

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