

and preserved the grand traditions of this institution.

Senator SIMON has been a national leader on literacy and on the power of the written word. His career and his life are a tribute to knowledge, learning, and the pursuit of excellence. Senator SIMON has walked these corridors with a quiet dignity and brought to them a sense of decency that we shall long remember.

Senator SIMON is truly a skilled teacher. He has taught us, in the U.S. Senate, the lesson of civility and he has taught us and every American who has heard his message that it is in the best interest of this Nation to put a premium on intellect again. He has done so in his actions, words, and deeds, and he shall be missed not only for his bow ties but for his honorable public service, his powerful independence, and his skill as a leader, a debater, and a quintessential U.S. Senator.

SENATOR DAVID PRYOR

I want to pay tribute to my distinguished colleague from Arkansas, Senator DAVID PRYOR who is a skilled and effective legislator with a gentlemanly southern charm and a modesty that belies his extraordinary skills and accomplishments.

Of his many accomplishments, not the least of which is his agricultural record for the people of Arkansas, Senator PRYOR became an outspoken critic of the prices that pharmaceutical companies charge for prescription drugs and his leadership on the issue brought national attention to the problem and gave hope to millions of elderly Americans who could not afford their medication.

Senator PRYOR's record of leadership in public service is marked by compassion and civility. I wish him all the best as he leaves the Senate and takes on new challenges.

MEN OF COLOR HEALTH INITIATIVE

Mr. KERRY. Mr. President, at this time, I would like to take a moment to recognize, encourage, and pay tribute to a comprehensive, new health initiative called "The Men of Color Health Initiative" which was started at the Harvard Street Neighborhood Health Center in my State of Massachusetts in 1993. This outstanding health service has combined years of careful and thoughtful research with a grassroots outreach program that brings to light important health care issues such as access to health care for people of African, Asian and Latino descent throughout Massachusetts and the United States.

The Men of Color Health Initiative was inspired by the need to address, in a comprehensive and culturally appropriate manner, the many health and social issues facing men of color today. In 1993, representatives of this program embarked upon a statewide study to examine why ethnic minority men did

not routinely have access to the health system. This project was designed to educate and activate men of African, Asian and Latino descent with regard to healthy lifestyles and appropriate medical care. The key to this process was the need to understand the health care needs, experiences, issues and perceptions of these highly exposed and often neglected groups.

This focused health care initiative takes a large step forward in attempting to help men of color become more aware of the health care options they have today. Many of the men interviewed before the inception of this program indicated that hospital emergency rooms were insensitive, inefficient, nonresponsive, and biased against ethnic minority men. There was an underlying distrust in and cynicism about the health system today. Many stated that language barriers keep them away from the options that they do have.

This program has gone the extra mile to see that the necessary surveys are conducted and discussion groups are available for male health system users and community-based providers to elicit information about viable methods to reach the population at risk. I applaud the efforts of this superb program and I wish it much success in the future. This thoughtful and successful program should be a model for others across the United States.

THE FEDERAL PRISON INDUSTRIES COMPETITION IN CONTRACTING ACT

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, on May 23, I introduced a bill—S. 1797—to implement the recommendation of the National Performance Review that we should "require [Federal Prison Industries] to compete commercially for Federal agencies' business" instead of having a legally protected monopoly. My bill would ensure that the taxpayers get the best possible value for their Federal procurement dollars. If a Federal agency could get a better product at a lower price from the private sector, it would be permitted to do so—and the taxpayers would get the savings.

Mr. President, many in both government and industry believe that FPI products are frequently overpriced, inferior in quality, or both. For example, I understand that the Veterans Administration has sought repeal of FPI's mandatory preference on several occasions, on the grounds that FPI pricing for textiles, furniture, and other products are routinely higher than identical items purchased from commercial sources. Most recently, VA officials estimated that the repeal of the preference would save \$18 million over a 4-year period for their agency alone, making that money available for veterans services.

Similarly, the Deputy Commander of the Defense Logistics Agency, wrote in a May 3, 1996, letter to Members of the

House that FPI has had a 42-percent delinquency rate in its clothing and textile deliveries, compared to a 6-percent rate for commercial industry. For this record of poor performance, FPI has charged prices that were an average of 13 percent higher than commercial prices.

