

I want to return power back home. Now, let us debate the size of Government. I do not think liberals can win that debate.

Now, when we are done doing those two, let us make sure that we get correct, historically accurate scoring of a capital gains cut which means, by the way, it will raise revenue. Under the budget act, if you honestly scored capital gains, it will increase revenue. So you do not score it as a cut. It is an increase. So it is magic. You lower taxes, more Americans save, more Americans invest, more Americans go to work, and historically every time we have done it, you have raised revenue. Only in Washington is an increase counted as a decrease. Only the technicians here who have never created a job could get away with it.

We need to have a debate and insist that it be scored historically accurately. At that point we have enough money. We can cut taxes. I want a straightforward debate. I believe we ought to have a cut in the capital gains tax to create jobs, we ought to lower the death taxes to save family farms and small businesses, we ought to have a \$500-per-child tax credit so that parents decide how to spend their money. If our liberal friends want to talk about targeted, which always means the Government targets, I think the American people ought to target. But that is the great debate over taxes.

My only point Monday was, here are three goals for 1997, the goal of saving Medicare because it deserves to be saved on its own. Let us get it done, Mr. President, and get it off the table and not use it for politics. The goal of balancing the budget with a smaller Government in Washington and more power back home. And the goal of reducing taxes so Americans save more, invest more, have more time off with their kids and more money to take care of their families.

I thought that is what I said on Monday. I wanted to come here and make very clear, I hope all my colleagues will go back and read what I said on the floor on Monday. I hope the reporters who had a field day all week re-explaining what I did not say in terms of making them feel better will now listen carefully to what I actually said.

I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. TAUZIN].

Mr. TAUZIN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding. I also commend him for even beginning this great national debate on whether or not we ought to replace an income tax in America with a fairer, flatter, more reasonable proposal for the country.

I want to let him know that on April 15 a great many Democrats and Republicans are going to be together in Boston Harbor. We are going to have an historic reenactment of the Boston Tea Party. We are going to dump the United States tax code into the harbor in a symbolic gesture to begin this debate.

It starts with recognizing we have a code out of control, 4,000 changes since

1986 alone. Maybe it is time for us to really debate whether a better system is right for the country, not Democrat or Republican but a better system for America.

Mr. GINGRICH. Let me say to the gentleman, as you know also on April 15, we are going to hold the vote until you get back from Boston, and we are then going to vote on an amendment that would require a supermajority to raise taxes because more and more States, particularly out West, now require that you get two-thirds of the vote or three fifths of the vote even to raise taxes because they have learned that politicians all too often will take money from the people to pay off the special interests. So April 15 is going to be a great date for the American taxpayer.

But my point to all of my colleagues is straightforward. It should not be hard to figure out what the agenda of the House Republican Party is. It should not be hard to figure out where the Republican Party is going. We want lower taxes for economic growth, stronger families, more take home pay, and greater volunteerism.

We want a stable, balanced budget so our children do not have to pay off our bills. In peacetime we should not borrow the money. We want the lower interest rates and the lower taxes that come from a balanced budget. We want less Government in Washington and more freedom back home, and we believe that saving Medicare should be done on its own terms for Americans by Americans.

It is wrong. It is wrong. It is wrong to use Medicare as a political blackmail to try to stop us from getting an agreement. Let us save Medicare now. Get it done in April. Get it over with. Make sure it is done. Take care of our senior citizens. Get it off the table. Cut out all the fear mongering, all the demagoguery. Then let us talk about how to cut taxes and balance the budget and get economic growth and strengthen families.

I hope that for anybody who is curious among our Members, among activists in the press corps, they now get the clear message. Lower taxes, balanced budget, less power in Washington, more freedom back home, save Medicare on its own terms because America's senior citizens deserve to see Medicare put above politics and done.

I think that is a pretty darn good agenda to start the next few weeks on.

#### A NATIONAL HOLIDAY FOR CESAR CHAVEZ

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HAYWORTH). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. FILNER] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor and remember a great American leader and hero, Cesar Chavez. He was a husband, father, grandfather, labor organizer, community

leader, and symbol of the ongoing struggle for equal rights and equal opportunity. March 31, the birthday of Cesar Chavez, has already been declared a State holiday in California. Today I ask my colleagues to join me in making March 31 a Federal holiday so that our entire Nation can honor Cesar Chavez for his many contributions.

