

They would like to invest their dollars improving salaries and benefits, but any additional dollars that might have been available to improve the lives of employees have been confiscated by the Federal Government.

Even when job providers find the means to offer wage and benefit increases, tax hikes mean families do not see much of a difference in their paychecks after it is done.

And so family incomes—the amount of dollars they have left to spend on food, transportation, clothing, housing, et cetera—have actually dropped every year of the Clinton Presidency.

A Government-mandated increase in the minimum wage is not the only solution—although many argue that is all we have to do and many problems would be cured—because low wages alone are not the problem.

The Clinton administration simply cannot stop spending, and requiring more and more tax dollars to feed that spending, taking away most of the money that could be used for better salaries, or new jobs.

If the Government would reform itself, if it would curb its spending and cut taxes, middle-class families would not need a hike in the minimum wage or risk losing their jobs because of it.

In our current economic climate, it is the working folks who have the most to lose. The wealthy do not need our help. The poor already have the safety net of welfare and the hundreds of Federal programs it opens up to them. But who is watching out for the working people? They are the ones being squeezed.

Yet the Clinton administration just does not get it, despite all the talk from the White House about the need to reform Government and balance the budget.

Just last week, President Clinton requested an additional \$8 billion from Congress for increased domestic discretionary spending.

How can you go on national television one week to declare that “the era of big Government is over,” and then come to Congress just a few weeks later, hat in hand, asking for another \$8 billion dollars’ worth of even bigger Federal Government?

Where do we get the money—higher taxes, or borrow it and make our kids pay?

My colleagues on the other side of the aisle still do not get it, either.

They staked out a new agenda of their own last week as part of a campaign to portray themselves as the soul of the working class. Incredibly, their proposal includes more job-killing taxes on the Nation’s job providers.

That, of course, comes after they spent months trying to delay and derail our efforts to balance the budget and offer meaningful tax relief to American families.

Republicans have put on the table a balanced budget, welfare reform and Medicare reform. But who has stood in the way of getting that passed so the

American people can begin to enjoy the benefits? It has been the Democratic leaders in this Congress and the President who have kept that from happening.

Mr. President, too many years of big Government have proven it: more taxes, more spending, more regulations, and more Government programs will not lead to more jobs and higher pay. We will never tax our way to prosperity or spend our way to economic success.

Unlike those Johnny-come-latelys in the White House and here on Capitol Hill who talk a good game about serving the middle class but never step up to the plate on their behalf, the taxpayers’ agenda Republicans are fighting for has always been focused on the working class.

We have heard their calls for tax relief—and we delivered.

We have heard their calls for opening the economy to more jobs, better paying jobs—and we delivered.

We have heard their calls for balancing the budget and putting an end to the legacy of debt we have imposed on our children and grandchildren—and we delivered.

We have heard the pleas of working Americans who ask for nothing more than a chance to reach prosperity—and again we delivered.

In the name of America’s working class, we shipped each one of those proposals to the White House—and the President sent each of them back stamped “Return to Sender.”

Mr. President, the balanced budget passed by this Congress, with its tax cuts and incentives to help stimulate growth and create jobs, is the best way we can help average Americans troubled by an economy that is heading down.

We agree that the key to creating economic prosperity and good jobs is a healthy business climate.

We understand that those jobs can help instill independence and dignity, and create more opportunities for anyone trying to get ahead.

And we know that the key to empowering families to reach that better life, however they may define it, is to cut taxes and let them keep more of their own dollars.

Mr. President, for the working-class people of this Nation who have built their own success and today lead the lives they have always wanted, prosperity is not defined by the size of their last Federal handout or how much something they got for nothing.

It is oftentimes about building something out of nothing, which, after all, is the definition of the American dream.

I urge the President to put aside the election-year politicking and take a real stand on the side of the working class by working with Congress to right the economic wrongs created by his administration.

