

democracy with a breakdown of order, rampant crime and corruption, and oppression by the mafia.

At this point, it appears that the Communist candidate, Gennadiy Zyuganov, has the largest amount of support among the electorate. Zyuganov has a chameleon-like ability to tailor his message to a particular audience. It is, therefore, difficult to distinguish his true beliefs from his campaign rhetoric, and by extension to predict how the Communist Party, if it captures the Presidency, would manage the Russian economy, political system, and foreign policy.

Many in Russia conclude that an electoral victory by the Communists would inevitably result in dictatorship. Such fears may not be overblown: anecdotal information indicates that some reformers are keeping their exit visas current through the presidential election. The gloomier analysts even predict a prompt reopening of the gulags and the reemergence of political trials.

Two trends in the Russian economy may serve to sustain market reforms in Russia even if an anti-market candidate is elected President. The first is the growing base of small businesses. The second is the increasing flow of economic power to the regions.

President Yeltsin has predicted that he will prevail in the first round of the June 16 election, gathering enough of the vote to win the election outright. While such an outcome is nearly impossible, Yeltsin is widely viewed as a likely second place finisher—which is sufficient to get him into the run-off.

While President Yeltsin's core supporters within the electorate are outnumbered by those committed to the Communists, it is widely believed that he has much more opportunity to broaden his support as the campaign wears on.

Vladimir Zhirinovskiy must be considered a serious contender if for no other reason than that he has consistently exceeded the expectations of most analysts. While he is reviled by most opponents, Zhirinovskiy has a loyal, if somewhat fractious electoral base. His high negative rating makes his chances of victory near impossible. A widely split vote among pro-reform candidates, however, could propel him into the second round, thereby creating the nightmare scenario for Russia's democratic reformers: a runoff between Zyuganov and Zhirinovskiy.

Grigory Yavlinsky considers himself to be the last, true democratic reform leader in Russia. Certainly, he is the last democrat with anything resembling a popular constituency in Russia today, although many question whether his popularity extends much beyond Moscow and St. Petersburg.

The key to Yavlinsky's electoral strategy is to build a coalition—the so-called "third force"—with fellow candidates Svyatoslav Fyodorov and General Alexandr Lebed. The three—all of whom have collected the necessary one million signatures to be listed on the

ballot—have tentatively agreed to support the most popular among them. The problem is that each of the three believes himself to be that person.

Aside from the campaign performance of the various candidates for the Presidential election, other factors which may influence the outcome include voter turnout and the ever present threat of fraud. Even if the June election is relatively fair, charges of fraud will likely be made by those who fail to make the second round.

Russian politicians readily admit that foreign policy will not play a major role in the upcoming presidential election campaign. That being said, Russia's identity and role in the world is a theme that all candidates are exploiting—and to which voters seem to be responding.

Given the resonance that nationalist themes have among the electorate, it is not surprising that the current government is emphasizing Russian integration with other countries of the former Soviet Union, rethinking its relationship with the United States, and opposing NATO expansion.

Russian officials go to great lengths to emphasize that the government is pursuing integration with its neighbors as distinct from reintegration. According to these officials, the distinction is that reintegration would imply a reimplication of a command economy and reestablishment of the Soviet Union, while integration implies a voluntary relationship on the model of the European Union.

After the break-up of the Soviet Union in December 1991, there was general euphoria in Washington and Moscow about the prospects for a United States—Russian partnership on a wide range of foreign policy, arms control, and other issues. By 1994, however, several events had occurred which collectively served to dampen enthusiasm in both capitals about the prospects for close United States—Russian cooperation.

Both Washington and Moscow had unrealistic expectations about the possibilities for United States—Russian relations. Still, many Russians, while readily admitting that things had changed, are reluctant to abandon the notion of a Russian—United States partnership—particularly on issues of mutual interest such as arms control and the fight against organized crime and terrorism.

Even those who admit to a cooling in relations with the United States point to United States—Russian collaboration in Bosnia as a success story and a model for future cooperation. Given previous United States—Russian divisions over Bosnia—with the Russians traditionally taking positions sympathetic to the Serbs—Russian satisfaction with the current IFOR arrangement is particularly noteworthy.

While Russian officials continue to voice their opposition to NATO expansion, their arguments are often contradictory and muddled. It is difficult

to gauge whether apparent Russian apprehensions are genuine or calculated.

