

be in our national interests to promote or to continue.

What is even more important to realize, Mr. President, is the real issue is not ultimately how often the permanent replacement weapon is used. The truth is that the mere availability of this weapon to management distorts the collective bargaining process in many, many more labor disputes than those in which it is actually used. The mere existence of the threat, whether or not it is carried out, is enough to undermine the right to organize and to undermine workers' ability to bargain on a level playing field about the conditions of their work.

In that regard, I reference the letter that was read by the Senator from California, when the letter writer said, "If you knew you were going to get fired, why would you try?"

After 12 years of antagonism during previous administrations, the time I believe has come to forge a new direction. The time has come for labor and management to work together in this country. Our major industrial competitors including Canada, Japan, Germany, and France, have recognized that banning the permanent replacement of strikers restores balance in the collective bargaining process and makes good economic sense. The time has come for Congress to do the same.

I point out again, with regard to Bridgestone/Firestone in Decatur and Des Moines, what is happening in Decatur, and what is happening in Des Moines, is illegal in Japan. It is almost too perverse to contemplate.

America's union workers are not simply another cost to be cut. They are human beings who are often struggling to provide for their families to make ends meet. Under our Nation's labor laws they have certain rights, including the right to strike. Congress thought that we were guaranteeing that in 1935 when the NLRA was passed. Unfortunately, they were wrong. They had not counted on someone coming up with the idea that to be permanently replaced was not the same thing as being fired.

But we can guarantee that today. We can acknowledge what everyone knows to be true: That absent the right to strike without being permanently replaced, collective bargaining does not work. It cannot. It cannot if management can replace workers the minute they take to the picket lines. Workers then do not have the right to bargain. They walk around in every negotiation with a loaded gun, frankly, at their heads.

Mr. President, we are entering a new era in economic competition. All over the world, barriers to trade between nations are falling. We are witnessing the development of a truly global marketplace. I believe that America can and must lead the way in this marketplace, but if we are to succeed, if we are to retain our competitive into the 21st century, there must be a symbiosis between labor and management and

government. That means a mutually beneficial working relationship, one of mutual respect: Labor needs jobs, workers need jobs, workers need the business to be competitive to make a profit to be able to compete. Government should be a partner of all of that.

Certainly, this issue of permanent replacement of strikers just cuts against the grain and prohibits and precludes our ability to advance ourselves and to go forward in terms of this global marketplace and the competitiveness challenges that we are facing in the world.

Mr. President, President Clinton's Executive order, I believe, is a first step in restoring the balance, the delicate balance, that will allow America to retain its competitive edge. I would, therefore, like to conclude my remarks by urging this body to oppose the pending amendment. I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

## MORNING BUSINESS

### THE PELL GRANT PROGRAM

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, recently, concern was expressed that the Pell Grant Program may be giving college students a free ride, and that Federal funds might be better spent by transferring funds to the College Work Study Program. Because of this, I thought it might be helpful to take a somewhat closer look at the Pell Grant Program, and place it in a more proper context regarding student aid in general and its relationship to college work study in particular. I thought it might also be good to see just how many students today have to work to help pay for their college education.

At the outset, let me make it clear that I support both of these very worthy programs. The Pell Grant Program provides students with need the opportunity to pursue a college education that might be beyond their financial reach. The College Work Study Program often supplements the Pell Grant Program and offers deserving students the chance to help defray their educational expenses by working. Both programs are important, and both programs are essential.

I am concerned, however, that with respect to the Pell Grant Program, the impression in the public's mind might be that these students do not have to work and that their college education is being fully financed by their Pell grant. Nothing could be farther from the truth.

As my colleagues know, the Pell grant award is need-based, which means it goes only to students who

demonstrate financial need. Over 75 percent of all students who receive Pell grants come from families with incomes of less than \$15,000 a year, which means that the program is targeted to those students who have the greatest financial need.