It is not too late to give prosperity a chance, but it would be irresponsible to

make Americans wait until the November elections have come and gone before we really try.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming is recognized to speak for up to 30 minutes.

#### FRESHMAN FOCUS

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, you will be relieved to know I will not take 30 minutes. I have shared it with my friend from Minnesota.

Mr. President, the freshman focus has been in here now for a couple of days, talking about the economy and talking about ways that we can strengthen American families, strengthen the economy, strengthen wages, strengthen jobs. The interesting part of it is that is what we have been talking about here for the last year. That is what we have been talking about when we talk about balancing the budget, when we talk about regulatory reform, when we talk about tax relief. Unfortunately, I think in our communications too often the perception is that we are talking about those things because they are what is in our mind—tax relief and balancing the budget. We really ought to be talking about the benefits of those things. That is why we are doing it.

We are balancing the budget for a result, and one of the results, of course, is the fiscal and moral responsibility to pay for what we are using and not to put onto our children and grandchildren a \$5 trillion debt, \$260-billion-a-year interest payment, a lifetime interest payment for a youngster born today of \$180,000. We really ought to be talking about that.

Our friends on the other side of the aisle stood up yesterday and said, “We want to start talking about the economy. We want to start the conversation.”

Excuse me? That is what we have been talking about for a year. That is the very thing that the Democrats have blocked all year long—a balanced budget, help to create jobs, tax reform, so that people will invest money in the economy and create jobs so families have more money in their pockets to spend. That is what we are talking about, jobs and wages and an economy that grows.

Unfortunately, we have not always had the information. The President, I think, maybe this year, has said our economy has been the healthiest it has been in three decades. I am sorry, Mr. President, but maybe you need to look at some of the information that comes from your agencies.

Employment data: Unemployment rose from 5.6 to 5.8 in January. The healthiest economy in 30 years? Not for workers. Increases in workers’ wages and benefits are the lowest in 14 years. After accounting for inflation, the rise in wages is an abysmal 0.3 percent. At least part of it is the fact that the economy has grown more slowly in the

last 4 years than it has grown in the previous 15.

This year's growth was 1.8, I believe. The last quarter was .9 when we were more accustomed to 3.5, or 4.5 growth.

Why is that? There is a great argument about why that is, of course. The Senator from New Mexico yesterday talked about a program in which the Government would decide which are class A corporations. We would have more regulation and seek to have the Government more involved. That is a point of view, and not one that I agree with.

On the contrary, it seems to me that what we need to do to spark the economy is to have tax relief so that there is more money in the private sector to invest in job creation and to do something about regulatory reform.

I come from a background of small business, and I have some idea of how costly it is to meet the requirements of the regulations. Nobody is saying do away with all regulations, but we are saying that there are ways to do it that are less expensive, that are more efficient, and that will encourage small business.

I do not know how many people have heard of small businesses who say, "I am not going to fight it anymore. It is not worth it. I have put in all of this effort and really take home very little."

So, Mr. President, that is what it is about, and we have an opportunity to do that. We have an opportunity—starting last year. And, frankly, we have had opposition from the White House. We have had opposition from the minority Democrats. They do not want regulatory reform. That is available. We can do that. Balance the budget—we are still in the process of that. What is so magic about balancing the budget, for Heaven's sake? We have not done it for 30 years. Everyone else has done it. You have to do it in your family. You have to do it in your business. It is a constitutional requirement in Wyoming. The legislature is meeting now. When they came, they knew. "Here is the revenue we have, and here is the expenditure that we are allowed to make."

They do not do as we have done in the Congress for 30 years and say, "Here is the revenue. Here is the expenditure. Put it on the kids' credit cards."

That is what we need to do in order to do something about the economy, Mr. President. I hope that we will do that.

#### SENATOR HENRY SCHWARTZ

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, I would like to acknowledge today one of my State's—Wyoming's—unsung heroes, Senator Henry Schwartz, who served our great State from 1936 to 1942.