Cesar Chavez, the son of migrant farmworkers, dedicated his life to fighting for the human rights and dignity of those farmworkers. He was born on March 31, 1927, on a small farm near Yuma, AZ, and died nearly 4 years ago, on April 23, 1993. Over the course of his 66 years, Cesar Chavez' work inspired millions and made him a major force in American history.

In 1962, Cesar Chavez and his family founded the National Farm Workers Association, which organized thousands of farmworkers to confront one of the most powerful industries in the country. He inspired them to join together and nonviolently demand safe and fair working conditions.

Through the use of a grape boycott, he was able to secure the first union contracts for farmworkers in the United States. These contracts provided farmworkers with the basic services that most workers take for granted, services such as clean drinking water and sanitary facilities. Because of Cesar Chavez' fight to enforce child labor laws, farmworkers could also be certain that their children would not be working side by side with them and would instead attend the migrant schools he helped establish. In addition, Cesar Chavez made the world aware of the exposure to dangerous chemicals that farmworkers and all consumers face every day.

As a labor leader, he earned great support from unions and elected officials across the Nation. The movement he began continues today as the United Farm Workers of America.

Cesar Chavez' influence extended far beyond agriculture. He was instrumental in forming the Community Service Organization, one of the first civic action groups in the Mexican-American communities of California and Arizona.

He worked in urban areas, organized voter registration drives, brought complaints against mistreatment by Government agencies. He taught community members how to deal with Government, school, and financial institutions and empowered many to seek further advancement in education and politics. There are countless stories of judges, engineers, lawyers, teachers, church leaders, organizers, and other hard-working professionals who credit Cesar Chavez as the inspiring force in their lives.

During a time of great social upheaval, he was sought out by groups from all walks of life and religions to bring calm with his nonviolent practices. In his fight for peace, justice, respect, and self-determination, he gained the admiration and respect of

millions of Americans, including this Congressman.

Cesar Chavez will be remembered for his tireless commitment to improve the plight of farmworkers, children, and the poor throughout the United States, and for the inspiration his heroic efforts gave to so many Americans. We in Congress must make certain that the movement Cesar Chavez began and the timeless lessons of justice and fairness he taught be preserved and honored in our national conscience. To make sure these fundamental principles are never forgotten, I urge my colleagues to support legislation to declare March 31 a Federal holiday in honor of Cesar Chavez. In his words and in the words of the United Farm Workers, "Si, se puede," yes, it can be done.

#### UTAH AND H.R. 1500

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Utah [Mr. CANNON] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I represent Utah's Third Congressional District. Most Americans know a little bit about my district. Last fall, on September 18, President Clinton stood across the State line in Arizona, on the other side of the Grand Canyon, and with a few quick words and the stroke of a pen created the Grand Staircase-Escalante National Monument.

The fully understand the scale of this new monument, you must understand how big the average U.S. monument is currently. The average is 30,500 acres. The new southern Utah monument at 1.7 million acres is more than 55 times larger. It is bigger than both Delaware and Rhode Island combined.

The monument is extremely rugged, and parts are truly beautiful. The issue is really not that the land should be protected. The issue is process. That is why Utahans are angry. If this had been done through an open and thoughtful process, I think Utahans could have embraced something in the area.

But that is not what happened. Instead this monument was done without discussion, without consultation and without consideration.

The first time anyone in Utah, including my Democratic predecessor, ever heard about the possibility of a monument was in the pages of the Washington Post, a mere 7 days before the actual creation of the monument.

During the week before September 18, Utah's congressional delegation and Governor were told repeatedly that nothing was imminent. Of course, something was.

On the day of the President's proclamation, I was in southern Utah in the town of Kanab, which is on the west edge of the monument. Kanab is a small pioneer town. The residents are solid people, ranchers, farmers and the people who make their living by supporting those who work on the land.

