

## DEFICITS (ON-BUDGET)

Fiscal year 2003: \$516,054,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2004: \$558,828,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2005: \$488,120,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2006: \$432,381,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2007: \$400,727,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2008: \$405,793,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2009: \$366,465,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2010: \$360,323,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2011: \$381,063,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2012: \$314,765,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2013: \$301,929,000,000.

## DEBT SUBJECT TO LIMIT

Fiscal year 2003: \$6,750,000,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2004: \$7,388,000,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2005: \$7,982,000,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2006: \$8,540,000,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2007: \$9,069,000,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2008: \$9,608,000,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2009: \$10,109,000,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2010: \$10,608,000,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2011: \$11,132,000,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2012: \$11,596,000,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2013: \$12,048,000,000,000.

## DEBT HELD BY THE PUBLIC

Fiscal year 2003: \$3,921,000,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2004: \$4,303,000,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2005: \$4,604,000,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2006: \$4,835,000,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2007: \$5,013,000,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2008: \$5,175,000,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2009: \$5,278,000,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2010: \$5,356,000,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2011: \$5,435,000,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2012: \$5,432,000,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2013: \$5,402,000,000,000.

These changes in the budget resolution also affect the allocation to the House Committee on Appropriations. The 302(a) allocation to the House Committee on Appropriations becomes \$844,986,000,000 in new budget authority and \$846,706,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 2003. For fiscal year 2004, the allocation to the Appropriations Committee is \$784,675,000,000 in new budget authority and \$861,084,000,000 in outlays.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. NORTON addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

## THE REAL AMERICAN AGENDA IN THE MIDDLE EAST

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. KAPTUR. Madam Speaker, this evening I would like to include in the RECORD an excellent editorial from the Toronto Star written by the editorial page's editor emeritus, Haroon Siddiqui. The focus of this article is looking at the United States and our role in the Middle East and Central Asia. Though I cannot read the entire editorial tonight, I thought it had some excellent observations that are important for the American people to hear. It is often helpful to have a country from the outside looking at us,

rather than us looking out at the world.

Mr. Siddiqui writes that a superpower like the United States would find it somewhat easy to defeat an incidental power like Iraq, but to do so not only for its publicly stated reasons, fighting terrorism, liberating Iraq and triggering a domino effect of democratization of the Middle East.

But, he observes, the real American agenda is now only becoming clearer. The conquest of Iraq, he says, is enabling a new Pax Americana, the exertion of American power. That goes well beyond control of oil, though that surely remains a central enterprise.

He points out that America is pulling out of traditional bases of allies like Saudi Arabia and Turkey, and probably doing so because of the rising conservative backlash in those countries to our very presence. He mentions that U.S. relations with Egypt have been placed upon the back burner; Egypt, of course, being the most populace Islamic and Arab country.

It is no accident that the three nations, Saudi Arabia, Turkey and Egypt, are the region's most populous, but that America's newest partners are some of the most thinly populated, Qatar, Bahrain, Oman and the United Arab Emirates, all as well tightly controlled monarchies.

People are a problem for America, he observes in the Arab and Muslim world. They are bristling with anti-Americanism, principally over the Israeli-Palestinian dispute, which remains unresolved.

He points out that the pullout just announced by the Bush administration of 10,000 U.S. troops from a Saudi air base was long overdue, but it so embarrassed the ruling House of Saud, which had to place it very far away from public view at a remote base in the desert.

I would point out in a way I was very disappointed that the Bush administration announced this current withdrawal so quickly, because Osama bin Laden has been given a victory. Osama bin Laden on 9-11 said to us that he wanted the infidels out of Saudi Arabia, and, among others, he was referring to U.S. troops based on Saudi soil. Why did we have to give him that victory? I think that helps to ripen terrorism globally.

The article goes on to say that the kingdom with the world's largest oil reserves, Saudi Arabia, and the highest output, will lose clout as America now controls the second largest reserves in the world in Iraq. And he states that America now has a vise grip on the region with 14 new post-9-11 bases, from eastern Europe, through Iraq, the Persian Gulf, Pakistan and Afghanistan, to the two Central Asian republics of Uzbekistan and Kyrgyzstan.

□ 2000

The singular feature of all those new allies, he says, is that they are weak states. Most are undemocratic, if not repressive. So America is replicating

its failed model of using unrepresentative regimes to suppress people, but doing it on new turf. He says this short-term gain, therefore, of victory in Iraq may come at the expense of long-term pain and rising terrorism, as he sees America determined to install its own puppet regime in Baghdad with the majority Shiites being shunted aside.

He then comments on the Bush administration quietly cozying up to a most notorious terrorist group, the leftist Mujahideen-e-Khalq in Iraq, and he questions why would the Bush administration even want to do that, a terrorist group that killed Americans when we were having difficulties in Iran.

Taken together, he says, these American moves bear an uncanny resemblance to the British colonial enterprise of nearly a century ago which is still being paid by the people there. As America confronts this new world in the Middle East and Central Asia, it is worth reading Mr. Siddiqui's very perceptive comments.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida). Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MALONEY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mrs. MALONEY addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

## HONORING THE SONGWRITING TEAM OF HOLLAND-DOZIER-HOLLAND

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

Mr. CONYERS. Madam Speaker, today I take the well to celebrate one of the great music writing teams in contemporary writing history, and that is the fabulous legendary song writing team of Brian Holland, Lamont Dozier and Edward Holland, who wrote frequently with the Berry Gordy Motown group creating the enduring Motown sound that is still being heard in this country and all over the world.

I am happy to point out that these three great songwriters, all from Detroit, Michigan, will be honored by the Broadcast Music Incorporated, BMI, on May 13 with the ICON Award which is reserved for songwriters who have been unique and had indelible influences on generations of music makers. They will receive this award at the 51st Annual BMI Awards Dinner in Beverly Hills, California, and its president and CEO, Ms. Frances Preston, will present the award.

I am happy to tell you that I have had the honor of watching this great musical system of Berry Gordy and his family and these writers develop over the years. How interesting to now turn back only a little while ago to find that the Hollands had to go to church

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 Diddley, 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