture the imagination of so many people.

First, we continue to attract the best that America has to offer. Last year, more than 100,000 people contacted us seeking information about how to become a Peace Corps Volunteer. Ten thousand went through our competitive application process, and we extended invitations to 3,500 of these talented and dedicated people.

Second, we are making sure that Volunteers are serving in the right countries for the times in which we live. That's why earlier this year, our Volunteers returned to Haiti after a five-year absence to work with the people of the poorest nation in this hemisphere.

That's why next month, Volunteers will go to South Africa for the first time in the history of the Peace Corps to help support and contribute to the historic transformation that is taking place in that critical country.

And that's why I recently signed an agreement with the government of Jordan that will allow Volunteers to begin serving there in April 1997 for the first time. Expanding the presence of Peace Corps Volunteers in the Middle East is an important step for us. I believe these Volunteers will help improve understanding between Americans and the people of the Arab world and contribute to Jordan's development.

Third, we are making sure that the work of our volunteers is driven by the needs of the communities where they are serving. Volunteers are working with their counterparts to help to protect and restore the environment. Others collaborate with small business people to create economic opportunities. They are working with teachers to expand access to education for children and adults, and they help farmers grow more and better food. Still others are helping to keep families healthy and prevent the spread of terrible diseases, such as HIV/AIDS.