On July 30, 1996, the master chief petty officer of the Navy testified before the House National Security Committee that the FPI monopoly on Government furniture contracts has undermined the Navy's ability to improve living conditions for its sailors. Master Chief Petty Officer John Hagan stated, and I quote:

In order to efficiently use our scarce resources, we need congressional assistance in changing the Title 18 statute that requires all the Services to obtain a waiver for each and every furniture order not placed with the Federal Prison Industry/UNICOR. * * * Speaking frankly, the FPI/UNICOR product is inferior, costs more, and takes longer to procure. UNICOR has, in my opinion, exploited their special status instead of making changes which would make them more efficient and competitive. The Navy and other Services need your support to change the law and have FPI compete with GSA furniture manufacturers. Without this change, we will not be serving Sailors or taxpayers in the most effective and efficient way.

Mr. President, S. 1797 is supported by the National Association of Manufacturers, the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, the National Federation of Independent Business, the Business and Industrial Furniture Manufacturers' Association, the American Apparel Manufacturers' Association, the Industrial Fabrics Association International, and the Competition in Contracting Act Coalition. It is also supported by hundreds of small businesses from Michigan and around the country that have seen FPI take jobs away from their businesses and give them to persons convicted of crimes and serving time in prison, and are justifiably outraged.

We all want to do what we can to ensure that we make constructive work available for Federal prisoners, but the way we are doing it is wrong. As one small businessman in the furniture industry put it in testimony at a House hearing earlier this year:

Is it justice that Federal Prison Industries would step in and take business away from a disabled Vietnam veteran who was twice wounded fighting for our country and give that work to criminals who have trampled on honest citizens' rights, therefore effectively destroying and bankrupting that hero's business which the Veteran's Administration suggested he enter?

Mr. President, my bill would not restrict FPI's business. It would not require FPI to close any of its facilities. It would not force FPI to eliminate any jobs for Federal prisoners. It would not undermine FPI's ability to ensure that inmates are productively occupied. It would simply require FPI to compete for Federal contracts on the same terms as all other Federal contractors. That is simple justice to the hard-working citizens in the private sector,

with whom FPI would be required to compete.

Mr. President, I intended to offer S. 1797 as an amendment to either the Commerce, Justice, State Appropriations bill or the omnibus appropriations bill. Unfortunately, the Commerce, Justice, State Appropriations bill was never brought to the Senate floor, and the omnibus appropriations bill was brought up under an agreement which permitted no amendments. This parliamentary situation made it impossible for me to bring S. 1797 before the Senate for its consideration.

I want to assure Federal Prison Industries, however, that this issue is not going to go away. The issue is too important to the taxpayers, and too important to the many small businesses adversely affected by unfair competition from Federal Prison Industries, to be ignored.

Earlier today, I received a letter transmitting the administration's formal position on S. 1797. This letter clearly indicates the administration's agreement that the process by which Federal agencies purchase products from Federal Prison Industries needs to be reformed. That letter states:

The Administration favors reform of Federal Prison Industries to improve its customer service, pricing, and delivery while not endangering its work program for Federal inmates. . . . The Administration will present reform proposals for the House and Senate Judiciary Committees in the next session of Congress.

I ask that a copy of this letter appear in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD immediately following my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.
(See Exhibit 1.)

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, with this letter, the administration has promised to join us in a serious reevaluation of the process by which Federal Prison Industries sells its products to other Federal agencies. The heart of that process is, of course, FPI's mandatory source status. The administration has made a commitment to present us with a reform proposal in the next Congress, and I intend to hold the administration to that commitment.

Mr. President, I do not consider myself to be an enemy of Federal Prison Industries. I am a supporter of the idea of putting Federal inmates to work. A strong prison work program not only reduces inmate idleness and prison disruption, but can also help build a work ethic, provide job skills, and enable prisoners to return to product society upon their release.

However, I believe that a prison work program must be conducted in a manner that does not unfairly eliminate the jobs of hard-working citizens who have not committed crimes. FPI will be able to achieve this result only if it diversifies its product lines and avoids the temptation to build its work force by continuing to displace private sector jobs in its traditional lines of work.

We need to have jobs for prisoners, but it is unfair and wasteful to allow

FPI to designate whose jobs it will take, and when it will take them. Competition will be better for FPI, better for the taxpayer, and better for working men and women around the country. I look forward to working with the administration in the next Congress to make reform of Federal Prison Industries a reality.

EXHIBIT 1

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT, OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT AND BUDGET,

Washington, DC, October 3, 1996.

Hon. CARL LEVIN,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR LEVIN: During consideration of the FY 97 appropriations bill for Commerce, Justice and State, you had originally proposed a floor amendment incorporating your bill, S. 1797, regarding the Federal Prison Industries. At the time, the Administration developed a statement regarding that amendment. Since the amendment was never introduced, no statement was ever sent.