In addition, it is very important that one realize that the maximum Pell grant can be no higher than \$2,340, the current maximum, or 60 percent of the cost of attendance, whichever is less. Thus, in no situation does the Pell grant pay for a student's entire education. At best, it covers only 60 percent of the cost of attendance, and that in the case of those students who demonstrate the very greatest need.

Increasingly, more and more students find they must work in order to obtain the additional funds necessary to pay for a college education. A recent Washington Post article indicated that the proportion of all fulltime college students between the ages of 16 and 24 who worked to help pay for their education had increased from 35 percent in 1972 to 51 percent in 1993. And, fulltime students now work an average of 25 hours a week.

The figures for Pell grant recipients are even more dramatic. Of those who responded to a recent survey by the U.S. Department of Education, more than 75 percent of all Pell grant recipients worked and 60 percent worked while they were in school. Numerically, this means that almost 2.8 million Pell grant recipients work, and over 2.2 million must work and go to college at the same time.

I am equally concerned that there may simply not be enough hours in a day for needy and deserving students to pay for their entire education by working. One goes to college to learn. If that is to be done and done well, students must have sufficient time to study. While work may be both necessary and laudable, it should not rob students of the time they need to fulfill the academic responsibilities that led them to seek a college education in the first place.

Further, it is very doubtful that there are enough jobs in and around campus to meet the demand that would be created if the Pell Grant Program were handed over to college work study. When we reauthorized the Higher Education Act in 1992, we considered an expansion of the Work Study Program, but found that many colleges were literally stretched to the limits in terms of finding employment for their students. Thus, as worthwhile and important as the College Work Study Program is, it simply cannot meet the overwhelming needs of students.

One of the unique features of the Pell Grant Program is that it is targeted to the student and not the institution. If students demonstrate need, Pell grant funds are available to help them attend a college of their choice. Transferring that approach to the campus-based Work Study Program would change the very nature of the Pell Grant Program.

Access and choice are twin features of this important program, and I am of the mind that we should not alter that approach.

The Pell Grant Program has helped literally millions of students achieve a college education that otherwise would have been beyond their reach. This year more than 3.7 million students received Pell grants, and more than 54 million grants have been made since the program began in 1973-74 school year. It is a program that has outstripped the widely popular and important GI bill on which it was modeled.

Mr. President, today we are faced with the fact that more students and families are having to go deeply into debt to pay for a college education. The number of students and families who must borrow and the amount of money they are borrowing are reaching gigantic proportions. A decade ago the anticipated new loan volume in the Guaranteed Student Loan Program was \$7.9 billion with just under 3.4 million borrowers. This year the anticipated loan volume is \$25.8 billion and almost 6.6 million borrowers. The number of borrowers has less than doubled, but the amount borrowed has more than tripled.

Instead of focusing concern on either the Pell Grant Program or the College Work Study Program, we should be examining with care the long-term effects of student indebtedness. Instead of a debate that would have us choose between grants or work study, we should be debating how to increase both of those programs in order to relieve students and families of the terrible debt burden they are incurring through student loans.

Mr. President, in a Congress where the size of the national debt is rightfully a major focus and where the need for a better balance between income and expenditures is absolutely necessary, we should not lose sight of the fact that this applies not only to Federal spending but also to family spending and the deficit they face in trying to pay for a college education.

In a Congress where budget cutting is a major theme, it may not be popular to suggest that the right and prudent course to follow in student aid is to increase funding in both the Pell grant and the College Work Study program. Yet, that is, to my mind, the course we should be following if, in fact, we are really, truly concerned about the debt American students and families are incurring as they invest not only in education but in their own and their Nation's future strength and well-being.

What Disraeli said of England over a century ago is surely just as true for America today: "Upon the education of our children depends the future of the nation."

#### COMMEMORATION OF NATIONAL SPORTSMANSHIP DAY

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, it is with great pride that I bring to the atten-

tion of my colleagues National Sportsman-ship Day which was celebrated on March 7.