Russian officials offer an unapologetic though naive defense of Russia's relationship with Iran. They regard Russia's relations with Iran as normal, and perceive Iran neither as enemy nor ally. Russian officials completely dismiss suggestions that Iran may use technology acquired from Russia to develop a nuclear weapons program.

Russian foreign policy analysts are divided over whether close relations can be forged with the People's Republic of China. Nonetheless, despite this skepticism, many endorse expanded cooperation with China as a useful counterbalance to the United States on issues such as NATO expansion.●

TRIBUTE TO LIEUTENANT COMMANDER STEPHEN P. METRUCK, U.S.C.G.

● Mr. KERRY. Mr. President, I want to take this opportunity to express my sincere thanks to Lieutenant Commander Stephen Metruck who has served as my legislative assistant for oceans and fisheries issues for the past 2½ years.

Steve has done an outstanding job and has honored himself and the Coast Guard with his dedication and quiet dignity. His talents and the depth of his knowledge brought a unique perspective on the issues on which he advised me, and he will be missed. I know that the Coast Guard needs to retain officers with his experience and capability and Steve's dedication to the Service compels him to return to the field, but I would welcome his permanent service in my office. Our loss is the Coast Guard's gain, and Steve will be leaving my staff shortly to return to serve as the Executive Officer of the Coast Guard Marine Safety Office in Buffalo, NY.

Steve came to my staff on detail from the United States Coast Guard to assist me with my work on the Senate Commerce Committee Subcommittee on Oceans and Fisheries. As Ranking Member of that Subcommittee—and in my prior role as Vice Chairman of the subcommittee's predecessor, the National Ocean Policy Study—I had planned to sponsor a number of important legislative measures including the reauthorization of the Magnuson Fishery Conservation and Management Act and was pleased to gain someone with Steve's experience and expertise in marine safety and environmental policy.

For over 2½ years, Steve has been a crucial part of my legislative team. I have come to rely on his expertise in Coast Guard, marine, coastal and fisheries issues. As we all know around here, it is critical to have staff that can produce high quality work under short deadlines and with constantly shifting priorities. Steve was a master juggler. He was a quick study and in short order he began to work closely with Committee staff where he helped

draft several bills and amendments, including the omnibus rewrite of the Magnuson bill as well as innumerable floor statements, memos and letters.

Another key aspect for any staff in my office is to provide courteous and helpful constituent service. Steve demonstrates an amazing ability to be sensitive yet fair to all parties involved in an issue. I believe that most of my constituents—fishermen, coastal residents, environmental activists and others—who he has served would agree that he is always extremely helpful and treats everyone equally and with respect.

As he leaves to continue his duty with the Coast Guard, I join the members of my staff and everyone who has had the pleasure to work with Steve Metruck during his time in the United States Senate in wishing him well in his service. I know Steve will continue to honor his uniform, his country, and his family with the decency, intelligence, and integrity he brought to his service on my staff. He is to be commended for his deep and abiding belief that we must do everything we can to responsibly protect and preserve the environment. Good luck, Lieutenant Commander Stephen P. Metruck, and thank you for a job well done.●

CONGRATULATING THE UNIVERSITY OF NORTH DAKOTA FLYING TEAM

Mr. CONRAD. Mr. President, I would like to offer my sincere congratulations to the men and women of the University of North Dakota Flying Team, who recently captured their third consecutive national championship at the National Intercollegiate Flying Association's 48th annual Safety and Flight Evaluation Conference in Daytona Beach, FL.

The championship places an emphasis on safety, and is comprised of nine different events that test a variety of aviation skills, both on the ground and in the air. In addition to scoring an overall win, UND was first in combined scoring for the five ground events, and second in the Judges Trophy, which is awarded on the basis of a team's overall depth.

A national championship is clearly a tremendous accomplishment, and I commend each and every member of the team. Although a significant achievement, I want my colleagues to know that this is only the most recent triumph for what has been without question the most successful NIFA team in the country. This year's national championship is the UND Flying Team's tenth in the last twelve years, and the fifth for retiring team coach John Bridewell.

This victory was a team effort from start to finish, but several individuals deserve special recognition. Mike Smieja placed first in Aircraft Recognition, the fourth time he has won that event at the national tournament. Larry Freer was another repeat winner, taking first place in Simulated

Comprehensive Aircraft Navigation (SCAN) for the second consecutive year. Freer also placed seventh in Simulator Flying. Robert Shaw captured second place in Computer Accuracy, and Susan Bailey took home second place in the message drop, in her very first competition.

