

skill as a soldier, a civil rights leader, and an attorney;

Whereas, Ronald H. Brown served since January 22, 1993, as the United States Secretary of Commerce;

Whereas, Ronald H. Brown devoted his life to opening doors, building bridges, and helping those in need;

Whereas, Ronald H. Brown lost his life in a tragic airplane accident on April 3, 1996, while in service to his country on a mission in Bosnia; and

Whereas, thirty-two other Americans from Government and industry who served the Nation with great courage, achievement, and dedication also lost their lives in the accident: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate of the United States pays tribute to the remarkable life and career of Ronald H. Brown, and it extends condolences to his family.

SEC. 2. The Senate also pays tribute to the contributions of all those who perished, and extends condolences to the families of: Staff Sergeant Gerald Aldrich, Duane Christian, Barry Conrad, Paul Cushman III, Adam Darling, Captain Ashley James Davis, Gail Dobert, Robert Donovan, Claudio Elia, Staff Sergeant Robert Farrington, Jr., David Ford, Carol Hamilton, Kathryn Hoffman, Lee Jackson, Steven Kaminski, Kathryn Kellogg, Technical Sergeant Shelley Kelly, James Lewek, Frank Maier, Charles Meissner, William Morton, Walter Murphy, Lawrence Payne, Nathaniel Nash, Leonard Pieroni, Captain Timothy Schafer, John Scoville, I. Donald Turner, P. Stuart Tholan, Technical Sergeant Cheryl Ann Turnage, Naomi Warbasse, and Robert Whittaker.

SEC. 3. The Secretary of the Senate shall transmit a copy of this resolution to each of the families.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, there will now be the period for the transaction of morning business for not to extend beyond the hour of 10 a.m., with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 5 minutes each.

Mr. GRAMS addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota.

EXTREMISM: THE MANTRA OF THE MINORITY

Mr. GRAMS. Mr. President, if there is 1 day that dramatically highlights the growing anxieties of middle-class Americans, it is April 15. During this tax week of 1996, I want to share some thoughts on taxes, Congress, and a certain word that has crept into a place of prominence here on Capitol Hill.

Since the opening days of the 104th Congress, my colleagues on the other side of the aisle have come to the floor repeatedly to talk of "extremism" and "extremists."

These are not words to be tossed around lightly, and yet more than 100

times over the past 16 months, those are the very words they have used to describe the work of this Congress. "Extremist" has become the mantra of the minority, repeated over and over when all the arguments have been exhausted and refuted, and name calling is all that remains.

The Contract With America "is simply the wish list of the extreme faction of one political party," says one.

"The sweeping and extremist approach in this bill poses a grave threat to all Americans, especially children," says another.

And finally, "If moderation does not prevail, this level of extremism will ultimately take our country backward, not forward, and the damage will be felt not by us, but by generations to come."

Of course, the rhetoric has not been confined to this Chamber alone, or to the other body. The Clinton administration, and particularly the President and Vice President, have repeatedly engaged in it as well, as they recite from the pages of this well-worn script. In just seven news conferences and speeches last year, Vice President GORE used some version of the word "extremist" 22 times in describing our efforts to reform the way Government undertakes the people's business.

"Extremist groups."

"Extremist measures."

"Extremist factions."

"The extremist, radical members of their caucus."

"An extremist set of priorities."

"An extremist agenda."

You would think from all the dramatics that something truly horrible is going here. So, Mr. President, what's happening that has my Democrat colleagues running so scared? What is Congress doing that is so radical, so dangerous, so wrong, so extreme?

Here are the shocking highlights:

We accomplished what a quarter century of Congresses couldn't when we balanced the Federal budget. This Congress is not willing to let our children and grandchildren collapse under a load of debt that we have created.

We have taken responsible steps to control spending, reining in the Federal Government and reducing its role as the dominating force in American life.

Working families would keep billions of their own money under the tax plan passed by Congress. We offered families a \$500 tax credit for each child, eliminated the marriage penalty that discriminated against married couples, and helped bring and keep families together through adoption and elderly care tax credits.

We are also not willing to sit by and let Medicare dissolve into bankruptcy. Under legislation passed by this Congress, seniors would be assured that Medicare—for some, their only link to health care insurance—would be rescued from its impending insolvency.

