veterans of this country are becoming aware of what is being done to them, and I urge this Congress to take action to reverse these policies.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.J. RES. 13, MAKING FURTHER CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE FISCAL YEAR 2003

Mr. LINDER, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 108–3) on the resolution (H. Res. 29) providing for consideration of the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 13) making further continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 2003, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

REMEMBERING WILLIE JAMES ''BUDDY'' CHISHOLM

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. BIGGERT). Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATSON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. WATSON of California. Madam Speaker, I rise today in sadness to share the passing of a good friend and a model parent, Mr. Willie James Chisholm. He was better known to me and his other friends and family as ''Buddy.''

His passing will be strongly felt by all of us because he was such a dedicated and caring person. One of the many things I admired about him was his joy in being a father. He made it a priority in his life to spend quality time with his two children, William and Cheryl.

The time spent with children is priceless and something that is hard to do for most parents, given how busy our lives have become. But Buddy knew how important it was and made sure to be a strong role model for his children, grandchildren, and other young people he knew in his community.

Indeed, Buddy exhibited traits that are fast becoming relics of the past: a dedicated and fulfilling faith, commitment to his 27-year career at McDonnell Douglas as a brick mason, and a love for the outdoors, sports, and traveling.

The world is a better place with people like Buddy Chisholm in it. His presence will certainly be missed. His memory will live on spiritually in the lives of those he touched, as well as physically in the many brick-laying projects he was involved with that beautified the Los Angeles area.

I send my heartfelt condolences to the Chisholm family. My thoughts and prayers are with them.

ECONOMY

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

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Madam Speaker, the President has the wrong plan on the economy. We need to focus on job creation and not on elimination of the tax on dividends. The President's plan only helps the wealthy and not middle-class and low-income Americans.

Fifty-five percent of Americans believe that President Bush is not paying enough attention to the economy. The economy has lost 1.7 million jobs over the last two years and there are now 8.6 million Americans out of work. The plan unveiled by the President is simply more huge tax breaks for the few that will not stimulate growth and create jobs.

As millions of people are out of work and the economy continues in a weak and jobless recovery, we must have a strong and immediate economic program that gives workers and families money immediately.

The centerpiece of the President's plan—the complete elimination of all taxes on stock dividends—will primarily benefit the wealthy rather than putting money into the hands of working class families.

The Congressional Budget Office concluded last year that ''tax cuts that are targeted toward lower-income households are likely to generate more stimulus dollar for dollar of revenue loss—that is, be more cost-effective and have more bang for the buck—than those concentrated among higher-income households.''

Ending the dividends tax will not provide the economy with a short-term stimulus. The Bush plan calls for a 10-year, $600 billion tax cut package. The President's plan simply favors the wealthy. The Democrats have offered a $136 billion plan for families and businesses and tax cuts that would take effect this year.

Projections indicate that the President's plan would boost budget deficits even higher. A study by the Urban Institute and the Brookings Institution show that a typical taxpayer with taxable annual income of $30,000 to $40,000 would receive a tax cut of $42 in 2003. For a family, this does not amount to much. However, those with taxable incomes of more than $1 million would receive on average $27,097.

The Democratic plan provides $55 billion in tax relief for working families, including a one-time rebate of $300 for individuals and $600 for married couples. It also includes $32 billion in business tax cuts; small businesses could write off up to $50,000 in investments; and cash-strapped state governments would be provided with $31 billion which could be used for homeland security, roads and bridges, Medicaid and aid to the unemployed.

Unemployment is at its highest levels in a decade. Nearly 6 percent of Americans are unemployed and daily we hear about corporations laying off tens of thousands of employees. Our trade deficit stands at 14 percent.

The President's economic stimulus package and a war against Iraq would push the federal budget deficit into record levels—as high as $350 billion.

Tax cuts cost and we are already operating under deficits—and the President has not clearly outlined who will pay for these tax cuts to the wealthy.

IRAQ

I am pleased that the United States, in seeking United Nations support for a new Security Council Resolution regarding Iraq, chose the path of multilateralism in dealing with Iraq and the potential threat of any weapons of mass destruction that it may possess.

Through strong diplomacy, we have placed weapons inspectors back on the ground, armed with greater investigative power and new technology that enables them to be more effective at their difficult task.

To date, it appears that Iraqi officials are granting access to all sites visited including presidential palaces and other sensitive locations. Now that we have re-established a system that contains all of the components that we deemed necessary in the latest resolution, it is important that we give this program a change to succeed.

The policy of the government appears confused at this point—still determined to effect regime change even as we profess to be choosing the path of peace. This is troubling because the Congress still retains the obligation to declare war should it become necessary, and the UN Security Council has been vested with the authority to evaluate the level of Iraqi cooperation prior to authorizing the use of force.

All preparations seem to be for war, and not for peace. The military buildup in the region does not appear to be countered by an equally aggressive diplomatic agenda to solve the crisis.

When our military openly speaks of planning for a war to begin in mid to late February, our foreign policy appears to be directed solely by the weather conditions in Iraq instead of serious consideration of what war will do to the region as well as to the economic and military security of our own country.

This is tantamount to holding a finger up to the wind to decide which route to take. The lives of our brave members of the armed forces are far too precious to risk based on planning that makes the weather the primary consideration on whether or not to wage war.

And now in recent weeks there has been an increasingly tense war of words between the North Korean Defense Ministry and U.S. government officials.

By all accounts, North Korea poses a more immediate threat to its neighbors and the United States than does Iraq. North Korea undisputedly has a deadly nuclear arsenal and has unabashedly pledged to reactive its nuclear weapons program.

When confronted recently with the possibility of sanctions to force its compliance with its previous non-proliferation agreement, North Korea responded by stating that sanctions are war, and that in war it would be merciless.

Today's threats are not the same as they were only months ago. Today's new threats pose new challenges to our Nation—challenges that our Congress is duty-bound to meet.

Congress is obligated to examine the new challenges that face our country and the world and to make crucial decisions based upon all of the information available. Making a truly informed decision with respect to the threats we may face today demands that we reconsider the decision we made months ago when our world was a different place.

On January 7, 2003 I introduced legislation that would repeal the Use of Force Against Iraq Resolution that was signed into law last October. Public Law 107–243 was enacted into law on October 16, 2002 prior to the deployment of United Nations weapons inspectors in Iraq, and at a time when the current nuclear crisis in North Korea had not reached its present level of dangerous tension.