

and Mr. Dozier did too, and they could not go to the movies on Sunday until they had gone to church. They could not do anything else for the rest of the week if they had not gone to church. And in their home the only music that was allowed was gospel and classical and sometimes Billy Eckstein or Sarah Vaughan or Nat King Cole. And so these youngsters on the west side and east side of Detroit where they went to school, some of them met and knew Aretha Franklin, who was then singing in her father's, the late Reverend C.L. Franklin, church on Linwood Avenue already at the tender age of 9 years old, and they came out of this great family tradition.

Mr. Dozier's grandmother, Mrs. Melvina Watson, was the choir director at the Spiritual Israel Church Pentecostal; and when he was in junior high school he had formed the vocal group, The Romeos, five young men who had a recording contract with Atlantic; and then they went to Gwen Gordy, Berry Gordy's sister, Anna Records, and opened up their career and furthered it there. Then Gwen Gordy went with her brother Berry Gordy and they formed the Motown sound.

It is just so wonderful to recall how all these artists began, where their first writing was for Jackie Wilson, where they wrote this song, Reet Petite. And then they began to develop, Robert Bateman will always be remembered for bringing them together. It was wonderful. They finally began to click.

Madam Speaker, I rise to celebrate the contributions of the legendary songwriting team of Holland-Dozier-Holland, consisting of Brian Holland, Lamont Dozier, and Edward Holland to American cultural history. The songwriting trio, known as H-D-H, wrote most of the songs that created the enduring American "Motown Sound." On May 13, 2003, they will be honored with the 2003 BMI (Broadcast Music, Inc.) ICON Award, which is reserved for songwriters who have been unique and indelible influences on generations of music makers. H-D-H will receive this award at the 51st annual BMI Pop Awards dinner in Beverly Hills, California. BMI President & CEO Frances W. Preston will present the award. Brian Holland, Lamont Dozier, and Eddie Holland are most deserving of this award, which puts them in the company of Chuck Berry, James Brown, Bo Diddly, and Little Richard.

In 1959, a young African American Detroit, Berry Gordy, Jr., formed a company named Motown (an abbreviation of Detroit's 'Motor City' moniker). Holland-Dozier-Holland were architects of the instantly recognizable and barrier breaking "Sound of Young America," of Motown, creating the songs that turned a fledgling Detroit record company and its associated songwriters, producers, and artists, into an industry groundbreaker and powerhouse.

As songwriters and producers, H-D-H created such classics as "Reach Out, I'll Be There," "Stop in the Name of Love," "Where Did Our Love Go?" "Heat Wave," "Baby Love," "Baby I Need Your Lovin'," "How Sweet It Is to Be Loved By You," and dozens more hits. The blend of sweet and joyful lyrics

and complex musical stylings defined an era. Their music is on the soundtrack of countless films and television programs and has become the soundtrack for many American lives. Their innovative style and sound inspired millions of musicians throughout the world to improve and enhance their craft.

The astonishing success of H-D-H and Motown was a symbol of change in the United States in the 1960's, and the end of an era when access to an audience was limited by either opportunities or racial prejudice.

The sales of Holland-Dozier-Holland's music run into hundreds of millions of dollars and include some of the most widely-recognized pop songs in the world. Holland-Dozier-Holland songs also have accrued nearly 100 million airplays on United States radio and television stations. The songwriting team is a member of the Rock & Roll Hall of Fame, the Songwriters Hall of Fame, and winner of The Rhythm and Blues Foundation's 2002 Pioneer Award.

I commend BMI, an American performing rights organization that represents more than 300,000 songwriters, composers, and publishers, in all genres of music, for honoring Brian Holland, Lamont Dozier and Eddie Holland. I also congratulate the three worthy recipients.

#### SINKING AMERICAN ECONOMY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. WYNN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. WYNN. Madam Speaker, now that we have achieved victory in Iraq, the country will refocus its attention on matters close to home, specifically our sinking economy. Unfortunately, victory in war does not necessarily translate into success in domestic economy. In terms of the economy, we have been treated to a cycle of failure by this administration and my Republican colleagues. Consider that unemployment is now up to 6 percent. There has been a decline in the length of the workweek, meaning more people are working fewer hours. Manufacturing workers were hurt particularly hard last month. Factory payrolls fell by 95,000, the 33rd consecutive monthly decline.