On that day they held a rally at Kanab High School. The entire town closed down and everyone gathered to express their frustration at a President who in another State on the other side of the Grand Canyon was making a decision that would greatly affect their lives. The people were hurt and, yes, justifiably angry. They asked over and over again why their government would do such a thing to them in such a manner.

I can remember standing outside the high school and watching as dozens of black balloons were released as a symbol of what had happened to southern Utah.

□ 1330

Given this history, is it any wonder that the citizens of Utah today feel bruised and battered on the public land issues? I think my colleagues can understand why I say that Utahns are suspicious of anyone from outside the State who would try to impose additional restrictions on Utah's public lands.

And that brings me to H.R. 1500, a bill that will be shortly introduced into Congress. This is a bill sponsored by one of my colleagues from New York. It would designate a staggering 5.7 million acres of BLM land in Utah as wilderness. This is an area three times the size of this enormous monument.

Utahns are still reeling from the blow by President Clinton's monument proclamation, and H.R. 1500 amounts to rubbing salt in still-open wounds. To have outsiders introduce this bill at this time is not only highly inappropriate but offensive to the dignity of the people of Utah.

Now, Utah has a lot of beautiful land. Some of it should be designated wilderness. But additional wilderness is terribly, terribly divisive as an issue in Utah. Utahns are split and deeply divided over how much of any acres of BLM land in Utah should be designated as wilderness. There is absolutely no consensus on this issue.

That is why I went and met with the sponsor of H.R. 1500, the gentleman from New York, a few days ago and asked him for a cooling-off period on this issue of wilderness in Utah. I told him if he introduced his bill it would be hurtful rather than helpful because of the anger over the monument. Any bill right now would have the effect of pitting Utah's political leaders, environmentalists, rural residents, and public land users against each other. It would dramatically and directly hurt the cause of bringing Utahns together over the issue of wilderness.

I proposed a 2-year period during which no one in the Congress would propose Utah wilderness legislation. Utahns could then use the time to deal with the monument and seek consensus on the issue of wilderness.

Despite my appeal, my colleague from New York told me he is compelled to move forward. Frankly, I found this pretty offensive. My colleague from

New York has a district some 2,200 miles away from mine. His district has no Federal lands, none at all. Surely he has more pressing environmental concerns in his own district.

Remember that H.R. 1500 is not about protecting public lands in Utah, it is about showing disregard for the people of Utah and the Utah congressional delegation. I ask my colleagues, as a matter of courtesy, please do not co-sponsor H.R. 1500.

#### TERRORISM THREATENS MIDEAST PEACE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. ENGEL] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, the suicide bombing today in a Tel Aviv cafe, which killed at least 4 Israelis and injured dozens of people, was a cowardly act. This cowardly act represents a knife in the heart of the peace process. Terror is not an arrow in the quiver of those who strive for peace.

What bothers me, Mr. Speaker, is that while Yasir Arafat condemned the bombing, he once again is speaking out of 16 sides of his mouth. What disturbs me is the Palestinian negotiators or the Palestinian authorities have been using the threat of terror for a while now, saying that if the Israelis went ahead and built the Har Homa housing that there would become suicide bombings, there would be terror, and that they could not be responsible for what might happen.

I say such rhetoric, such language is to give an indirect green light to those people who would use terror to maim and kill innocent civilians.

We will not and cannot allow terror to destroy the peace process. When Yasir Arafat releases Hamas terrorists from prison and then predicts that violence will happen in Israel as a result of the housing, he is giving a green light to terrorist attacks.

He cannot speak out of 10 or 20 or 30 sides of his mouth. He cannot oppose Hamas when it is expedient and then wink and turn the other way and say, "Oh, I condemn this terror," when in essence we know that by predicting it and looking the other way, it becomes a self-fulfilling prophecy. When Arafat signed the peace accords, he committed himself to the peace process, and committing himself to the peace process means no side deals with Hamas terrorists.

The Hamas terrorists ought to know that Jerusalem is the undivided capital of Israel and will remain so. When Israel decides it wants to build housing or do whatever else it deems necessary in its own capital, Israel has the right to do that. Terrorism should not be used and cannot be accepted as a vehicle with which one side in a peace process makes threats and says if you do not give us what we want we are going to have terrorist attacks and we will not be able to do anything about it.