

Those wishing additional information should contact the Committee on Indian Affairs at 224-2251.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE, SCIENCE, AND TRANSPORTATION

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation be allowed to meet during the Thursday, July 27, 1995 session of the Senate for the purpose of conducting a hearing on spectrum reform.

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

COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources be granted permission to meet during the session of the Senate on Thursday, July 27, 1995, for purpose of conducting a full committee hearing which is scheduled to begin at 9:30 a.m. The purpose of this hearing is to consider the nomination of John Garamendi to be Deputy Secretary of the Interior.

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

COMMITTEE ON FINANCE

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Finance Committee be permitted to meet on Thursday, July 27, 1995 beginning at 9:30 a.m. in room SD-215, to conduct a hearing on the Medicaid Distribution formula.

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

COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent on behalf of the Governmental Affairs Committee to meet on Thursday, July 27 at 9:30 a.m. for a hearing on S.929, the Department of Commerce Dismantling Act.

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

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the committee on the Judiciary be authorized to hold a business meeting during the session of the Senate on Thursday, July 27, 1995 at 9:30 a.m.

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

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Thursday, July 27, 1995, at 10:00 p.m. to hold a hearing on "Prison Reform: Enhancing the Effectiveness of Incarceration"

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

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

NOTICE OF INTENTION TO AMEND SENATE RULE 34

• Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, I submit the following notice in writing:

"In accordance with rule V of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby give notice in writing that it is my intention to move to amend Senate Rule 34."

I ask that the amendment be printed in the RECORD.

The amendment follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. . ADDITIONAL DISCLOSURE IN THE SENATE OF THE VALUE OF CERTAIN ASSETS UNDER THE ETHICS IN GOVERNMENT ACT OF 1978.

(a) CATEGORIES OF INCOME.—Rule XXXIV of the Standing Rules of the Senate is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

"3. In addition to the requirements of paragraph 1, Members, officers, and employees of the Senate shall include in each report filed under paragraph 2 the following additional information:

"(a) For purposes of section 102(a)(1)(B) of the Ethics in Government Act of 1978 additional categories of income as follows:

"(1) greater than \$1,000,000 but not more than \$5,000,000, or

"(2) greater than \$5,000,000.

"(b) For purposes of section 102(d)(1) of the Ethics in Government Act of 1978 additional categories of income as follows:

"(1) greater than \$1,000,000 but not more than \$5,000,000;

"(2) greater than \$5,000,000 but not more than \$25,000,000;

"(3) greater than \$25,000,000 but not more than \$50,000,000; and

"(4) greater than \$50,000,000.

"(c) For purposes of this paragraph and section 102 of the Ethics in Government Act of 1978, additional categories with amounts or values greater than \$1,000,000 set forth in section 102(a)(1)(B) and 102(d)(1) shall apply to the income, assets, or liabilities of spouses and dependent children only if the income, assets, or liabilities are held jointly with the reporting individual. All other income, assets, or liabilities of the spouse or dependent children required to be reported under section 102 and this paragraph in an amount or value greater than \$1,000,000 shall be categorized only as an amount or value greater than \$1,000,000."

(b) BLIND TRUST ASSETS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Rule XXXIV of the Standing Rules of the Senate is further amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

"4. In addition to the requirements of paragraph 1, Members, officers, and employees of the Senate shall include in each report filed under paragraph 2 an additional statement under section 102(a) of the Ethics in Government Act of 1978 listing the category of the total cash value of any interest of the reporting individual in a qualified blind trust as provided in section 102(d)(1) of the Ethics in Government Act of 1978, unless the trust instrument was executed prior to July 24, 1995 and precludes the beneficiary from receiving information on the total cash value of any interest in the qualified blind trust."

(2) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by this subsection shall apply with respect to reports filed under title I of the Ethics in Government Act of 1978 for calendar year 1996 and thereafter. •

LEGISLATING PRAYER IN SCHOOLS TRIVIALIZES WHAT PRAYER IS ABOUT

• Mr. SIMON. Mr. President, Dr. Paul Jersild is a professor of theology and ethics at Lutheran Theological Southern Seminary in Columbia, SC.

Recently, I had a chance to read a column he wrote for the Columbia newspaper, the State, on the issue of prayer in the schools.

At a time when there is much political malarkey being spread about this issue and a lot of concerned people on both sides, I think it is worthwhile to listen to a voice of reason.

I have known Paul Jersild for many years and trust his instinct and good judgment.

I ask that his column be printed in the RECORD.

