

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

shoes. Just like anybody else, he will have to get his cleats the old-fashioned way. He will have to earn them. That is the way it will be.

Mr. President, we bid farewell to a man who has brought so much respect and so much quality to the University of Montana and the football program, and we say goodbye, but we do not say so long.

I yield the floor.

PROGRESS TOWARD A BAN ON ANTIPERSONNEL LANDMINES

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I want to bring Senators up to date on the progress of the past 2 months since the Leahy amendment for a moratorium on the use of antipersonnel landmines was signed into law.

That amendment received bipartisan support from about two-thirds of the Senate. It was supported by the House-Senate conference committee, and it was signed by the President on February 12. I want to thank all those Senators who voted for it. I would also like to thank those Senators who have come up to me since the vote who did not vote for it and said now they wished they had because of the havoc that the mines have wreaked in Bosnia.

In fact, in Bosnia just since December, 38 NATO soldiers have been injured, 7 have been killed by landmines, including 3 Americans. There are 3 million landmines left in Bosnia. To put that in perspective, there are 3 million landmines in a country about the size of Tennessee. They will kill and maim civilians for decades after our troops leave. Children going to school, farmers working in their fields, and people going to market will be dying long after most of us have left the U.S. Senate.

Over the past several years, I have sponsored legislation against antipersonnel landmines. The purpose of my legislation has been to exert United States leadership so that pressure would build on other countries to follow our example. During a lot of that time this was seen as some kind of a crusade of civilians against the military. It was never the case. It was never intended by me to be the case. In fact, one of the greatest encouragements I had in my efforts to ban landmines was the support I received from combat veterans around this country.

Those who say we need antipersonnel landmines should read the April 3 full-page open letter to President Clinton that appeared in the New York Times. In this full-page letter to the President, 15 of the country's most distinguished retired military officers called for a ban on the production, the sale, the transfer, and the use of antipersonnel landmines. They say such a ban would be both "humane and militarily responsible."

Look at some of the people who signed this. These are not just wild-eyed theorists. They include Gen. Norman Schwarzkopf; former Chairman of

the Joint Chiefs of Staff, Gen. David Jones; the former Supreme Allied Commander, Gen. John Galvin; former Commander in Chief of the U.S. Southern Command, Gen. Frederick Woerner; former Commanding General, U.S. Readiness Command, Gen. Volney Warner. Mr. President, these are generals who know what has happened.

I ask unanimous consent that a copy of the generals' letter be printed in the RECORD following my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. LEAHY. There is no doubt that antipersonnel landmines have some use. Any weapon does. But to those who would argue that whatever use they have outweighs the devastation they inflict on whole societies, I would answer that the commanders of our forces in South Korea, Vietnam, NATO, and Desert Storm say otherwise.

They say we can get rid of these landmines. These generals have used antipersonnel landmines and have seen what they do. They say these indiscriminate weapons made their jobs more dangerous, not safer. They remember their troops being blown up by their own minefields.

Today, it is landmines that our troops fear the most in Bosnia. No army is going to challenge our men and women in Bosnia, but there are hidden killers everywhere. A \$2 antipersonnel mine will blow the leg off the best-trained, the best-equipped, the best-motivated American soldier.

In the 2 months since February, Canada, the Netherlands, Australia and, yesterday, Germany, have announced they will unilaterally, effective immediately, ban their use of antipersonnel landmines. These countries have gone way out ahead of the United States in showing leadership to ban landmines. Several, like Germany, said they will destroy their stockpile of these weapons. They are taking this action, which far surpasses what the United States has done, to lead the rest of the world.

Mr. President, next Monday, the United States will join over 50 countries in Geneva in the final session of negotiations on a treaty to limit the use of antipersonnel landmines. We already know that any agreement is going to fall far short of what is needed to solve this problem. Countries have insisted on exceptions and loopholes that are just going to assure that landmines will continue to maim and kill innocent civilians for decades to come.

In the weeks of negotiations there have not been more than 2 minutes of discussion on the banning of these weapons—the simplest and easiest thing to do, and what all of these distinguished retired American generals asked us to do. The only way we are going to get rid of antipersonnel landmines is by leadership that energizes the rest of the world.

A year and a half ago in a historic speech at the United Nations, President Clinton declared the goal of rid-

ding the world of antipersonnel landmines.

There is no reason why today, with the world's attention focused on Bosnia, where we are spending tens of millions of dollars just to try to find the mines, we cannot join with our NATO partners, who have gone way out ahead of the United States, and renounce these insidious weapons. Let the United States—the most powerful nation on Earth—instead of being a follower in this, become the leader. A law we voted for in the Senate, now on the books, says we will halt our use of these landmines in 3 years. It should happen immediately, and it should be permanent, as Germany, Canada, and the others have done. Our senior retired combat officers support it. Hundreds of humanitarian organizations support it. They have seen the limbs torn off children at the knee.

If I have anything to do with it—and I intend to—this country is going to end this century having banned these terrible weapons once and for all. I hope the President and his administration will do what the United States Senate has already done—shown leadership in this. I hope that the rest of the Congress will do that, and then I hope that the United States will come back into a leadership role in banning landmines. It is what our NATO allies want, it is what our retired generals want, and it is what our men and women in the Armed Forces want.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an article in the April 8 edition of Newsweek magazine, by David Hackworth, America's most decorated soldier, entitled, "One Weapon We Don't Need," be printed in the RECORD.

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

[From Newsweek, Apr. 8, 1996]

ONE WEAPON WE DON'T NEED

(By David H. Hackworth)

Last February, Sgt. 1/C Donald A. Dugan was killed instantly on a snowy patch of ground in Bosnia. An antipersonnel mine exploded while the veteran U.S. Army reconnaissance sergeant was attempting to disarm it. The explosion drove a piece of the steel disarming tool into his forehead. On a dozen different killing fields around the world in the past 50 years, I've seen thousands of soldiers and civilians blasted apart by landmines. In northern Italy, where I served as a 15-year-old soldier boy at the end of World War II, I saw an army captain's legs ripped off by a land mine. In Bosnia last January, I came within minutes of becoming a casualty myself from a land-mine explosion. But I've never seen a battle in which landmines made a difference to the outcome. They are ugly and ineffective weapons, and they ought to be outlawed.

Land mines are indiscriminate killers. They kill not only during the conflict, but decades after the last shot was fired. The technology has improved; a modern mine can be programmed to blow itself up after a few weeks or months, reducing the postwar threat to civilians. But anti-personnel mines are still not "smart." They can't tell a good guy from a bad guy, a soldier from a civilian, an adult from a child. And some fail to blow themselves up. When millions of mines are