My pride stems from the fact that this celebration, which is recognized by the President's Council on Physical Fitness and Sports, originated as a concept of the Institute for International Sport. The institute, housed at the University of Rhode Island, has brought us the hugely successful World Scholar-Athlete Games and the soon to be held Rhode Island Scholar-Athlete Games. National Sportsman-ship Day, now in its fifth year, has grown into a national and now an international movement.

National Sportsman-ship day was conceived to create an awareness among the students of this country—from grade school to university level—of the importance of ethics, fair play, and sportsman-ship in all facets of athletics as well as society as a whole. The need to periodically refocus our young people on sportsman-ship and fair play is sadly evident on the playing field in these days of taunting, fighting, winning at all costs mentality, and the lure of huge sums of money for athletes hardly ready to cope with life's normal challenges.

To commemorate National Sportsman-ship Day, the Institute for International Sport sends to all participating schools—now numbering 5,000 in all 50 States as well as a number of schools in nearly 50 countries—packets of information with instructional materials on the themes surrounding the issue of sportsman-ship. Throughout the country, students are involved in discussions, writing essays, creating art work, and in other creative ways engaging each other on the subject.

The institute's nationally recognized Sports Ethics Fellows Program, which counts among its present members Olympic gold medal skater Bonnie Blair, promotes and supports National Sportsman-ship Day activities.

Mr. President, as it has in past years, the President's Council on Physical Fitness and Sports had recognized National Sportsman-ship Day. I ask unanimous consent that the letter signed by the council's cochairs Florence Griffith Joyner and former Congressman Tom McMillen be printed in the RECORD following my remarks. I also urge my colleagues, Mr. President, to encourage students to focus on National Sportsman-ship Day.

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

THE PRESIDENT'S COUNCIL ON  
PHYSICAL FITNESS AND SPORTS,  
Washington, DC, November 28, 1994.

Mr. TODD SEIDEL,  
Director of National Sportsman-ship Day, Insti-  
tute for International Sport, University of  
Rhode Island, Kingston, RI.

DEAR MR. SEIDEL: The President's Council on Physical Fitness and Sports is pleased to recognize March 7, 1995, as National Sportsman-ship Day. The valuable life skills and lessons that are learned by youth and adults

through participation in sports cannot be overestimated.

Participation in sports makes contributions to all aspects of our lives, such as heightened awareness of the value of fair play, ethics, integrity, honesty and sportsman-ship, as well as improving levels of physical fitness and health.

The Council congratulates the Institute for International Sport for its continued leadership in organizing this important day and wish you every success in your efforts to broaden participation and awareness of National Sportsman-ship Day.

Sincerely,

FLORENCE GRIFFITH  
JOYNER,  
Cochair.  
TOM McMILLEN,  
Cochair.

#### MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Thomas, one of his secretaries.

#### EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session the Presiding Officer laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations which were referred to the Committee on Labor and Human Resources.

#### REPORT RELATIVE TO THE ATOMIC ENERGY ACT—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT—PM 31

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, together with an accompanying report; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

*To the Congress of the United States:*

The United States has been engaged in nuclear cooperation with the European Community, now European Union, for many years. This cooperation was initiated under agreements that were concluded in 1957 and 1968 between the United States and the European Atomic Energy Community [EURATOM] and that expire December 31, 1995. Since the inception of this cooperation, EURATOM has adhered to all its obligations under those agreements.

The Nuclear Non-Proliferation Act of 1978 amended the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 to establish new nuclear export criteria, including a requirement that the United States have a right to consent to the reprocessing of fuel exported from the United States. Our present agreements for cooperation with EURATOM do not contain such a right. To avoid disrupting cooperation with EURATOM, a proviso was included in the law to enable continued cooperation until March 10, 1980, if EURATOM agreed to negotiations concerning our cooperation agreements. EURATOM agreed in 1978 to such negotiations.