At your request, we are providing you in this letter with the statement that would have been sent. It reads as follows:

"The Administration favors reform of Federal Prison Industries to improve its customer service, pricing, and delivery while not endangering its work program for Federal inmates. The appropriations process is not the best way to address this issue. The Administration will present reform proposals for the House and Senate Judiciary Committees in the next session of Congress."

Very truly yours,

STEVEN KELMAN,
Administrator.

ASPEN STRATEGY GROUP RECOMMENDS MEASURES TO REDUCE NUCLEAR PROLIFERATION THREAT

Mr. NUNN. Mr. President, our Nation faces many national security challenges in the post-cold war era. I can think of no greater challenge than the threat posed by the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction. The Aspen Strategy Group, which I chair along with Ken Dam, is committed to providing a bipartisan forum within which to address this and other national security concerns.

In August of this year, the Aspen Strategy Group, which included top U.S. national security officials and experts, met in Colorado to discuss our Nation's proliferation challenges and policies. I believe the observations from these meetings, as well as the resulting ideas and recommendations, will enhance our Nation's understanding of these important issues.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the Aspen Strategy Group's recommendations related to the threat of nuclear proliferation.

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

BIPARTISAN ASPEN STRATEGY GROUP RECOMMENDS PRACTICAL MEASURES TO REDUCE NUCLEAR PROLIFERATION THREATS

The Aspen Strategy Group (ASG), chaired by Senator Sam Nunn and Ken Dam, met in

Aspen, Colorado on 10-15 August to examine post-Cold War threats presented by the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction (WMD). Several top U.S. officials, including the Secretary of Defense, attended the ASG meeting, along with leading experts on weapons proliferation from the United States and other countries. The group reached a general (although not necessarily unanimous) consensus on several points.

The ASG believes that the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction constitutes one of the greatest threats the United States faces in the post-Cold War era. Accordingly, controlling WMD proliferation is among our top national security policy priorities.

Efforts to control WMD proliferation provide a mixture of good news and bad:

Important progress has been achieved in restraining—even rolling back—nuclear proliferation. The Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty has been extended indefinitely. The nuclear weapons formerly controlled by Ukraine, Belarus and Kazakhstan have been consolidated in Russian hands. South Africa has voluntarily dismantled its nuclear arsenal. Brazil and Argentina terminated their nuclear efforts, and North Korea has frozen its weapons program. And, most recently, a Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty has been approved.

But new threats have also appeared, and they appear particularly difficult to control. Russia continues to present a "loose nukes" problem. Moreover, the dangers of biological and chemical weapons proliferation have become more acute. Dual use BW and CW technology is widely available, and such weapons activities are relatively easy to conceal. Subnational groups as well as states have sought (successfully in the case of the Aum Shinrikyo cult in Japan) to acquire such capabilities. Millenarian or terrorist groups, moreover, may not be susceptible to the rational calculus of deterrents.

The Aspen Strategy Group believes that, while there is no "silver bullet" with which to eliminate threats of WMD proliferation, there are a variety of steps that should be taken to lessen current risks. These include:

1) Enhance Nunn-Lugar Legislation. The Nunn-Lugar program was designed to improve U.S. security by preventing hostile parties from acquiring the nuclear weapons, materials, and technology of the former Soviet Union. It has achieved demonstrable results. Yet Nunn-Lugar funds have been targeted for cuts by congressional appropriations committees, and critics cite Russian policies vis-a-vis Chechnya, Bosnia or the Middle East as grounds for such cuts.

The ASG agreed that the Nunn-Lugar legislation is not a favor to Moscow. Rather, it serves the security interests of the United States, and it deserves to be fully funded. The group urges the Administration to exert greater efforts to marshal support for this legislation, and enjoin Congress to extend to it the financial support its success to date warrants.

2) Ratification of the Chemicals Weapons Convention. Congressional ratification of the CWC is long overdue. While this treaty will not eliminate all CW threats, it does provide significant benefits—not least the assurance that foreign governments will be obligated to monitor terrorist threats.

Some complain about the treaty's enforcement provisions. But the CWC will soon achieve the ratification by the 65 governments that are required for it to go into effect. The ability of the United States to propose modifications and qualifications to the enforcement provisions depends on its being one of the countries ratifying its adoption. Staying out of the treaty, moreover, could place our chemical firms at a commercial disadvantage.