

Ann Harrison Hill, an esteemed educator and public servant who is retiring after 40 years of top level service. I am honored to pay tribute to this outstanding community leader, and hope that my colleagues will join me in recognizing her achievements.

As many of my colleagues know, resources are essential tools for properly educating students. Dr. Hill understands this necessity, and throughout her career has served to increase the amount of materials available to teachers nationwide. As project director of the SCORE online program, Dr. Hill has overseen the creation of a database of educational resources that serves a wide range of teachers across the country. For 5 years Dr. Hill codirected Footsteps to Freedom, a project which aids educators in developing materials that inculcate study of the Underground Railroad into classroom curriculum. She has served as the curriculum coordinator for the San Bernardino County Superintendent of Schools, developing and implementing training programs that expand the leadership and instruction capacity of San Bernardino educators.

The "We the People Program" has been a tremendous success in my district under the leadership of Dr. Hill. Under the program, Dr. Hill has coordinated civic education training programs, and has expanded student knowledge of the political process by facilitating mock congressional hearings on constitutional issues. Dr. Hill has contributed her writing to several prominent publications, and has developed and written grant proposals that have helped to secure funding for important educational programs. She has served on countless educational advisory and planning boards and has remained a sought-after presenter at educational conferences in California and throughout the Nation.

Dr. Hill's commitment to social studies education has not gone unnoticed. Throughout her years in teaching, she has been the recipient of several awards. In 2001, Dr. Hill was chosen to receive the Hilda Taba Award for Outstanding History-Social Science Leadership in California, the highest honor presented by the California Council for the Social Studies. Dr. Hill has also been presented with awards from her own community, being named Outstanding Educator in Social Studies by the Inland Empire Council, and receiving the Service Award from the Inland Empire Consortium for International Studies.

Madam Speaker, Dr. Hill's retirement will undoubtedly leave San Bernardino County with a difficult void to fill. Her exemplary commitment to her students and peers is seldom seen, and I take great pleasure in knowing that many of the children residing in my district have been fortunate enough to learn from Dr. Hill. It is with honor that I congratulate Dr. Hill on her achievements, and wish her well in her future endeavors.

MEDICARE PRESCRIPTION DRUG PRICE NEGOTIATION ACT OF 2007

SPEECH OF

**HON. JOHN D. DINGELL**

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Friday, January 12, 2007*

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I submit the following for the RECORD for H.R. 4.

AMERICAN DIABETES ASSOCIATION,  
*Alexandria, VA, Jan 12, 2007.*

HON. SHELLEY MOORE CAPITO,  
*House of Representatives,*  
*Washington, DC.*

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE CAPITO: On behalf of the 20.8 million adults and children living with diabetes in the United States, we write to let you know that the American Diabetes Association remains neutral on the issue of requiring the Department of Health and Human Services to negotiate for lower drug prices.

We understand that leading up to the debate on the Medicare Prescription Drug Price Negotiation Act of 2007 (H.R. 4) your office received a letter from one of the Association's local offices asking that you vote against H.R. 4. While we respect your right to have read the letter you received on the floor of the U.S. House of Representatives on January 12, 2007, we must retract the opposition offered in that letter. The structure of our Association is one in which all policy positions come out of the National Office and the letter you received was crafted in error. With regard to H.R. 4, the Association took no formal position.

Please know that the availability and cost of medications is of great importance to the Association. However, we have historically not been involved to the level of supporting or opposing specific strategies through which to lower prices or make medications available. When Part D was proposed and debated, for example, we remained neutral on the actual market-based construct of the program.

Thank you for your understanding of this situation. And, again please accept our apologies for the confusion. If you have any questions or would like to further discuss our position, please have your staff contact Andrea LaVeccia, Associate Manager of Government Affairs and Advocacy at (703) 253-2323.

Sincerely,

JAMES SCHLICHT,  
*Executive Vice President,*  
*Government Affairs & Advocacy.*

FAIR MINIMUM WAGE ACT OF 2007

SPEECH OF

**HON. BETTY SUTTON**

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, January 10, 2007*

Ms. SUTTON. Mr. Speaker, one of the greatest measures of our success as elected representatives will be the impact our actions have on the silent majority of working class poor in America.

This Congress, to its shame, has ignored these Americans for over a decade now in favor of an embarrassing collection of legislative excess that favored the connected few.

Today, we put an end to it.

During the course of the campaign that ended just a few months ago, I met a woman whose story I have carried with me all the way to Congress.

She was working at the snack bar at the local bowling alley and she was working her heart out.

As she shared her story with me, it became terribly apparent that despite valiant efforts, she was struggling mightily to make ends meet for her family.

This fine woman you see was a single mother who had a teenage daughter at home, a daughter she worried about because she

just had too little time to spend with her because she worked so much.

And this fine woman also had a son who had recently graduated from high school, a son who intended to join the military to serve his country and hopefully find a way to a higher education and a brighter future.

