death Friday evening, May 30, of Albert J. Davis, Chief Democratic Economist of the House Ways and Means Committee.

Let me express my deepest condolences to Al's longtime companion, Mary Beilefeld. While our words today cannot replace the loss felt by Mary, I hope it is somehow comforting that her loss is not only hers but is shared by the Members and staff of the House Committee on Ways and Means and by all inside and outside of this institution who had the privilege of working with Al.

I never saw a day when Al did not possess an amiable and peaceful air about him. And when you got him talking, it was wonderful seeing this gentle man's passion for his work, for economic justice and fairness come pouring out, the passion that fueled his mind and body while he spent long hours in his Longworth office writing the reports and memos on which my colleagues and I on the House Ways and Means Committee relied.

During the past several years, Al provided us with the most up-to-date, readable, and, dare I say, entertaining analyses of budget and tax information available in Washington. There were many flights back to Los Angeles where a stack of Al's most recent memos written late the night before or bright and early that morning helped me pass the time and prepare for the committee or floor debates ahead.

I have many fond remembrances of Al. For instance, there were the times when the two of us and perhaps John Buckley, his colleague on the Ways and Means Committee Democratic staff and accomplice in such matters, would sit behind the committee dais in 1100 Longworth and in an effort to liven things up a bit, devise a spirited line of questioning for a witness before the committee. Or other times when with only moments to spare, Al would come through with a quote, note, number, or other factoid from his encyclopedic memory or his always-threatening-to-burst accordion file folder that was central to the argument I was preparing to make during a tax mark-up. But perhaps my fondest memories of Al will be the after-hours, informal banter in the hallways or whenever we would run into each other in which the thoughtful, comedic, and interesting character of this wonderful human being would shine.

Mr. Speaker, Al Davis was a public servant in the best sense of the phrase. The work he did, whether it was writing memos, crunching numbers, or producing charts and graphs, was all with the goal of ensuring that the public was served well by its government. I will long remember Al and his contributions to the Ways and Means Committee and this House and I ask that my colleagues remember and honor his memory as well.

THOMAS FRIEDMAN COLUMN ON SERVICE CUTS

HON. NICK J. RAHALL, II

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 12, 2003

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Speaker, as the Republican majority shortchanges working families on the child tax credit; as our veterans' benefits are cut; as the majority approaches cuts in transportation funding; as we experience a lack of funding for education and homeland security initiatives, and as the President is cutting services for the many in his incessant thirst to help the wealthy few, Thomas Friedman offers a view in his column ''Read My Lips'' in the June 11, 2003 edition of the New York Times, which I recommend to all my colleagues, Democrats and Republicans alike. It is as follows:

[From the New York Times, June 11, 2003]

READ MY LIPS

(By Thomas L. Friedman)

Democrats have been groping for a way to counter George Bush's maniacal tax cuts, which are designed to shrink government and shift as many things as possible to the market. May I make a suggestion? When you shrink government, what you do, over time, is shrink the services provided by federal, state and local governments to the vast American middle class. I would suggest that henceforth Democrats simply ask voters to substitute the word ''services'' for the word ''taxes'' every time they hear President Bush speak.

That is, when the president says he wants yet another round of reckless ''tax cuts,'' which will shift huge burdens to our children, Democrats should simply refer to them as ''service cuts,'' because that is the only way these tax cuts will be paid for—by cuts in services. Indeed, the Democrats' bumper sticker in 2004 should be: ''Read my lips, no new services. Thank you, President Bush.''

Say it with me now: ''Read my lips, no new services—or old ones.''

Whenever Mr. Bush says, ''It's not the government's money, it's your money,'' Democrats should point out that what he is really saying is, ''It's not the government's services, it's your services''—and thanks to the Bush tax cuts, soon you'll be paying for many of them yourself.

As the former Nixon-era commerce secretary Peter Peterson just observed in this newspaper, when Mr. Bush took office the 10-year budget projection showed a $5.6 trillion surplus—something that would easily prefinance the cost of Social Security. The first Bush tax cut, coupled with continued spending growth and the post-9/11 costs, brought the projected surplus down to $1 trillion. ''Unfazed by this turnaround,'' notes Mr. Peterson, ''the Bush administration proposed a second tax-cut package in 2003 in the face of huge new fiscal demands, including a war in Iraq and an urgent 'homeland security' agenda.'' Result: now the 10-year fiscal projection is for a $4 trillion deficit.

This in turn will shrink the federal government's ability to help out the already strapped states. Since most states have to run balanced budgets, that will mean less health care and kindergarten for children and the poor, higher state college tuition, smaller local school budgets and fewer state service workers. And Lord only knows how we'll finance Social Security.