The column follows:

[From the Columbia (SC) State, June 2, 1995]
LEGISLATING PRAYER IN SCHOOLS TRIVIALIZES

WHAT PRAYER IS ABOUT

[By Paul Jersild]

South Carolinians—and the South in general—tend to be "more religious" than the rest of the nation. What that means can be debated, but one thing is clear enough: Residents of this state are more likely to support a constitutional amendment which would legalize prayer in the public schools.

What is it, exactly, that we would accomplish by such an amendment?

The recent debate on NBC's "Meet the Press" between Ralph Reed, executive director of the Christian Coalition, and White House adviser George Stephanopoulos brought out an important point in answering this question. Stephanopoulos noted that under present law, students can pray before meals in school, express their religious views in classroom discussions or even gather at the flagpole before school begins to start off the day with a prayer.

It is the advocacy of religion on the part of government that is at issue here. No one denies that students can pray, and, in that sense, prayer is not the real issue. What Mr. Reed argued is that an amendment is needed in order to reverse what he sees as a climate of hostility toward expressions of religious faith in public life. The question in my mind—and it is shared by many Christians—is whether an amendment is the appropriate solution to the kind of problem posed by Mr. Reed.

Here I see a disturbing aspect to religion in the South. Baptists make up the vast majority of church members in this region, and they represent one of the most revered and important traditions in American religious and political history. From their beginnings, Baptists have been known for their vigorous advocacy of separation of church and state in order to assure their own freedom and that of others to practice the religion of their choice.

But now, with their majority status in the South, Baptists seem to have forgotten this honored tradition. Many of them have become more concerned with politically enforcing a religious practice which they regard as essential to maintaining their version of civic religion. Concern for minority religious groups and non-believers has disappeared as they insist on the "rights" of the majority.

The irony of this situation is obvious, for it is largely their own notable history that has taught us to beware of majoritarian attempts to enforce religious views and practices on the rest of the population.

This whole development carries an important lesson concerning the vagaries and pitfalls of trying to politically shape the practice of religion.

There is, indeed, a proper role for religious ceremony in the public realm, and separation of church and state should not be understood as the elimination of all religious expression in public life. But when prayer is used as a political weapon to counteract what is perceived as a hostile environment, it is being grossly misused. Passing a law does not create a community of faith where, alone, prayer is both vital and necessary. Enforcing prayer in the classroom (or a silent moment for prayer) turns it into a symbolic act for the sake of a political purpose, which destroys or, at least, trivializes what prayer is about.

Since Christians disagree among themselves about the wisdom of a prayer amendment, it should be clear that this is not an issue of the church against the state or the rest of society. It is an ideological battle being waged by certain Christians who want to implement their particular vision of a "Christian" society. If we can actually legislate that goal, it is not worth achieving. •

BOSNIA AND HERZEGOVINA SELF-DEFENSE ACT

• Mr. SANTORUM. Mr. President, 2 days ago in Bosnia and Herzegovina, the town of Zepa, the second safe haven fell to the Bosnian Serbs, lending increasing urgency to the need to pass S. 21, the Dole-Lieberman bill. Mr. President, the U.S. Congress has voted on the issue of the arms embargo many times, but the fall of two U.N. safe havens has dramatically highlighted this ill-fated policy as never before. The failure of the U.N. peacekeepers to protect the enclaves and themselves is coupled with the knowledge that the Bosnian Government troops have been effectively rendered useless by their lack of heavy weaponry. As the fighting continues to escalate in Bihac, a third U.N. safe haven, it is time for the Clinton administration to abandon this doomed policy, accept that UNPROFOR must be withdrawn, and lift the arms embargo on the Bosnian Government.

We have been warned many times by the Clinton administration that this bill would undermine efforts to achieve a negotiated settlement in Bosnia and could lead to an escalation of the conflict there, including the possible Americanization of the conflict. Mr. President, the conflict has already escalated. More U.N. troops are being deployed, and as the United States and European leaders issue more empty threats, the reality is that the indecisiveness and ineffectiveness of the West has invited the Serbs to step up their assaults. As of this week, two safe havens have fallen, a third is under siege, and in the past 4 days in Sarajevo, at least 20 people have been killed, while more than 100 people have been wounded. The U.N. mission has failed and has been declared more of a hindrance than a help by the Bosnian Prime Minister. The peace talks have failed because the Bosnian Serbs have determined that, judging by their re-

cent military success, they have more to gain by fighting than by negotiating a peace settlement. The Bosnian Serbs already have control of 70 percent of Bosnia-Herzegovina due in large part to a near monopoly of heavy weapons.