The problem was her son had a medical condition which precluded him from military service. And by the way, as hard as she worked, this fine woman did not have any health insurance.

As this proud woman and mother told me of her struggles to build a future for her family, her exhaustion grew and her strength diminished as she tried to think of a phone number where she could be reached.

You see, this fine woman not only worked at the local bowling alley, she also worked two other jobs where she earned minimum wage.

As she talked, her dilemma was apparent—she worried that her jobs were robbing her of the time her kids needed to spend with her but she knew that she needed to work all three minimum wage jobs just to provide for them.

This is not a choice that any woman or man should have to make and our Congress over the last decade should be ashamed for not helping this fine woman and tens of millions more hard working Americans.

As you can see from this very real and personal story, raising the minimum wage is not about politics, it's about traditional American values, it's about fairness and opportunity, it's about changing the way we treat our working men and women.

It's about paying rent, putting food on the table and paying for our children to go to college.

That is why today's vote to increase the minimum wage is so important, not just for our Nation's working families, not just for that proud woman and mother working at the bowling alley, but for her children, for our future.

Today with Americans supporting us, we start fighting for those who have been for far too long neglected.

IN MEMORY OF KATHERYN REEVES JEAN

**HON. MIKE ROSS**

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, January 17, 2007*

Mr. ROSS. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor the memory of Katheryn Reeves Jean, who passed away January 14, 2007, in Magnolia, Arkansas.

Katheryn Reeves Jean was a pillar of the community of Magnolia and of greater Columbia County for decades. Mrs. Jean was a homemaker and president of Reeves Land and Timber Company. She also served the community in numerous ways, including Chairman of the Columbia County Election Commission, Justice of the Peace for Columbia County and Director of Farmer's Real Estate.

Mrs. Jean was a member of the Jackson Street Church of Christ, Quota Club International and the local and state Republican Party. Mrs. Jean was a former Girl Scout troop leader and a den mother for the Boy Scouts of America. Her dedication to making Magnolia and South Arkansas a better place to live could not have been greater.

My deepest condolences go to her two sons, Hal Jean and Mayor Lane Jean of Magnolia; her sister, Ann Reeves Eddy; and to her 4 grandchildren. Kathryn Reeves Jean will be greatly missed in Magnolia and throughout the state of Arkansas.

INTRODUCTION OF THE TAX CODE  
TERMINATION ACT

**HON. BOB GOODLATTE**

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 17, 2007

Mr. GOODLATTE. Madam Speaker, I rise today to re-introduce the "Tax Code Termination Act".

This bi-partisan legislation, which I introduced with my colleague COLLIN PETERSON of Minnesota, and 65 bi-partisan cosponsors, will accomplish two goals. It will abolish the Internal Revenue Code by December 31, 2010, and call on Congress to approve a new Federal tax system by July of the same year.

The fact is our current tax system has spiraled out of control. At a time when Americans devote a total of 7 billion hours each year to comply with the tax code, we need tax simplification. Today's tax code is unfair, discourages savings and investment, and is impossibly complex. The problem is Congress won't act on fundamental tax reform unless it is forced to do so. The Tax Code Termination Act will force Congress to finally debate and address fundamental tax reform.

Once the Tax Code Termination Act becomes law, today's oppressive tax code would survive for only 4 more years, at which time it would expire and be replaced with a new tax code that will be determined by Congress, the President, and the American people. The Tax Code Termination Act will allow us, as a nation, to collectively decide what the new tax system should look like. Having a date-certain to end the current tax code will force the issue to the top of the national agenda, where it will remain until Congress and the President finish writing the new tax law.

The tax code is hopelessly broken and abolishing it is the necessary first step to debating, designing, and adopting a new tax system. Although many questions remain about the best way to reform our tax system, I am certain that if Congress is forced to address the issue we can create a tax code that is simpler, fairer, and better for our economy than the one we are forced to comply with today.

Whichever tax system is adopted, the key ingredients should be: a low rate for all Americans; tax relief for working people; protection of the rights of taxpayers and reduction in tax collection abuses; promotion of savings and investment; and encouragement of economic growth and job creation. Taxes may be unavoidable but they don't have to be unfair and overcomplicated.

Just like other programs that require reauthorization, the tax code must be reviewed to examine whether it is fulfilling its intended purpose and then Congress must make what changes are necessary.

America's future depends on overcoming the handicap of the current tax code. There is a widespread consensus that the current system is broken, and keeping it is not in America's best interest. I urge each of my colleagues to support this important legislation.

MR. BUSH, MEET WALTER JONES

**HON. RON PAUL**

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 17, 2007

Mr. PAUL. Madam Speaker, I would like to place the following article written by eminent conservative commentator Patrick Buchanan into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. In this fine op-ed, Mr. Buchanan makes reference to the recent efforts by my colleague and good friend, Rep. WALTER JONES, JR, to derail the march to war with Iran. I am very pleased to have been an original co-sponsor of the legislation referenced by Mr. Buchanan, H.J. Res. 14, which puts forth the very simple idea that if we are going to have a war with Iran we must follow the Constitution. The resolution clarifies the fact that the President shall consult with Congress, and receive specific authorization pursuant to law from Congress, prior to initiating any use of military force against Iran. I hope my colleagues will read this article closely and consider what Mr. Buchanan has written—and what Rep. JONES is trying to do.