Our plan to reform the welfare system encourages recipients to seek a

life beyond their monthly welfare checks, while it protects the American taxpayers from the abuses of the past.

Mr. President, have my colleagues across the aisle become so insulated from the public and isolated from reality that they have forgotten what qualifies as extreme out in the real world? Our work on behalf of the Nation's families, taxpayers, senior citizens, children, and job providers could hardly be considered extreme. Far from it—what we have accomplished is exactly what the American people sent us here to carry out.

So how do you think it makes them feel to see their dreams for the Nation dismissed on the Senate floor as the notions of extremists?

If you really want to talk about extremism, there is a good reason why so many American families have April 15 circled on that calendar taped to the refrigerator door. They have experienced extremism in their Government right where it hurts the most—the family wallet—and they are reminded of that fact every year when tax day rolls around.

Under the current administration, Americans are paying more in Federal taxes this year than they have ever paid before.

President Clinton started the trend with his recordbreaking \$241 billion tax hike in 1993, which raised taxes on every member of the middle class. Add to that the new taxes imposed by the President in his latest budget, and Americans will be paying a half trillion more in taxes than we did before President Clinton took office. That is an additional \$758 every year, for the next 10 years, for every taxpayer in this country.

The American people say that is extreme.

The tax load has become such a burden that Tax Freedom Day—the day we are no longer working just to pay our taxes and can begin keeping that money for ourselves—will not arrive this year until May 7. That is the latest ever. It means working Americans have been on the job from January 1 through today, and have not been allowed to keep even a dime of their own money. That will not happen for another 20 days.

And by the way, families in my home State of Minnesota will have to wait even longer. Because State taxes in Minnesota are higher than the national average, my constituents are forced to hold out an additional 8 days until their Tax Freedom Day arrives.

And the calculations for Tax Freedom Day do not include the additional days we are forced to work to cover the heavy costs of Washington's unnecessary and burdensome regulations as well. If it did, we would not be marking our freedom until the first week of July. That is a cruel joke, considering that is when we are also celebrating Independence Day.

The American people say that is extreme.

When President Clinton was elected in 1992, Federal taxes on a median-income American family—Federal taxes on a median-income American family—totaled \$12,770. By last year, that same family was paying a total of \$14,813 in taxes—over \$2,000 a year more per median family since 1992. And now 26.5 percent of every family's income goes directly to Washington.

That is not exactly what the American people had in mind. In a survey conducted last year, they were asked what percentage of their income should reasonably go to paying taxes. This was for all levels of government, including social security taxes, sales taxes, excise taxes, and property taxes. Across the board, regardless of income group, age, education, gender, race, or political affiliation, the answer was the same: most people said a maximum tax burden of 25 percent would be fair.

No wonder they are feeling squeezed today. Far from the 25 percent tax rate they think is reasonable, the typical American family faced a total tax burden—and that includes Federal, State, and local taxes—of 38.2 percent of all their income in 1995. That is more money going to Washington than families spend for food, clothing, shelter, and transportation combined.

The American people say that is extreme, too.

I know that is what Minnesotans are saying. I held a series of town meetings back home last week, in a part of the State where life can be tough and money doesn't come easy. It is home to hard-working people who sometimes hold down two jobs, and spend as many as 7 days a week on the job, struggling to stay afloat. They ask nothing more of their Government than the opportunity and freedom to make something of their lives. But high taxes continue to block the way.

We talked about taxes at every stop over the recess, and how 40 years of Washington's economic extremism have trapped working families short of their dreams.

They are frustrated. They do not see where their tax dollars are going, or how those dollars are directly improving their lives and their communities. And given that, they do not understand how Congress can keep coming after them for more.

During one of our stops, a college student pulled me aside after my town meeting in Duluth. He said, "It seems like the federal government is reaching deeper and deeper into our pockets, but in my case, I don't have any more to give." He went on to say, I don't qualify for student aid, so I'm working for my tuition and rent. I'm paying all these taxes, but none of it comes back to benefit me. So please—cut my taxes and let me keep my own money."

People do not understand what is happening in Washington. The crowds at my town meetings wanted to know why the President campaigned on a promise to balance the budget and cut their taxes, but then vetoed the bal-

anced budget and tax relief bill passed by this Congress, and, by the way, passed the largest tax increase on its own.