This situation in Bosnia, particularly the "dual key" approach has eroded United States credibility and undermined NATO cohesion while contributing to the decline of the effectiveness of the U.N. peacekeepers. Mr. President, this is not a partisan issue, I am not blaming the Clinton administration, many of the problems with our policy in Bosnia began with the previous administration. This is a moral issue. The U.N. peacekeepers have not been able to achieve their mission. They are no longer capable of delivering humanitarian supplies to the enclaves, they are no longer capable of protecting the safe havens, and judging by the ease with which the peacekeepers have been killed and taken hostage, they are no longer capable of protecting themselves. Mr. President, this is not the fault of the troops in Bosnia. They were sent into a situation as noncombatants though they were seen as combatants by Serbs. UNPROFOR went to Bosnia to protect civilians, but they were never given the mandate, the equipment, or the rules of engagement to do the job. It was unconscionable to inject U.N. peacekeepers into a war where there is no peace to keep and without adequate means to defend themselves. The United Nations and NATO have been humiliated and weakened as Serb violations of U.N. resolutions were met with silence and empty promises.

The arms embargo against Bosnia was adopted by the Security Council of the United Nations in 1991 when Yugoslavia was still intact. It was requested and supported by the then Government of Yugoslavia in Belgrade, the Milosevic government. It is a cruel twist of fate that the results of this arms embargo has hurt the very people who have been the victims of the war. This embargo has had no effect on the Bosnian Serbs who have inherited the powerful former Yugoslav army but has devastated the Bosnian Moslems. We can no longer stand by helplessly and watch as a country, recognized by the United Nations, is promised assistance that is too little, too late.

Two days ago, Bosnian Serb leaders Karadzic and his military chief of staff, Ratko Mladic, were charged with genocide, war crimes, and crimes against humanity by the U.N. International Criminal Tribunal. Mr. President, the world has recognized the atrocities of this tragic situation. Let us finally act to give the Bosnian Moslems the capacity to fight back and to defend themselves. Let us stop punishing these helpless civilians for the error of our policy.

A TOOL FOR A COLORBLIND AMERICA

• Mr. SIMON. Mr. President, there is a great deal of nonsense in the political oratory on affirmative action. Like policies on education, religion or any other good thing, it can be abused.

But fundamentally, it will make America a better place. It has made America a better place and is making America a better place.

We still have a long way to go before we are a nation without prejudices and without the discrimination that comes from prejudices.

Chancellor Chang-Lin Tien of the University of California-Berkeley had an op-ed piece in the Los Angeles Times that I think provides a needed balance.

I urge my colleagues to read it.

At this point, I ask that the op-ed piece be printed in the RECORD.

The material follows:

[From the Los Angeles Times, July 18, 1995]

A TOOL FOR A COLORBLIND AMERICA

(By Chang-Lin Tien)

As an Asian American, I have endured my share of affirmative action "jokes." Even when I became chancellor of UC Berkeley, I was not spared teasing about how affirmative action was the reason I landed this coveted post at one of America's great universities.

Opponents of affirmative action use examples like this to argue that affirmative action tars all minorities with the same brush of inferiority—whether or not we benefit directly.

Affirmative action is not the source of the problem. As much as America would like to believe otherwise, racial discrimination remains a fact of life. Whether we preside over major universities or wash dishes, people of color confront discrimination.

In my first months as chancellor, I was encouraged by friends to get coaching to eliminate my accent. While a European inflection conjures up images of Oxford or the belles-lettres, Asian and Latino accents apparently denote ignorance to the American ear.

Our nation is far from fulfilling the Rev. Martin Luther King Jr.'s dream of a country where people are judged on the content of their character, not the color of their skin.

King's immortal words challenged America to live up to its founding principle—that all men are created equal. It is an ideal all Americans embrace. Yet it has needed redefining as America has struggled to broaden its concept of democracy to include women and races other than Caucasian.

King's challenge is especially relevant today as this country undergoes a phenomenal demographic transformation. His challenge will resonate on Thursday when the UC Board of Regents considers eliminating race and ethnicity in admissions and hiring.

As an educator, I know that America's demographic shift poses tremendous challenges. American universities must educate more leaders from all racial and ethnic groups so they can succeed in a diverse environment.

How can America's educators accomplish this? Affirmative action has been an effective tool for diversifying our student body while preserving academic excellence. Yet its opponents argue that affirmative action runs counter to the principle of individual rights on which this country was founded. Affirmative action, they believe, is based on the "group rights" of racial and ethnic groups.