Everyone wants taxes to be cut, but no one wants services to be cut, which is why Democrats have to reframe the debate—and show President Bush for what he really is: a man who is not putting money into your pocket, but who is removing government services and safety nets from your life.

Ditto on foreign policy. As we and our government continue to spend and invest more than we save, we will become even more dependent on the outside world to finance the gap. Foreigners will have to buy even more of our T-bills and other assets. And do you know on whom we'll be most dependent: for that? China and Japan. Yes, that China—the one the Bush team says is our biggest geopolitical rival.

''In the 1990's, Japan's and China's excess savings were financing our private sector investment, because the government was in surplus,'' says Robert Hormats, vice chairman of Goldman Sachs International. ''Now, with these looming deficits, China and Japan are being asked to finance our government's actual operations.'' That makes us very dependent on their willingness to continue sending us hundreds of billions of dollars of their savings. Should China and Japan not want to play along, your services will very likely be cut even sooner (unless you believe in ''voodoo economics''). Which is why Democrats should rename this tax bill the China-Japan Economic Dependency Act.

I don't think Democrats can win the presidency with a single issue. You win the presidency by connecting with the American people's gut insecurities and aspirations. You win with a concept. The concept I'd argue for is ''neoliberalism.'' More Americans today are natural neolibs, than neocons. Neoliberals believe in a muscular foreign policy and a credible defense budget, but also a prudent fiscal policy that balances taxes, deficit reduction and government services.

To name something is to own it. And the Democrats, for too long, have allowed the Bush team to name its radical reduction in services, and the huge dependence it is creating on foreign capital, as an innocuous ''tax cut.'' Balderdash. This new tax cut is a dangerous foray into wretched excess and it will ultimately make our government, ourselves and our children less secure.

FLORIDA'S FALLEN HEROES

HON. JOHN L. MICA

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 12, 2003

Mr. MICA. Mr. Speaker, as our Nation remembered its war dead on Memorial Day and June 6th D-Day, I believe it is fitting to pay tribute to all of those who have paid the ultimate sacrifice. In our most recent conflict in Iraq, 14 individuals from my State of Florida gave their lives in service to our Nation in that war. While we honor and remember all those brave men and women and their loved ones who have given their full measure of devotion to their country from the days of the American Revolution to this hour, I submit the names of the following members of our military, their age, service and Florida hometown for special remembrance:

Lance Cpl. Andrew J. Aviles, Tampa,18, Marine Corps.

Cpl. Armando A. Gonzalez, Hialeah, 25, Marine Corps.

Cpl. John T. Rivero, Tampa, 23, Army National Guard Infantry.

Lance Cpl. Brian R. Buesing, Cedar Key, 20, Marine Corps.

Lance Cpl. David K. Fribley, Fort Myers, 26, Marine Corps.

PFC Michael R. Creighton Weldon, Palm Bay, 20, Army.

Lance Cpl. Antonio J. Sledd, Tampa, 20, Marine Corps.

Ranger Specialist Marc A. Anderson, Brandon, 30, Army.

Army Ranger Sgt. Bradley S. Crose, Orange Park, 30, Army.

Navy SEAL Chief Petty Officer Matthew J. Bourgeois, Tallahassee, 35, Navy.

Sgt. Michael C. Barry, Brandon, 29, Army National Guard.

CWO Timothy W. Moehling, Panama City, 35, Army.

Master Sgt. Michael Maltz, St. Petersburg, 42, Air Force.

Specialist Pedro Pena, (Last residence in Florida), 35, Army.

FLIGHT 100—CENTURY OF AVIATION REAUTHORIZATION ACT OF 2003

SPEECH OF

HON. BRAD SHERMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 11, 2003

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 2115) to amend title 49, United States Code, to reauthorize programs for the Federal Aviation Administration, and for other purposes.

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise to express my support for H.R. 2115, the Century of Aviation Reauthorization Act. This bipartisan legislation authorizes $58.9 billion over four years for the activities of the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA), and continues provisions in current law that ensure that all aviation trust fund revenues are spent only on aviation programs.

While I was pleased to join my colleagues in voting for passage of this important legislation, it is disappointing that the legislation does nothing to improve local control over flight curfews at airports. Noise generated by airports is a constant infringement on the quality of life for residents in surrounding communities.

I believe that local authorities, working in conjunction with the Federal Aviation Administration, should be making the decisions with respect to flight curfews at locally controlled airports. I did not submit such an amendment to the Rules Committee because I was told the Committee would not make it in order.

I hope that as this legislation proceeds to the Senate, we can work to strengthen the provisions of the legislation with respect to airport noise and to give more control to local authorities.