I had to admit that I did not understand either. "Chalk it up to election-year politics," I said.

Would the President come around and sign your bill this year, they wondered?

I had to say, "It doesn't look good." "Not this year. Not this President." And the people just shook their heads.

Listen to the people, Mr. President—they will tell you just what they told me. Cutting taxes for working families is not extreme. Preserving Medicare is not extreme. Giving people opportunities to pull themselves out of poverty is not extreme.

If anything is extreme about our government, it is the past practices of a Congress and President willing to steal from tomorrow's kids to finance another Federal handout or social program or pork project today. That is what the people sent us here to change.

Mr. President, there are despicable people in this world—assassins, bombers, terrorists—who are filled with such rage and contempt that they deserve to be branded as "extremists."

But in America, a man or woman who works themselves to the bone, who struggles to put food on the table and keep a sturdy roof over their family's heads, who just wants to sign their tax return knowing that this government does not take their tax dollars for granted anymore—is not an extremist.

Yet, Mr. President, any time my colleagues dismiss the people's taxpayers' agenda as extreme, they pin that label on every one of those Americans.

During tax week, 1996, my colleagues would do well to acknowledge the debt of gratitude we owe the American taxpayers. After all, their sacrifices have built this massive Federal Government. I leave you with this question—during tax week, 1996, when Washington's burden has become too much and the people are begging for our help, what is this Government willing to sacrifice in return?

Mr. BURNS. Mr. President, might I inquire, are we in morning business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate is in morning business.

RETIREMENT OF UNIVERSITY OF MONTANA FOOTBALL COACH DON READ

Mr. BURNS. Mr. President, I rise today to echo what is probably on the mind of everybody who ever attended school at the University of Montana, and every Grizzlies fan in my home State. Coach Don Read, the football coach of the last 10 or 11 years, is retiring. He told us all Monday that he was retiring in order to spend more time with his wife, Lois, and the rest of the family, and to move in a new direction.

We are losing a legend in Missoula. We are saddened by that, even a little bit stunned, because Coach Read is the

winningest coach in the history of the University of Montana. When he arrived in Missoula 10 years ago, he recruited heavily, ushering in the "Read Era" of UM, an era that culminated in the university's first-ever Division One-double-A national championship just this past season. It was a thrilling ride for every one of us in Montana, and we cannot help but think of what is ahead for the Griz because of the foundation and the base that Coach Read has laid.

Mr. President, Vince Lombardi, the legendary coach of the Green Bay Packers, said "winning is a habit." No one typified the winning habit more than Coach Read. Since taking over the University of Montana football program in 1986, he has never had a losing season. His overall record there was 85 and 36. That is a winning average of better than 70 percent, the best any coach at UM and the sixth best in the history of the Big Sky Conference.

In his tenure at the University of Montana, Coach Read even managed to pull off 10 straight wins against his cross-state rival and another one of my favorite teams, Montana State University. His overall coaching record including his many years coaching in Oregon is an impressive 154 and 127 and one—he had one tie.

Mr. President, I could go on about all the "firsts" and the "mosts" and the awards of Coach Read and what he has earned in his time at the University of Montana. Most wins by a Griz football team in a single season, five playoff appearances, three-time Big Sky Coach of the Year, selected Division One-double-A Coach of the Year by two national magazines, but all of that pales in comparison to Don Read as a man, and as a man that I know. He is loved and respected by his players and his colleagues and he is a fiercely devoted family man.

You know they say the coach will probably be judged on the wins and losses. But basically, what effect he has had on the young men who have played on his team is just absolutely—you cannot measure that. By his own words, the demands of coaching is a 16-hour-a-day, 7-day-a-week job. It has a way of catching up with you. Coach Read wants to make sure that his players will have a full-time coach that devotes all of his energy toward that team. In that respect, I admire him for putting the needs of a team before his own.

So the University of Montana is really losing one of the great ones. We want to thank him for the season just passed. The national championship is one that is not written about and is not voted on by sportswriters. It is played. Of course when you want it, he beat Marshall here in the State of West Virginia. It was a great thrill for all of us who live in the State of Montana.

Coach Read said he believes his replacement will be the best coach ever. I hope he is right. But I tell you he will be stepping into some awfully big