This victory and the women and men who made it possible are a credit to the university and UND's Center for Aerospace Sciences, an internationally recognized center for aerospace learning. I am proud of every member of the team, and offer special congratulations to coach Bridewell, who is ending his distinguished tenure with yet another championship. Every member of the team and coaching staff deserve recognition, and I am pleased to submit a complete list for the RECORD.

The list follows:

1996 UND FLYING TEAM

Team Members: Bill Bailey (senior, Rogers, MN), Susan Bailey (sophomore, Sutton, ND), Shannon Bengeyfield (sophomore, Dillon, MT), Chris Farmer (co-captain, senior, Bluefield, WV), Larry Freer (junior, West Palm Beach, FL), Mike Galante (co-captain, senior, Champlin, MN), Brian Jackson (junior, Sioux Falls, SD), Joshua Kendrick (senior, Lino Lakes, MN), Aleah Longshore (sophomore, Settler, Alberta, Canada), Robert Shaw (senior, Naperville, IL), Mike Smieja (senior, Wells, MN), Juliana Stops (sophomore, Buffalo Grove, IL), and Chris VanGinkel (senior, Maurice, IA).

Coach: John Bridewell.

Assistant Coaches: Drew Avery, Spencer Henderson, Jim Higgins, Mark Johnson, and Al Skramstad.

Mr. BOND addressed the Chair.

The Senator from Missouri is recognized.

(The remarks of Mr. BOND pertaining to the introduction of S. 1816 are located in today's RECORD under "Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.")

Mr. MURKOWSKI addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska is recognized.

ARTS, LETTERS, AND POLITICS

Mr. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I thank the Chair. An interesting fund-raising letter came to my attention. It was written by actress Priscilla Presley, Elvis Presley's former wife.

Accompanying the letter was another from actor, Robert Redford.

These letters are promoting a special evening of "Arts, Letters and Politics" in Beverly Hills benefiting a group called "Americans for a Safe Future."

During this special star-studded evening, there will be a lavish reception, followed by a "program of celebrity prose and poetry readings" by movie stars Ed Harris and Amy Madigan. The Master of Ceremonies will be Ed Begley, Jr.

Other names on the letterhead include such Hollywood luminaries as rock star Don Henley and TV producers Gayle Hurd and Gary Goldberg.

For as little as \$250 or as much as \$5000, one can attend this glittering

fund raising event at the beautiful Chateau Marmont in Beverly Hills.

The letter goes on to note that proceeds from this fund raising event will benefit Americans for a Safe Future and "its continuing efforts to protect our environment, our children, and our future from radioactive contamination."

Well, Mr. President, I want to protect our environment, our children, and our future from radioactive contamination.

We all do.

But I will not be making a contribution to this group.

I will not be sending a check.

I will not be going to Beverly Hills to listen as movie stars read poetry.

Because this group is on the wrong side of the environment, Mr. President.

They are actually opposing what they claim to uphold.

While these movie stars claim to be protecting our children from radioactive contamination, their efforts are inadvertently exposing our children to radioactive contamination.

I am not suggesting that these movie stars want to do this because of a lack of intention.

I am sure they are well meaning. I am certain they think they are doing the right thing.

But they are misinformed, and they are harming those they really want to protect.

"Americans for a Safe Future" claim they are protecting the Colorado River from the low-level radioactive waste facility planned for Ward Valley in the Mojave Desert.

If the Ward Valley site is built, they say radioactivity from Ward Valley will leak into the Colorado River.

Robert Redford says so.

Ed Begley, Jr. says so.

Priscilla Presley says so.

Don Henley says so.

That is all some people need to hear to reach for their checkbooks and take up the cause.

Sadly, some are content to get information about radioactive waste and desert hydrology from rock singers and movie stars, even if prominent and distinguished scientists say otherwise.

I want to refer to this chart, because it speaks for itself. There are the Hollywood movie stars, and here are the scientists who risk their reputation in saying that Ward Valley is unlikely to leak radioactivity into the Colorado River. Where are you going to put this waste? Nobody wants it. California has met the Federal laws that we set up to allow them to do it. This is the site the National Academy of Sciences has recommended, and here we are listening to movie stars raising money that it will not be there, but they do not propose to put it anywhere.

Mr. President, I believe we ought to listen to geologists and hydrologists when the subject is radioactive waste and desert hydrology, and we ought to listen to movie stars when the subject is, well, movies.

Sadly, the activism of movie stars has temporarily eclipsed the findings of scientists.