Ducking on Affirmative Action

In a hurtful blow to affirmative action in higher education, the Supreme Court said on Monday that it would not hear an appeal by the state of Texas from a lower court ruling that banned preferences from using race as a factor in selecting students. With this sidestep, the Court left officials in at least three Southern states who are working to overcome educational and employment barriers for minority students in an untenable state of uncertainty. It also sowed confusion nationwide—hardly an uplifting way for the Court to finish its term and head into recess. The Court should instead have seized the opportunity to reject the lower court’s flawed pronouncement and reaffirmed its historic commitment to carefully designed affirmative action.

The high court seemed insensitive to the long history of racism at the University of Texas Law School, whose affirmative action program was challenged by rejected white applicants, giving rise to the case. As late as 1971, the law school admitted no black students. The Court also ignored the Clinton Justice Department, which filed a brief warning that the “practical effect” of the lower court’s “holding” will be to return the state to a system of “most privileged” with state and university systems to their “former ‘white’ status.”

The refusal to hear the case left standing a ruling by the United States Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit that caused justifiable consternation in the academic world three months ago. An appellate panel invalidated a special admissions program at the Texas law school aimed at increasing the number of black and Mexican-American students. In doing so, the panel took the gratuitous, additional step of declaring the Supreme Court’s landmark 1978 affirmative action decision in the so-called Bakke case no longer good law.

That case involved a white applicant who sought entry to a California state medical school, resulted in a ruling that barred the use of quotas in affirmative action plans but permitted universities to use race as a factor in choosing applicants to serve the “compelling interest” of creating a diverse student body.

If Bakke is no longer good law, it is for the Supreme Court to declare. But instead of grabbing the case to reassert Bakke’s sound principle, the justices found a way out in the oddest procedural and legal one-paragraph opinion that was also signed by Justice David Souter. Justice Ruth Blader Ginsburg said that the Court was denying review because the case did not factually present a live controversy. The kind of two-track admissions system that inspired the legal challenge is no longer used or defended by Texas, she explained. Like most other colleges and universities, the University of Texas Law School now uses a single applicant pool, in which race is one factor to be considered among others in choosing among the qualified.

Justice Ginsburg’s message, a welcome one, was that Court’s refusal to hear the case should not be read as endorsement of the Fifth Circuit’s analysis. But, in fact, there was a remaining live controversy before the Court in the Fifth Circuit’s decision on a state’s leading law school to completely exclude race as a factor in future admissions. The shame is the Court declined to address it.

Instead, the Court left behind a mess. Its refusal to hear the case has put educational institutions in the three states that make up the Fifth Circuit—Mississippi—in a terrible spot. They could face punitive damages if they fail to change their practices to conform to an ill-considered ruling that may ultimately be judged an incorrect statement of the law.

Nervous educators elsewhere in the nation can find some comfort at least in Justice Ginsburg’s benign explanation. Eventually, this equal rights battle will find its way back to the Supreme Court. Meanwhile, it is promising legislation that gives education programs still needed to blot out historic racial bias and promote educational diversity.

Executive Session

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to executive session to consider the following nomination on today’s Executive Calendar: Calendar No. 598, Edmund Sargus, I.r., of Ohio, to be United States District Judge for the Southern District of Ohio.

Legislative Session

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

The nomination considered and confirmed is as follows:

Edmund A. Sargus, J.r., of Ohio, to be United States District Judge for the Southern District of Ohio.

Orders for Tuesday, July 23, 1996

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its legislative business today, it stand in adjournment until the hour of 9:30 a.m. on Tuesday, July 23; further, that immediately following the prayer, the Journal of proceedings be deemed approved to date, the morning hour be deemed to have expired, and the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day, and the Senate immediately resume the reconciliation bill as under the previous order.

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

Program

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. President, for the information of all Senators, tomorrow morning at 9:30 a.m., there will be a lengthy series of roll call votes, or in relation to, amendments to the reconciliation bill. Members should be alerted that there may be as many as 24 consecutive roll call votes.

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

Mr. COCHRAN. Senators should remain in or around the Senate Chamber during these votes in order for the Senate to complete the reconciliation bill in a timely manner. Votes will occur throughout the morning. And it is the leader’s intention to hold these votes to 10 minutes in length. Therefore, Senators are reminded again to remain in or around the Chamber during this voting series.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate stand in recess between the hours of 12:30 p.m. and 2 p.m. for the weekly party caucuses to meet.

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

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. President, I further ask unanimous consent that following the stacked votes regarding the reconciliation bill, the Senate proceed to vote on or in relation to the McCain amendment No. 4968 to be followed immediately by a vote on or in relation to the Gregg amendment No. 4969.

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

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask that the Senate now stand in adjournment under the previous order following the remarks of the distinguished Senator from Nebraska [Mr. KERREY] for up to 10 minutes.

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

Mr. KERREY addressed the Chair. The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognizes the Senator from Nebraska.

AGRICULTURE, RURAL DEVELOPMENT, FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 1997

The Senate continued with the consideration of the bill.

AMENDMENT NO. 4978

Mr. KERREY. First, Mr. President, in relation to an amendment that I introduced earlier that provided an additional $8.5 million for the Food Safety and Inspection Service and the Packers and Stockyards Administration, I ask unanimous consent that the distinguished Democratic leader, Senator DASCHLE, be added as an original co-sponsor.