JANUARY 16, 2007.

MR. BUSH, MEET WALTER JONES

(By Patrick J. Buchanan)

America is four years into a bloody debacle in Iraq not merely because Bush and Cheney marched us in, or simply because neocon propagandists lied about Saddam's nuclear program and WMD, and Iraqi ties to al-Qaeda, anthrax attacks, and 9/11.

We are there because a Democratic Senate voted to give Bush a blank check for war. Democrats in October 2002 wanted the war vote behind them so they could go home and campaign as pro-war patriots.

And because they did, 3,000 Americans are dead, 25,000 are wounded, perhaps 100,000 Iraqis have lost their lives, 1.6 million have fled, \$400 billion has been lost, and America stands on the precipice of the worst strategic defeat in her history.

Yet, Sens. Clinton, Biden, Kerry, and Edwards—all of whom voted to give Bush his blank check—are now competing to succeed him. And how do they justify what they did?

"If only we had known then what we know now," they plead, "we would never have voted for the war." They are thus confessing to dereliction in the highest duty the Founding Fathers gave Congress. They voted to cede to a president their power to take us to war.

Now they wash their hands of it all and say, "It's Bush's war!"

And now George Bush has another war in mind.

In his Jan. 11 address, Bush said that to defend the "territorial integrity" of Iraq, the United States must address "Iran and Syria."

"These two regimes are allowing terrorists and insurgents to use their territory to move in and out of Iraq. Iran is providing material support for attacks on American troops. We will disrupt the attacks on our forces. We will interrupt the flow of support from Iran and Syria. And we will seek out and destroy the networks providing advanced weaponry and training to our enemies in Iraq."

The city sat bolt upright. If Bush was talking about Iranian agents inside Iraq, he has no need of a second aircraft carrier in the Gulf, nor for those Patriot missiles he is sending to our allies.

But does Bush have the authority to take us to war against Iran?

On ABC last Sunday, National Security Adviser Stephen Hadley, while denying Bush intends to attack Iran, nonetheless did not deny Bush had the authority to escalate the war—right into Iran.

George Stephanopoulos: "So you don't believe you have the authority to go into Iran?"

Stephen Hadley: "I didn't say that. That is another issue. Any time you have questions about crossing international borders, there are legal questions."

Any doubt how Attorney General Gonzales would come down on those "legal questions"? Any doubt how the Supreme Court would rule?

Biden sputters that should Bush attack Iran, a constitutional crisis would ensue.

I don't believe it. If tomorrow Bush took out Iran's nuclear facilities, would a Senate that lacks the courage to cut funds for an unpopular war really impeach him for denying a nuclear capability to Mahmoud Ahmadinejad? Bush's lawyers would make the same case Nixon made for the 1970 "incursion" into Cambodia—and even a Nixon-hating Democratic House did not dare to impeach him for that.

Bush's contempt for Congress is manifest and, frankly, justified.

Asked if Congress could stop him from surging 21,500 troops into Iraq, Bush on 60 Minutes brushed aside Congress as irrelevant.

"I fully understand [the Congress] could try to stop me from doing it. But I've made my decision. And we're going forward." Asked if he had sole authority "to put the troops in there no matter what the Congress wants to do," Bush replied, "In this situation I do, yeah."

Is Congress then impotent, if it does not want war on Iran?

Enter Rep. Walter Jones, Republican of North Carolina.

The day after Bush's threat to Iran, Jones introduced a Joint Resolution, "Concerning the Use of Military Force by the United States Against Iran." Under HJR 14, "Absent a national emergency created by attack by Iran, or a demonstrably imminent attack by Iran, upon the United States, its territories, possessions, or its armed forces, the President shall consult with Congress, and receive specific authorization pursuant to law from Congress, prior to initiating any use of force on Iran."

Jones' resolution further declares, "No provision of law enacted before the date of the enactment of this joint resolution shall be construed to authorize the use of military force by the United States against Iran."

If we are going to war on Iran, Jones is saying, we must follow the Constitution and Congress must authorize it.

If Biden, Kerry, Clinton, and Obama refuse to sign on to the Jones resolution, they will be silently conceding that Bush indeed does have the power to start a war on Iran. And America should pay no further attention to the Democrats' wailing about being misled on the Iraq war.

A TRIBUTE TO REPRESENTATIVE  
LOUISE WILLIAMS BISHOP

**HON. ROBERT A. BRADY**

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 17, 2007

Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania. Madam Speaker, I rise to honor one of my city's great leaders, Representative Louise Williams Bishop. Representative Bishop, who I am