

We can debate "value for money," the wisdom of particular government policies, programs and expenditures. We can argue as to whether we're spending too much here, not enough there. But that debate is distorted if we enter it with the view that any government expenditure—which means my tax dollar—is inherently burdensome.

I feel as I do because I remember what Justice Holmes wrote in 1904: "Taxes are what we pay for a civilized society" and what Franklin Delano Roosevelt said in 1936, "Taxes, after all, are the dues that we pay for the privileges of membership in an organized society."

Now, at century's end, our economists tell us taxes are a burden, and our pension funds tell us taxes are a pain. Is it any wonder that our leaders vie to reduce the burden and the pain, even if in so doing our society becomes somewhat less organized and less civilized? ●

GEORGIA O'KEEFFE COMMEMORATIVE STAMP

● Mr. BINGAMAN. Mr. President, today, on the historic plaza in Santa Fe, New Mexico, the United States Postal Service will unveil the Georgia O'Keeffe "Red Poppy" Commemorative Stamp. This stamp is a culmination of the work of many people to bring special recognition to the artist who is considered one of the foremost American artists of the 20th Century.

Although a native of Wisconsin, Miss O'Keeffe has been closely identified with New Mexico for nearly 70 years through her life and work. We are exceptionally proud of the fact that her love of our landscape was so wonderfully realized in her paintings.

Miss O'Keeffe found endless fascination in the bleached bones that dot the New Mexico deserts. The intense colors of common flowers, the vastness of the sky and the shape of the hills all were sources of profound inspiration. Her art expressed her vision. Because of her work, we can have a glimpse of what she saw.

When Georgia O'Keeffe died in Santa Fe on March 6, 1986, her work remained as a lasting testament to her talent and grace. She, like her work, was an American original, and I am very glad that the U.S. Postal Service has chosen to honor her in this way. ●

TRIBUTE TO JOHN LIEBENSTEIN, SLAIN RICE COUNTY DEPUTY

● Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, I rise to pay tribute to a very brave man, to Deputy John Liebenstein, 40, a nine year member of the Rice County Sheriff's Department in Minnesota.

Deputy Liebenstein sacrificed his life on May 3, 1996 in the line of duty. He was killed when a suspect, allegedly driving a stolen car, rammed his unmarked squad car on a freeway exit, following a high speed chase by police over forty miles through three counties.

It is a tragedy when any policeman falls in the line of duty. However, Deputy Liebenstein's untimely death had an immediate impact on the citizens of his tightly-knit Minnesota community.

John was a fine law enforcement officer who dedicated his life to defending the peace. Therefore, it was fitting when Governor Arne Carlson ordered all state flags to be lowered to half-staff in his honor.

Deputy John Liebenstein was also a loving husband, and a wonderful father. I extend my deepest, most heartfelt sympathy to his devoted wife, Jean and his three children.

He leaves a rich legacy of protecting the lives and property of his fellow citizens, and we will never forget this gallant man. ●

HONORING THE LANGLEYS CELEBRATING THEIR 50TH WEDDING ANNIVERSARY

● Mr. AKAKA. Mr. President, I am delighted today to honor Norton and Joan Langley of Honolulu, Hawaii, who will celebrate their 50th wedding anniversary on May 28, 1996. The commitment to marriage is a solemn one, and the desire to remain united for half a century is laudable.

The Langleys met while teenagers and were married in 1946, after Norton returned from World War II with two Purple Hearts. In 1957, they traded life in San Francisco for Honolulu where they opened the first of their clothing stores, Casual Aire of Hawaii. Their flagship shop, located in the lovely Hilton Hawaiian Village Hotel in Waikiki, was featured in the opening shots of the first television series produced in Hawaii—"Hawaiian Eye."

Two of their three children continue to reside in Honolulu where son, Larry, and daughter, Jodi, operate Casual Aire. Their eldest daughter, Nanci, resides in Virginia, and is a valued member of my staff. I wish this happy family all the best and congratulate them on the strength of their family ties. ●

ON THE EVE OF RUSSIA'S PRESIDENTIAL ELECTIONS

● Mr. PELL. Mr. President, since the Soviet Union broke up in December 1991, Russians have undergone five very painful years of political and economic transition. Life is difficult and uncertain for many average Russians. In Russia's most recent elections, held last December, Communists gained control of the Russian legislature and pro-reform parties were marginalized. Earlier this year, that Parliament voted to abrogate the treaty which disbanded the Soviet Union. While rejecting the Parliament's vote, President Yeltsin is nevertheless pursuing closer ties with its former Soviet neighbors. President Boris Yeltsin has also made several key personnel changes in the last few months, dismissing some of the key reformers. War continues to rage in Chechnya. At the same time, Russia has agreed to adhere to stringent economic requirements to continue to receive funding from International Monetary Fund.

Against this backdrop, on June 16, in less than a month, Russians will go to

the polls to elect a President. Whatever the outcome, this election will have profound implications for the course of reform in Russia, the future of democracy in Central and Eastern Europe and the former Soviet Union, the development of United States-Russian relations, and in fact, global stability.

I fear that we are not giving enough thought and attention to what is taking place in Russia and particularly to how the impending election might affect United States-Russian relations. Accordingly, majority and minority staff members of the Foreign Relations Committee were recently tasked with visiting Russia to get a sense of the issues and the candidates in the lead-up to the elections. They have prepared a report based upon their visit which I would commend to my colleagues.

The report makes no predictions about the outcome of the election. Rather, it presents some of the issues confronting the candidates and the electorate, including economic and key foreign policy issues. I would ask that the report summary be placed in the RECORD at the end of my remarks.

The bottom line is that no one can predict what will happen in Russia in the coming weeks and months. I believe, however, that it is important to be as informed as possible about developments in Russia so as to avoid uninformed or knee-jerk reactions to events there. I believe the committee staff report makes a useful contribution to the discussion.

I am pleased to note that the staff trip was conducted and the report was written on a bipartisan basis. I would like to thank Senator HELMS and his staff for the high level of cooperation they have offered on this venture. I know that we share the goal of supporting continued reform in Russia, and as Russia heads into a period of uncertainty, I am hopeful that we can continue to work together to promote that goal.

SUMMARY OF KEY FINDINGS

On June 16, 1996, the Russian Federation will hold Presidential elections. By any estimation, this election—just over a month away—will have profound implications for the course of reform in Russia, the future of democracy in Central and Eastern Europe and the former Soviet Union, the development of United States-Russian relations, and in fact, global stability. No clear favorite candidate has yet emerged.

The Russian presidential election comes in the wake of five very painful years of political and economic transition. Ironically, just as the Russian economy shows evidence of imminent growth, the Russian electorate's hostility to reform and pro-reform candidates is peaking.

The Russian people appear to fear change more than they dislike President Boris Yeltsin. However, voter discontent runs deep and nostalgia for the better, more stable and predictable times, whether based on reality or not, is the order of the day. Many equate

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