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

SOCIAL SECURITY

Mr. KERREY. Mr. President, I do not know if I will take 30 minutes or not, but it was called to my attention this morning when I got back in town that there was an opinion piece that appeared in the Washington Post yesterday, Sunday, written by Mr. Henry Aaron, a senior fellow in the Economic Studies Program at the Brookings Institution. The headline is “The Myths of the Social Security Crisis.” Henry Aaron, a distinguished fellow and economist, goes through one, two, three, four, five myths.

I do not know how many of my colleagues or how many people that are concerned about this particular issue read this opinion piece, but I wanted to immediately call to your attention later to the floor to deal with some of the statements Mr. Aaron makes in detail—but wanted to immediately come to the floor and urge colleagues who have increasingly started looking at Social Security as an issue that we need to address currently, to hear the following.

First, Mr. Aaron says myth one is that “Social Security is in crisis.” This essentially is a strawman argument, the fact that some people are saying it is in crisis. Destroy that argument, therefore, we do not need to do anything.

Mr. President, I hope we do not have to deal with problems only when they are in crisis. I hope that, particularly with a program that promises retirement payments to people 30, 40, 50, 60, 70 years from now—and understand that every beneficiary of Social Security for the next 70 years is alive today. They may be 5 years old, but they are future beneficiaries. And we need to, whether or not we have the resources or the will, to be able to pay their benefits. So the longer one delays, the more Social Security as an issue that we need to address currently, to hear the following.

Mr. President, I hope we do not have to deal with problems only when they are in crisis. I hope that, particularly with a program that promises retirement payments to people 30, 40, 50, 60, 70 years from now—and understand that every beneficiary of Social Security for the next 70 years is alive today. They may be 5 years old, but they are future beneficiaries. And we need to, whether or not we have the resources or the will, to be able to pay their benefits. So the longer one delays, the more Social Security as an issue that we need to address currently, to hear the following.

Mr. President, I hope we do not have to deal with problems only when they are in crisis. I hope that, particularly with a program that promises retirement payments to people 30, 40, 50, 60, 70 years from now—and understand that every beneficiary of Social Security for the next 70 years is alive today. They may be 5 years old, but they are future beneficiaries. And we need to, whether or not we have the resources or the will, to be able to pay their benefits. So the longer one delays, the more Social Security as an issue that we need to address currently, to hear the following.

Mr. Aaron actually later on said one myth is that it is the “third rail of American politics—touch it and you die.” That is another myth he identifies. I do not actually think that is a myth.

The last time we dealt with Social Security substantively was in 1983. We waited until we were almost out of money. Even then we almost did not do anything. Then when it took an independent panel to provide the Congress with protection. Mr. Aaron says we did it in 1983. The change that was made in 1983 is already under attack. The reason it was changed was the Deficit-Reduction Act. There was a substantial effort to eliminate that change.

So I do not think that the fact that Congress has dealt finally with Social Security is an act? Wait until it is in crisis. Mr. President, we are not going to see the same thing we had in 1983. Once the baby boomers have retired, if you look at the numbers that are required to pay out, it is a much different situation than we face today. It is not in crisis. I do not argue that Social Security is in crisis. I am not saying it is contributing to the deficit, which is another myth that is here.

But one of the myths that is not on Mr. Aaron’s list—and I have a great respect for Henry Aaron and his views—but one of the myths he does not identify is the most troubling and difficult of all is that Americans who are beneficiaries today, No. 1, believe that the Social Security Program is a savings program; in this they are getting back is what they paid in. We have perpetrated that myth very often with television advertising saying: Your Social Security is safe. I will not let anybody touch your Social Security. It is the safest program that we have today. You do not really hear people standing up talking about radical change in the program or cutting current beneficiaries.

I want to listen to the organizations who are concerned about this program talk, when they do their direct mail pieces, you would think that every single day somebody is down here on the floor talking about changes in the program.

The program enjoys broad support from the American people. And 85 percent of almost every generation supports Social Security as a program. It has reduced the rates of poverty substantially in this nation of people over the age of 65. It has been, in general, a very, very good program.

The myth, though, that it is a savings program encourages people to believe that their payroll tax is going into an account that is reserved for them that they own. It is not being reserved for them. Social Security was designed as a collective transfer program. It is social insurance because there are progressive payments made. The connection between what you receive is based upon your income, not based upon what you have contributed. It is very progressive.

As a consequence, it has been a program that most, I think, look at as a good way to help, and particularly lower income retirees avoid the trauma of living in poverty at the very time when they are no longer able to produce and earn a living.

It is not a savings program. That is the most difficult myth of all. There is no account being held here for people that are paying into the program, which leads, Mr. President, to one of the most important reasons that people, like myself, have been arguing for reform.

The first one is, as I said earlier, waiting until the end, as we typically do. Mr. Aaron is basically saying: Wait until there is a crisis. There is no crisis. You are not going to see a crisis, he is saying. Wait another 30 years until there is a crisis, and then act.

That is foolishness to do that. The people who are going to pay the price for that are not current beneficiaries, people currently receiving payments. But it will be people under the age of 43 who will have to answer the question, “Gee, wait a minute. Do I want, in order to preserve my benefits, my kids to pay this kind of payroll tax?” I look at the kind of payroll tax that they are going to have to pay if you wait for 30 years, if some kind of adjustment is not made before then.