

Cleveland, graduated from St. Ignatius High School, then worked his way through John Carroll University, where he graduated in 1943. Shortly thereafter, Judge Corrigan enlisted in the Army, where he participated in five European campaigns as a surgical technician during World War II.

After the war, he earned a law degree from the Western Reserve University School of Law, and began a private law practice. Judge Corrigan served on the Cleveland Municipal Court from 1953 until 1956. He was elected to the Cuyahoga County Court of Common Pleas in 1956, where he served until 1973. In 1991, Judge Corrigan retired after serving three terms on the 8th Ohio District Court of Appeals. His unequalled work ethic, keen legal mind, and uncompromising professional integrity continuously garnered the respect and admiration of all members of the court. While Chairman of the Civil Rules Committee, Judge Corrigan was a leader in the successful effort to streamline and unify the court process regarding civil cases. His dedication on behalf of the public good was present throughout his work, and served to uplift our entire judicial system.

Mr. Speaker and Colleagues, please join me in honor and remembrance of Judge John V. Corrigan. Courage, vision and integrity defined his life, and he will be greatly missed by those who knew and loved him well. I extend my deepest condolences to his beloved wife, Eileen; to his children, Clare, Kate, Mary Ann, Eileen, Tom, Dan and Jack; and to his beloved grandchildren, extended family and many friends. Judge Corrigan's life was one of joy, energy and unwavering service to others. His faith in our system of justice will continue to serve as a guiding force and brilliant example of truth, fairness and equity for all.

#### THE FAMILY EDUCATION FREEDOM ACT

#### HON. RON PAUL

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, January 26, 2005*

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to introduce the Family Education Freedom Act, a bill to empower millions of working and middle-class Americans to choose a non-public education for their children, as well as making it easier for parents to actively participate in improving public schools. The Family Education Freedom Act accomplishes its goals by allowing American parents a tax credit of up to \$3,000 for the expenses incurred in sending their child to private, public, parochial, other religious school, or for home schooling their children.

The Family Education Freedom Act returns the fundamental principle of a truly free economy to America's education system: what the great economist Ludwig von Mises called "consumer sovereignty." Consumer sovereignty simply means consumers decide who succeeds or fails in the market. Businesses that best satisfy consumer demand will be the most successful. Consumer sovereignty is the means by which the free market maximizes human happiness.

Currently, consumers are less than sovereign in the education "market." Funding decisions are increasingly controlled by the fed-

eral government. Because "he who pays the piper calls the tune," public, and even private schools, are paying greater attention to the dictates of federal "educrats" while ignoring the wishes of the parents to an ever greater degree. As such, the lack of consumer sovereignty in education is destroying parental control of education and replacing it with state control. Loss of control is a key reason why so many of America's parents express dissatisfaction with the educational system.

According to a June 2001 poll by McLaughlin and Associates, two-thirds of Americans believe education tax credits would have a positive effect on American education. This poll also found strong support for education tax credits among liberals, moderates, conservatives, low-income individuals, and African-Americans. This is just one of numerous studies and public opinion polls showing that Americans want Congress to get the federal bureaucracy out of the schoolroom and give parents more control over their children's education.

Today, Congress can fulfill the wishes of the American people for greater control over their children's education by simply allowing parents to keep more of their hard-earned money to spend on education rather than force them to send it to Washington to support education programs reflective only of the values and priorities of Congress and the federal bureaucracy.

The \$3,000 tax credit will make a better education affordable for millions of parents.

Mr. Speaker, many parents who would choose to send their children to private, religious, or parochial schools are unable to afford the tuition, in large part because of the enormous tax burden imposed on the American family by Washington.

The Family Education Freedom Act also benefits parents who choose to send their children to public schools. Parents of children in public schools may use this credit to help improve their local schools by helping finance the purchase of educational tools such as computers or to ensure their local schools can offer enriching extracurricular activities such as music programs. Parents of public school students may also wish to use the credit to pay for special services, such as tutoring, for their children.

Increasing parental control of education is superior to funneling more federal tax dollars, followed by greater federal control, into the schools. According to a Manhattan Institute study of the effects of state policies promoting parental control over education, a minimal increase in parental control boosts students' average SAT verbal score by 21 points and students' SAT math score by 22 points! The Manhattan Institute study also found that increasing parental control of education is the best way to improve student performance on the National Assessment of Education Progress (NAEP) tests.

Clearly, enactment of the Family Education Freedom Act is the best thing this Congress could do to improve public education. Furthermore, a greater reliance on parental expenditures rather than government tax dollars will help make the public schools into true community schools that reflect the wishes of parents and the interests of the students.

The Family Education Freedom Act will also aid those parents who choose to educate their children at home. Home schooling has be-

come an increasingly popular, and successful, method of educating children. Home schooled children out-perform their public school peers by 30 to 37 percentile points across all subjects on nationally standardized achievement exams. Home schooling parents spend thousands of dollars annually, in addition to the wages forgone by the spouse who forgoes outside employment, in order to educate their children in the loving environment of the home.

Ultimately, Mr. Speaker, this bill is about freedom. Parental control of child rearing, especially education, is one of the bulwarks of liberty. No nation can remain free when the state has greater influence over the knowledge and values transmitted to children than the family.

By moving to restore the primacy of parents to education, the Family Education Freedom Act will not only improve America's education, it will restore a parent's right to choose how best to educate one's own child, a fundamental freedom that has been eroded by the increase in federal education expenditures and the corresponding decrease in the ability of parents to provide for their children's education out of their own pockets. I call on all my colleagues to join me in allowing parents to devote more of their resources to their children's education and less to feed the wasteful Washington bureaucracy by supporting the Family Education Freedom Act.

#### INTRODUCTION OF ROCKY FLATS SPECIAL EXPOSURE COHORT ACT

#### HON. MARK UDALL

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, January 26, 2005*

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, today I am again introducing a bill to make it more likely that red tape and missing documents will not frustrate Congress's attempt to provide compensation and care for some nuclear-weapons workers made sick by on-job exposure to radiation.

The bill is similar to one I introduced in the 108th Congress. Like that bill, this one is cosponsored by my colleague from Colorado, Mr. BEAUPREZ. I greatly appreciate his support.

The bill would revise the part of the Energy Employees Occupational Injury Compensation Act ("the Act") that specifies which covered workers are part of what the law designates as the "Special Exposure Cohort."

The revision would extend this "special exposure cohort" status to Department of Energy employees, Department of Energy contractor employees, or atomic weapons employees—all terms defined by the current law—who have worked at the Rocky Flats site, in Colorado, for at least 250 days or will have worked there that long by January 1, 2006.

The result would be to help provide the Act's benefits to any of those workers who contracted a radiation-linked cancer specified in the Act after beginning employment at Rocky Flats.

As the law now stands, before a Rocky Flats worker suffering from a covered cancer can receive benefits, it must be established that the cancer is as likely as not to have resulted from on-the-job exposure to radiation.

That sounds like a reasonable requirement—and it would be appropriate for Rocky