

be on welfare in the coming years. It is time the administration stopped hiding behind children.

the NGA proposals have sparked an important debate not only about the future of these programs, but the future of the relationship between the States and the Federal Government as well. Despite Secretary Shalala's opposition to every fundamental change to the current welfare system, we should move forward on the Governors' welfare and Medicaid proposals. It is time to dispell the false choices conjured up by the bureaucracy and give the States the opportunity to change the future.

Mr. President, 37 months ago, President Clinton promised the Nation's Governors that he would work with them to "remove the incentive for staying in poverty." He told the Governors that "many people stay on welfare not because of the checks * * * they do it solely because they do not want to put their children at risk of losing health care or because they do not have the money to pay for child care * * *."

As President Clinton has indicated, Medicaid must be part of the solution for returning families to work. Separating Medicaid from the rest of the welfare reform package simply will not work. Medicaid reform is welfare reform. If the President genuinely wants bipartisan welfare reform, his administration cannot pitch the NGA proposal out as just so much straw.

At that NGA meeting 3 years ago, President Clinton also told the Governors that the American people "don't want our process divided by partisanship or dominated by special interest, or driven by short-term advantage."

Mr. President, the Governors have given us the opportunity to meet this expectation. It is my hope that the President will join with us and embrace this opportunity.

If the administration rejects this last best chance for bipartisanship in the next few weeks and welfare reform fails for a third time, the American people should clearly understand that Governors they elected were defeated by the Federal bureaucracy and the special interests it serves. The American people should then judge the administration not by its words but by its deeds.

THE RUSSIAN POULTRY DISPUTE

Mr. ROTH. Mr. President, I want to say a few words about recent developments in the United States-Russian trade relationship. In February, Russian Prime Minister Chernomyrdin announced a ban effective tomorrow—March 16—against imports of American-produced poultry to protect Russian farmers. This proposed ban is of great concern to American agriculture and, if imposed, would be a terrible blow to the American poultry industry.

Our poultry sales to Russia have been one of our great exporting success stories. In 5 short years, Russia has become the largest foreign market for United States-produced chicken and

turkey—worth over \$500 million a year. The tremendous growth in popularity of American poultry with Russian consumers is due, in no small part, to its recognized quality and reasonable price.

On March first, I sent a letter and spoke to our trade representative, Mickey Kantor, expressing my concerns over the proposed Russian ban and Moscow's increasing protectionism against foreign imports. I ask unanimous consent that a copy of this letter be printed in the RECORD.

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

U.S. SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON FINANCE,
Washington, DC, March 1, 1996.

Hon. MICHAEL KANTOR,
U.S. Trade Representative, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. AMBASSADOR: I am writing in reference to our two conversations on the Russian Government's recent ban on imports of United States-produced poultry. Apparently, this ban is part of a broader protectionist plan by the Russian Government to block agricultural imports into Russia. As I told you, these actions will severely hurt the U.S. poultry and agribusiness industries.

If the Russian Government does not act swiftly to end the ban on poultry imports, I strongly urge the Administration to take forceful retaliatory measures. Immediate action should include: Trade retaliation under Section 301 against imports of Russian products—in particular on imports of aluminum and other ferrous and non-ferrous metals.

An across-the-board freeze on Export-Import Bank loans and credits to Russia, including the recently approved \$1 billion assistance package for the Russian aircraft industry.

Suspension of U.S. assistance programs to Russia, including those from the U.S. Department of Agriculture and the United States Agency for International Development, which focus on assisting the global competitiveness of the Russian economy.

Should these measures not result in a satisfactory response from Moscow, the Administration should also reconsider its support for the International Monetary fund's recently concluded \$10 billion economic-assistance package for Russia.

Let me reiterate that I am particularly shocked by these protectionist actions by the Russian Government, given the generous assistance the U.S. has provided in helping Russia to enter the global economy.

I greatly appreciate your support on this issue, which is of utmost importance to the U.S. poultry and agribusiness industries.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM V. ROTH, Jr.

Mr. ROTH. Shortly after I sent that letter, Russian Prime Minister Chernomyrdin told Vice President GORE that the ban was off and that American poultry exports to Russia could continue uninterrupted. Based on press reports, I understand Russia's chief veterinarian still threatens to block imports of United States poultry.

Mr. President, due to these conflicting signals from Moscow, it is unclear what action the Russian Government will take. I hope that Prime Minister Chernomyrdin is good on his word. We will have to see what the Russians do after tomorrow.