According to Jerry Jasinowski, President of the National Association of Manufacturers, "Since July 2000 manufacturing has lost 2.2 million jobs, among the highest-skilled, best-paying jobs in our economy."

My colleague, the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT), goes on to point out that "Republican claimed that both the 2001 and the 2002 tax cuts would create jobs but they were wrong. Instead, 2.7 million private sector jobs have vanished since this administration took office a little over 2 years ago."

The fact is tax cuts have yielded 400 to \$500 billion deficits. They did not revive a sluggish economy, and what you are hearing now is, well, this is because of the war. Not true. Forty-three percent of our current deficits are directly attributable to these tax cuts. A small percentage is attributable to the war.

We have only authorized \$80 billion and the rest comes from the sluggish economy which the 2001 tax cuts failed to revive.

What happened in 2001 was that we had a \$5.6 trillion surplus, and my Republican colleagues came down here and said, We have got to give this money back to the American taxpayer so we can invigorate our economy. That did not happen. What we have instead is a projection over the next 10 years of a \$2 trillion deficit and we are going to borrow over \$500 billion this year.

The fact of the matter is the tax cut policy of the Republicans has not worked. We have seen this plan before.

Now we turn to what I call the Bush/Thomas model. I think it is a model of tax unfairness and ineffective economic policy. An analysis of the Thomas proposal by the Urban-Brookings Tax Policy Center concluded that his plan would be even more tilted to the affluent than Bush's original plan. According to the Brookings analysis, the average tax cut offered by the Thomas proposal for households earning more than a million dollars would be almost \$43,000 in tax cuts in 2003, compared with the administration's original proposal to give the very wealthy only 27,000. Then on top of that the top 5 percent of households, the top 5 percent of American households would receive 64 percent of the Bush dividend proposal, but under the Thomas proposal that they will roll out this week that same 5 percent would get 75 percent of the tax benefits.

There is something fundamentally unfair about that.

Now, in truth the middle class will only get about \$100 to \$200 in so-called tax relief; but the administration says, oh, no, a family earning about \$40,000 would get about \$1,000. That is called flimflamming the numbers. What they do is they take the average, reflecting the fact that the millionaire will get \$43,000 annually. That is how they get that false average.

In addition, we find that the Thomas plan does not create jobs. There is broad consensus among economists that reducing dividend taxes does not create jobs. In fact, economy.com has rated this as one of the least effective options in terms of stimulating growth. Bill Dudley, chief U.S. economist for Goldman Sachs has pointed out, "Rather than shoe-horning the dividend plan in, they should be trying to shoe-horn in the most amount of economic stimulus."

When the Democrats talk about our plan, we will talk about that, stimulus, putting money into the pockets of the middle class, helping our States' government so we can really stimulate this economy.

Finally, the Republicans tell us, well, look at our child care tax credit. We do not just care about the wealthy. It is very interesting when you look closely because although the tax breaks for the very wealthy are permanent, the

child care tax credit that they would have you focus on is really only temporary, and by the year 2006 they will actually be losing money on the child care tax credit.

So what we see in conclusion is a very flawed tax proposal tilted very much to the wealthy. They give us a solution to the American economy that says if you cut taxes on the wealthy, you will improve the economy by creating jobs. It did not work in 2001. It did not work in 2002. It is as Yogi Berra said, *deja vu* all over again.

I think we ought to reject this approach to tax policy and adopt a progressive Democratic approach that really works for middle class and working Americans.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

#### THOMAS TAX PLAN BAD FOR AMERICA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 2003, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. PALLONE. Madam Speaker, I did not think it was possible but the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, the gentleman from California (Mr. THOMAS) came up with a worse tax plan than the one President Bush proposed earlier this year. And, of course, we all know that that tax proposal was marked up. It was considered this afternoon in the Committee on Ways and Means. And I want to say that neither the President's plan nor the House Republican plan that was marked up by the Committee on Ways and Means today will jump-start the economy, which is our major concern.

We have now been through several months, even several years of an economic downturn and something has to be done to jump-start the economy, but nothing that the Republicans in the House nor the President have proposed will accomplish that.

Madam Speaker, since the President took office, more than 2.7 million private sector jobs have been lost, the worst record in 40 years. Any tax cuts passed by Congress should be fair, fast acting and fiscally responsible; but the Republicans plan fails all three of those tests. The Republican plan does not create jobs. It irresponsibly piles up debt, risks Social Security to make room for tax cuts for the wealthy, and continues the failed economic policies responsible for the current economic downturn.