Senator Schwartz did much for Wyoming. But today I would like to focus on his efforts during the 76th session of Congress when he had amended the Na-

tional Defense Act to establish a school specifically for the training of black pilots.

While military opportunities for minorities increased after the Civil War—like the establishment of the famed Buffalo Soldiers who fought and died for our country on the western frontier—there were very few, if any, opportunities available in the Air Force, at that time, the Air Corps.

To challenge that trend, in 1939 representatives of the African-American community asked Congress to consider allowing blacks to be military pilots. The matter had been given little consideration until Senator Schwartz submitted an amendment to the National Defense Act which established a training school specifically for African Americans. The amendment passed with a vote of 77 to 8, and history was made.

With the help of the Senator from Wyoming, legends like Benjamin O. Davis, Jr., America's first black Air Force general and commander of the 99th Pursuit Squadron—also known as The Tuskegee Airmen—was given a chance to serve this country.

Past and future aviators, from astronauts to fighter pilots, will continue to rise in the defense of America because of Henry Schwartz's work.

So today I rise to acknowledge the work of Senator Henry Schwartz and sincerely thank him. His genuine belief in affording all Americans the opportunity to achieve is his legacy to this Nation.

Thank you, Mr. President. I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. D'AMATO. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

#### CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Morning business is closed.

#### WHITEWATER DEVELOPMENT CORP. AND RELATED MATTERS—MOTION TO PROCEED

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the motion to proceed to Senate Resolution 227.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

Motion to proceed to consider a resolution (S. Res. 227) to authorize the use of additional funds for salaries and expenses of the Special Committee to Investigate Whitewater Development Corporation and related matters, and for other purposes.

The Senate resumed consideration of the motion.

Mr. D'AMATO. Mr. President, I believe that we have a constitutional ob-

ligation to get the facts as it relates to the Whitewater Committee and its work, which is incomplete. It is not nearly complete. It is not complete for a variety of reasons. The fact of the matter is that just this past Saturday—actually late on a Friday—this committee received a letter from a very prominent lawyer. That lawyer represents Bruce Lindsey. Bruce Lindsey is President Clinton's close friend, confidant, and assistant.

For months and months and months, Mr. Lindsey and his attorney were aware of the fact that we were seeking all notes and all relevant material that he may have had in connection with Whitewater. We know that he was part of this Whitewater strategic team. We know that. Mr. Lindsey testified that he did not take notes. We were concerned and we had reason to believe that he did take notes.

Mr. Lindsey's attorney sends us a letter, very interestingly, dated March 1. That is after the deadline for our committee's work or the appropriation for our committee. He sends us the notes that we had asked him about, which he had first denied ever having taken. There are two pages, all about Whitewater and various questions—like who made telephone calls in connection with it to Bill Kennedy, Randy Coleman, Hale, and other people involved in it. And then he tells us in his concluding sentence that he has additional documents, and he claims a privilege—not a privilege between himself, being Mr. Lindsey's lawyer—but he raises a privilege between himself and these documents being sent, that they are attorney-client discussions and communications with the President's counsel.

Now, first, we have the White House saying they would not raise the issue of privilege. Second, we have no way of knowing if this information falls within that domain. Third, in order to keep his client from obviously thwarting the will of the committee and its subpoena, he cloaks this. Understand, if anybody can simply say that these are documents or information that I shared with the President's counsel, that would automatically thwart us from getting information. That is what this is about. This is a way of keeping information from us and not, obviously, being in a position where he is in contempt of a duly authorized, issued subpoena. That is what is going on. It is incredible.

Now, our attorneys have written to him. Our attorneys have written and we have asked to see the so-called privilege log that would exist, and we have been denied that. We have been given no response to this. Here we have people who want to cut off this investigation. They want to cut it off. Well, I have to tell you that when we get information that comes in after the work of the committee, that we hoped had been concluded, and get information from key White House officials, I have to suggest that that is why it becomes