However, if the ban is imposed, I strongly urge the administration to take the forceful and immediate re-

sponses I outlined in my letter to Ambassador Kantor—including retaliation against Russian imports into the United States, a freeze on Export-Import Bank loans and credits, and suspension of American foreign assistance programs to Russia.

If these measures should prove to be insufficient, then I would urge the administration to reconsider United States support for a \$10 billion assistance package the International Monetary Fund has promised Russia.

Mr. President, if we do not send a strong message to the Russians, it will only encourage them to take further protectionist measures that will only hurt United States exporters, Russian consumers, and Russia's economic development as a full partner in the world economy.

Russia's apparent swing to protectionism is particularly disturbing given the high level of American aid to Russia. Since the end of the cold war, the United States has given over \$1.5 billion in foreign assistance to Russia, not including several billion dollars we have provided to promote Russian trade. In light of U.S. generosity, Moscow's protectionist bent against American products is simply astonishing.

I trust that the Russian Prime Minister's word will be good, the poultry ban will not go into effect, and that Russia's commitment to free trade will not weaken, but will grow stronger.

JOHN P. CAPELLUPO

Mr. BOND. Mr. President, I rise at this time to recognize a fellow citizen for the achievements and contributions he has made to this Nation and industry in which he has worked for three decades.

John P. Capellupo, president of McDonnell Douglas Aerospace, will step down from his position and retire from this leading U.S. producer of military aircraft on March 31.

As a member of the Senate Appropriations Committee Subcommittee on Defense, I am intimately aware of the contributions that John Capellupo has made to aerospace and the national security of the United States.

Mr. Capellupo, or Cap as he is widely known, began his aerospace career in 1957 working as a technical analyst on the F-101B aircraft and super Talos missile programs at what was then the McDonnell Aircraft Co. in St. Louis. He rose steadily through the engineering ranks, into program management, and ultimately, to the company's highest leadership positions. In February 1989, he was named president of McDonnell Douglas Missile Systems Co. In January 1990, he left St. Louis for Long Beach, CA, to become deputy president of Douglas Aircraft, the company's commercial and military transport division. In May 1991, he returned to St. Louis as president of what is now McDonnell Douglas Aerospace.

Throughout his distinguished career, Mr. Capellupo served as a driving force

behind a diverse list of successful and essential military programs: the AV-8B, F/A-18, T-45, C-17, Apache helicopter, and Harpoon, SLAM, and Tomahawk missiles. Most recently, he provided the management focus on affordability which dramatically reduced costs on the new Joint Direct Attack Munitions Program.

Yet of all his achievements and contributions to our national defense, none eclipses his work to bolster our maritime strength via the F/A-18 Hornet program. He was there on day one when the idea of a combination fighter and attack aircraft—a strike fighter—was no more than a study project with a fancy acronym. He shepherded the program through its infancy, planned its growth and improvement, and watched it mature into the safest, most reliable and maintainable aircraft ever flown into combat by the Navy. Never one to fear following a tough act, Mr. Capellupo later directed the studies that defined the Navy's strike fighter for the 21st century—the F/A-18E/F Super Hornet. Under his leadership, and with the future of Naval aviation hanging in the balance, this program has become a monument to efficient and effective defense program management.

In my tenure in the Senate and as the Governor of Missouri, I have worked with thousands of business leaders and defense officials from across the country and around the world. There are very few of the same high caliber as John Capellupo. His energy, integrity, enthusiasm, and dedication are unequalled. So, too, are his achievements on behalf of our military strength and national security. For this, our great Nation and its people thank him and wish him and his family the very best.

RECOGNITION OF THE REPUBLIC OF CHINA PRESIDENTIAL ELECTION

Mr. CRAIG. Mr. President, on March 17, 1996, Representative and Mrs. Benjamin Lu of the Taipei Economic and Cultural Representative office in Washington, DC, will sponsor the Music for Democracy concert at the Kennedy Center. It will be an occasion to celebrate Taiwan's long journey toward democracy.

The late President Chiang Ching-Kuo nurtured the seeds of democracy on Taiwan by lifting the emergency decree, liberalizing personal freedoms and legalizing opposition political parties. After Chiang's death in 1988, President Lee Teng-Hui presided over further economic and political liberalization, vowing to make the Republic of China a nation built on economic opportunity and democracy.