□ 2015

Madam Speaker, the Republican tax plan, in my opinion, is simply unfair.

The wealthiest Americans will fare better under the Republican tax plan in the President's plan, while middle-class Americans, Americans with annual incomes between \$30,000 and \$100,000, will actually receive less under the Republican plan than they would have under the President's plan, which also was not good.

According to a report released this week on the Center on Budget and Policy Priorities, households with incomes of more than \$1 million per year would receive an average tax cut this year of \$105,600 under the House Republican plan, and that is \$15,000 more than they would have received under the President's proposal. Contrast those benefits with the middle fifth of households that would receive an average tax cut of \$218 under the Thomas plan, slightly less than under the Bush plan.

Let me reiterate, a millionaire under the Republican plan would see a tax benefit of more than \$105,000; but an average American making between \$40,000 and \$50,000 would receive a cut of only \$456.

I just do not understand what my Republican colleagues and what the House Republican leadership have in mind with this rush once again to pass another tax cut that will primarily benefit wealthy Americans and corporate interests and really do nothing to turn the economy around. We frankly cannot take another 6 months or another year of this economic downturn; and to suggest that somehow we are going to do something like this that helps a few people who happen to be wealthy, as opposed to helping the general populace or doing something to create jobs, makes absolutely no sense to me.

We understand that coming out of the Committee on Ways and Means today this is likely to be on the floor sometime the end of this week. We probably would vote for it on this Friday, and I would hope that there would be an opportunity to bring up Democratic alternatives and to bring up amendments under an open rule so we have an opportunity to make some changes in what the Republican leadership has proposed. I doubt it, but I think we have to continue to agitate and say that other options must be considered.

Again, as I said, Madam Speaker, at a time when we should be doing everything possible to jump-start the economy, the Republican solution centers around tax cuts on dividends, stock dividends and capital gains, two cuts that are, again, a target towards the wealthiest Americans and according to economists will not create new jobs. If my colleagues think about it, if we think about eliminating the tax on stock dividends, what does that accomplish? What makes anyone on the Republican side think that by eliminating a tax on stock dividends that the money saved by the people who would benefit from that would necessarily be reinvested in the economy, in the cre-

ation of new jobs, in the creation of a new means of production? We have no guarantee of that, and there is nothing in our economic policy that suggests that those kinds of tax cuts or elimination of stock dividends or capital gains are actually going to force or create a situation where money is reinvested in the economy, that is, creates more jobs.

My colleagues do not have to take my word for it. There are about 400 economists earlier this year who put out a statement that basically said that "the tax cut plan proposed by President Bush is not the answer to the problem." They concluded that "the permanent dividend tax cut, in particular, is not credible as a short-term stimulus."

We need things that are going to create jobs immediately, money pumped into infrastructure, into economic development projects, not money that is just going to go to pay for people who have invested in the stock market and somehow that that is going to be turned around. There is no guarantee this is going to create jobs in the short term.

Madam Speaker, like the Bush economic blueprint, the House GOP plan is also fiscally irresponsible because of the debt that it would create, saddling our children with debt and hurting long-term economic growth. This is such a reversal of fortunes from what we witnessed before the President took office under the Clinton administration. The economy was growing; we had a surplus rather than a deficit. Now, under the Bush economic plan, the deficits keep mounting.

When the Bush administration came into office, there was a projected \$5.6 trillion 10-year surplus. With this latest tax package that we will probably vote on this Friday, coupled with the huge tax cut in 2001, Republicans will produce a record \$1.4 trillion deficit over the next 10 years. That is a \$7 trillion reversal in our country's fortunes from where we were 2 years ago in the last few months of the Clinton administration.

What I really do not understand is how the Republican leadership in the House is no longer concerned about deficits. Madam Speaker, I remember a time when I was first elected here, which is about 15 years ago now, when I would come down on the House floor to do a Special Order, and there were a group of Republican Congressmen who used to bring a huge clock. It was about the length of the entire desk here where the House Clerks are sitting behind me; and it was so heavy and long they used to have the pages to come down and carry the digital clock. It recorded the level and the increase in the deficit on a daily basis or a weekly basis and the Republicans would harangue about the problem that the Nation faced because of increasing deficits. Where is that concern? It does not seem to exist anymore on the GOP side.