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 federal 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 become 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

Flats if we had adequate documentation of radiation exposures for the years when it was producing nuclear-weapons components as well as for the more recent time when DOE and its contractors have been working to clean it up and prepare it for closure.

However, in fact there were serious shortcomings in the monitoring of Rocky Flats workers' radiation exposures and in the necessary recordkeeping—to say nothing of the slowness of the current administrative process for making the required determinations concerning links between exposure and employment.

This means there is a real risk that a significant number of Rocky Flats workers who should be able to benefit from the Act will not obtain its benefits in a timely manner or will be denied them entirely.

The bill would prevent this miscarriage of justice, by recognizing that Rocky Flats workers have been plagued by the same kinds of administrative problems that entangled workers at some other locations—administrative problems that were addressed through inclusion in the Act of the provisions related to the "Special Exposure Cohort."

My understanding of the need for this bill came from meeting with Rocky Flats workers and their representatives and from consulting experts.

I have particularly benefited from the great experience and expertise of Dr. Robert Bistline. Dr. Bistline has served as Program Manager of the Energy Department's Oversight of Radiation Protection Program at the Rocky Flats field office and has few if any peers in terms of his understanding of the problems addressed by the bill.

In particular, the bill reflects these aspects of Rocky Flats history—

Many worker exposures were unmonitored over the lifetime of the plant. Even within the past month a former worker from the 1950's was monitored under the Former Radiation Worker Program and found to have a significant internal deposition that had been undetected and unrecorded for more than 50 years.

No lung counter for detecting and measuring plutonium and americium in the lungs existed at Rocky Flats until the late 1960's. Without this equipment the very insoluble oxide forms of plutonium cannot be detected and a large number of workers had inhalation exposures that went undetected and unmeasured.

Exposure to neutron radiation was not monitored until the late 1950's and most of those measurements through 1970 have been found to be in error. In some areas of the plant the neutron doses were as much as 2 to 10 times as great as the gamma doses received by workers but only gamma doses were recorded. The old neutron films are being reread but those doses have not yet been added to the workers records or been used in NIOSH's dose reconstructions for Rocky Flats workers.

Radiation exposures for many workers were not measured or were missing, therefore, the records are incomplete or estimated doses were assigned. There are many inaccuracies in the exposure records that NIOSH is using to determine whether Rocky Flats workers qualify for compensation under the Act.

The model that has been used for dose reconstruction by NIOSH in determining whether Rocky Flats workers qualify for compensation under the Act is in error. The default values used for particle size and solubility of the internally deposited plutonium in workers are in error. Use of these erroneous values reduces the actual internal doses for claimants by as much as 3 to 10 times less than the Rocky Flats records and autopsy data indicate.

Some Rocky Flats workers, despite having worked with tons of plutonium and having known exposures leading to serious health effects, have been denied compensation under the Act as a result of potentially flawed calculations based on records that are incomplete or in error as well as the use of incorrect models.

Mr. Speaker, since early in my tenure in Congress I have worked to make good on promises of a fairer deal for the nuclear-weapons workers who helped America win the Cold War. That was why enactment and improvement of the compensation Act has been one of my top priorities. I saw this as a very important matter for our country—and especially for many Coloradans because our state is home to the Rocky Flats site, which for decades was a key part of the nuclear-weapons complex.

Now the site's military mission has ended, and the Rocky Flats workers are pressing to complete the job of cleaning it up and preparing it for closure. But while they are taking care of the site, we in Congress need to take care of them and the others who worked there in the past.

That was the purpose of the compensation act. I am very proud that I was able to help achieve its enactment, but I am also aware that it is not perfect. Last year Congress made important changes that will remedy some of its shortcomings. This bill will make it better yet.

For the benefit of our colleagues, I am attaching an outline of the bill's provisions:

SECTION 1: SHORT TITLE, FINDINGS, AND PURPOSE

Subsection (a) provides a short title, "Rocky Flats Special Cohort Act."

Subsection (b) sets forth several findings regarding the need for the legislation.

Subsection (c) states the bill's purpose: "to revise the Energy Employees Occupational Illness Compensation Act so as to include certain past and present Rocky Flats workers as members of the special exposure cohort."

SECTION 2: DEFINITION OF MEMBER OF SPECIAL EXPOSURE COHORT

Subsection (a) amends section 3621(14) of the Energy Employees Occupational Injury Compensation Act (EEOICPA). The effect of the amendment is to provide that a person employed by the Department of Energy or any of its contractors for an aggregate of at least 250 work days at Rocky Flats before January 1, 2006 would be a "member of the Special Exposure Cohort." Under EEOICPA, a member of the special exposure cohort suffering from one of the cancers specified in the Act is covered by the Act if the cancer was contracted after the person began employment at a covered facility.

Subsection (b) provides that someone employed by the Energy Department or any of its contractors for an aggregate of at least 250 work days at Rocky Flats before January 1, 2006 may apply for compensation or benefits under EEOICPA even if the person had previously been denied compensation or benefits under the Act. This is to make clear that the subsection (a)'s change in the law will apply to people who had applied previously.

HONORING THE SERVICE OF PAUL KEARNS TO THE IDAHO NATIONAL ENGINEERING AND ENVIRONMENTAL LABORATORY

HON. MICHAEL K. SIMPSON

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 26, 2005

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to thank Dr. Paul Kearns of Idaho Falls for his service as Laboratory Director of the Idaho National Engineering and Environmental Laboratory (INEEL).

On February 1, Paul's tenure as Laboratory Director will come to an end and I want to thank Paul and his wife Lynn for their contribution to Idaho. Paul has guided the INEEL through a time of great change and challenge and he has been a true friend and champion of the lab and its employees.

When Paul took over as INEEL Laboratory Director, he reached out to employees, DOE and the Idaho congressional delegation to improve communication and understanding. That effort has helped the INEEL grow and prosper under Paul's leadership.

Under Dr. Kearns' guidance, the research and development programs of the INEEL have experienced significant growth and so has the recognition of the lab's accomplishments. The growth in R&D programs coupled with a sterling safety and performance record give the new Idaho National Laboratory a strong foundation for future growth and success.

Paul has been a respected leader in Idaho serving as a member of Governor Kempthorne's Science and Technology Advisory Council and a board member of the Idaho Nature Conservancy.

Paul and the Bechtel team have been very good for Idaho and the INEEL and while their association with the lab will soon end, we want to thank them for their efforts and support. I want to wish Paul and Lynn all the best as they embark on new challenges and opportunities.

REGARDING THE INTRODUCITON OF SPIRIT CORRIDOR LEGISLATION

HON. TOM UDALL

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 26, 2005

Mr. UDALL of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to rise today to introduce companion legislation to a bill being introduced by Senator BINGAMAN of New Mexico in the Senate. The Senator and I also introduced this legislation during the 108th Congress and I am hopeful that we will make further progress on this issue during this session.

I am also very pleased to be joined once again by my colleagues Mr. JERRY MORAN of Kansas, Mr. FRANK LUCAS of Oklahoma, Mr. MAC THORNBERRY, Mr. SILVESTRE REYES and Mr. RANDY NEUGEBAUER of Texas, and Mr. STEVE PEARCE, one of my colleagues in the New Mexico delegation, in introducing this legislation. Each of these Members were cosponsors last Congress and are demonstrating their commitment to achieving this corridor designation by joining me again.