Now in 1996, Taiwan is indeed a success story with a strong, growing economy and open democratic elections. Over the last 8 years, the People of the Republic of China have participated in the free election of the National As-

sembly, three elections of the Legislative Yuan, the election of the Governor of Taipei Province, and mayoral elections in Taipei and Kaohsiung.

The most notable in the progression will occur on March 23 of this year, when Taiwan will hold its first free and direct election of the President of the Republic of China.

Mr. President, there will be four presidential candidates on the ballot, the incumbent President Lee Teng-Hui being one of the four. This presidential election will answer the old question of whether democracy is possible or appropriate in a Chinese society. As the Republic of China has demonstrated to the world, democracy is truly appropriate and possible for Taiwan, and for all countries. Democracy, in Taiwan's case, has been achieved without sacrificing either political stability or economic growth.

I have met President Lee Teng-Hui and have been impressed by his commitment to democratic principles. I also understand from individuals associated with President Lee and his Government, such as Professor N. Mao, that he is a man truly dedicated to making the Republic of China a first-rate nation and its people prosperous and free.

Mr. President, I commend Representative and Mrs. Lu for sponsoring the Music for Democracy Concert on March 17. I join the people of the Republic of China on Taiwan in their celebration of democracy and commend President Lee for his efforts in leading the Republic of China down that road. Mr. President, I salute President Lee and his people.

MEASURE PLACED ON THE CALENDAR—S. 161

Mr. BOND. Mr. President, I understand there is a bill due for second reading at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct. The clerk will read the bill for the second time.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 161) to provide uniform standards for the award of punitive damages for volunteer services.

Mr. BOND. Mr. President, I object to further proceedings on this matter at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under rule XIV, the bill will be placed on the calendar.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. BOND. Mr. President, what is the pending business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there is no further morning business, morning business is concluded.

SMALL BUSINESS REGULATORY FAIRNESS ACT OF 1995

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, we will now turn to S. 942.

The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 942) to promote increased understanding of Federal regulations and increased voluntary compliance with such regulations by small entities, to provide for the designation of regional ombudsmen and oversight boards to monitor the enforcement practices of certain Federal agencies with respect to small business concerns, to provide relief from excessive and arbitrary regulatory enforcement actions against small entities, and for other purposes.

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Small Business, with an amendment to strike all after the enacting clause and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Small Business Regulatory Enforcement Fairness Act of 1996".

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

Congress finds that—

(1) *a vibrant and growing small business sector is critical to creating jobs in a dynamic economy;*

(2) *small businesses bear a disproportionate share of regulatory costs and burdens;*

(3) *fundamental changes that are needed in the regulatory and enforcement culture of federal agencies to make agencies more responsive to small business can be made without compromising the statutory missions of the agencies;*

(4) *three of the top recommendations of the White House Conference on Small Business involve reforms to the way government regulations are developed and enforced, and reductions in government paperwork requirements;*

(5) *the requirements of the Regulatory Flexibility Act have too often been ignored by government agencies, resulting in greater regulatory burdens on small entities than necessitated by statute; and*

(6) *small entities should be given the opportunity to seek judicial review of agency actions required by the Regulatory Flexibility Act.*

SEC. 3. PURPOSES.

The purposes of this Act are—

(1) *to implement certain recommendations of the 1995 White House Conference on Small Business regarding the development and enforcement of Federal regulations;*

(2) *to provide for judicial review of the Regulatory Flexibility Act;*

(3) *to encourage the effective participation of small businesses in the Federal regulatory process;*

(4) *to simplify the language of Federal regulations affecting small businesses;*

(5) *to develop more accessible sources of information on regulatory and reporting requirements for small businesses;*

(6) *to create a more cooperative regulatory environment among agencies and small businesses that is less punitive and more solution-oriented; and*

(7) *to make Federal regulators more accountable for their enforcement actions by providing small entities with a meaningful opportunity for redress of excessive enforcement activities.*

SEC. 4. EFFECTIVE DATE.

This Act shall become effective on the date 90 days after enactment.

TITLE I—REGULATORY COMPLIANCE SIMPLIFICATION

SEC. 101. DEFINITIONS.

For purposes of this Act—

(1) *the terms "rule" and "small entity" have the same meanings as in section 601 of title 5, United States Code;*

(2) *the term "agency" has the same meaning as in section 551 of title 5, United States Code; and*

(3) *the term "small entity compliance guide" means a document designated as such by an agency.*