



**The Washington Flyer
June 26, 2009**

School Choice Proves Fiscally Efficient

The Flint Hills Center for Public Policy released a study, "[Moving Kansas Schools from Monopoly to Free Choice](#)," in which author Paul Souter fully analyzes the school choice option and its successful results. In this study, he praises school choice and its ability to provide quality education to all children while saving the state thousands of dollars. Due to a state law that requires school districts to authorize a charter school, it is very difficult to gain any momentum or support for school choice in Kansas. Despite the outcry from teacher unions that school choice and voucher programs would "kill public education," his study proves that quality and savings can be attributed to school choice.

The Friedman Foundation for Educational Choice also released a study, "[School Choice by the Numbers: The Fiscal Effect of School Choice, 1990-2006](#)." In the study, the researchers found that "in nearly every school choice program, the dollar value of the voucher or scholarship is less than or equal to the state's formula spending per student." They went on to find that practically speaking "this means states are spending the same amount or less on students in school choice programs than they would have spent on the same students if they had attended public schools, producing a fiscal savings."

The Friedman Foundation research also found that school choice also [effectively benefited the local level](#) as well. The study reported, "When a student uses school choice, the local public school district no longer needs to pay the instructional costs associated with that student, but it does not lose all of its per-student revenue, because some revenue does not vary with enrollment levels." In conclusion the study found, "school choice produces a positive fiscal impact for school districts as well as for state budgets."

As more studies show the benefits school choice has not only on the quality of education and the satisfaction among parents but also on the efficiency and value of state and local funds, it is extremely important that states implement these programs and allow choice to be option when it comes to children's education and their future.

President's Council on Bioethics Disbanded

This week, the President disbanded the current council on bioethics which was originally set up by the Bush administration. According to the [New York Times](#), members of the council were informed last week that their services were "no longer needed" and according to White House officials it was disbanded due to its original intent set up by the previous administration to be "a philosophically leaning advisory group" that favored discussion over developing a shared consensus."

The decision to disband comes in the wake of a statement released by 10 of the 18 members on the council, criticizing the President's order to overturn restrictions on funding for embryo-destroying stem cell research. The *New York Times* further reported that a White House official did say a "new bioethics commission appointed by Obama will have a new mandate to offer 'practical policy options.'"

David Prentice, senior fellow for life sciences at the Family Research Council and one of many [conservatives who are concerned](#) about the "new" council, stated, "I'm afraid what we're going to see from President Obama is a much-stacked ideological bioethics council." A new council under the current administration would likely support research and experiments in human cloning, animal-human hybrids, and the continual destruction of embryonic stem-cell research.

While this new council will be designed to create “practical policy options,” many are worried that the administration is simply replacing one ideology with another.

The End of Free Speech

Speaking at the Heritage Foundation this week, Brad O’Leary discussed his new book, *Shut Up, America! The end of Free Speech*. During his presentation, O’Leary discussed how the current Administration and Congress along with the main stream media are using different means to implement strict government regulations that will in turn impede on Americans and their right of free speech. O’Leary expressed deep concern for the future of talk radio and the internet and the danger that government control and takeover of the once “free press” will have on the liberties and freedoms enjoyed by all Americans.

While Washington politicians have strayed away from titles such as the “fairness doctrine” when speaking about local radio, they have started using language such as “localism” and creating “diversity” meaning that talk radio should focus on local rather than national issues, and there should be a “diversity” in the ownership of these talk radio programs, which O’Leary went on to say are predominantly owned by white males.

O’Leary also touched on the issue of the “fairness doctrine” being issued on the internet. In practical terms it would mean that any site that expressed a certain political viewpoint would be required to post in a “highway” or column on the website links to “alternative” views on the issue. For instance, the National Right to Life website would be required under the fairness doctrine to display the names or links to other organizations who take the opposite view, i.e. Planned Parenthood, National Organization of Women, etc. As Speaker of the House has referred to organizations who hold particular views against issues such as abortion and homosexuality as promoting “hate speech” and Democrat Senator Chuck Schumer has declared talk radio to be equivalent to pornography, it is clear to see their full support on such legislation. However, O’Leary was fervent in his explanation that the legislation would not be defined in terms like “fairness” but rather new language which would not be as easily recognized. He urged groups to be concerned about words such as “localism” and “diversity.”

In closing, O’Leary expressed his deep concern for the growing momentum to strip Americans of free speech and the free press. He saw the current events of the major network ABC and their “infomercial” on the President’s health care reform as a “total sellout.” He also expressed fears of a government bailout for newspapers and expressed that the current actions were crucial and initial steps in government takeover of our free press. To watch the Presentation: [“Shut Up, America! The End of Free Speech”](#)

Employment Non-Discrimination Act (ENDA) Reintroduced in the House

Congressman Barney Frank (D-MA) [reintroduced the Employment Non-Discrimination Act \(ENDA\)](#) in the House this week. ENDA would prohibit employers from discriminating when hiring based on whether a person is a homosexual. For years, conservatives have fought against this legislation based on the rights of an employer to hire whom they wish and the concerns of the regulations this legislation would impose on faith-based institutions who believe homosexuality is immoral.

Congressman Frank, an outspoken homosexual himself, also made sure to include language which allows “sexual orientation” and “gender identity” to be covered in the legislation as well. In practical terms, if an employer at Curves, a women’s fitness center, is seeking to hire someone and a young man, who claims to identify himself as a woman, comes in for an interview, and is not hired due to his obvious sex, the employer and company may be subject to a law suit or fine for not complying with the law by discriminating against the individual’s perceived gender identity. The legislation will also prohibit employers from discriminating against an individual’s “sexual orientation,” which includes not just homosexuals but pedophiles and other appalling sexual acts. Not only will this affect secular institutions and business but it will also affect religious organizations. While in the past a religious exemption is usually offered, the concerns still linger on the impediment of regulations and infringement of constitutional liberties and freedoms.

Many conservatives are concerned that some politicians are bowing to special interest groups rather than considering how their proposed policies and legislation would not only hurt Americans and their liberties but in turn create a society that is so far removed from the strong foundations it was once built upon.

In Case You Missed It:

[Generic Plan B Ok for Teens 17 and Under](#)

[House DOD Authorization Includes Language that may Target Pro-Life Servicemen and Women](#)

[Virginia Abortion Restriction is Upheld](#)



Editor: Maureen Wiebe
Staff Writer: Sarah Griffith
Legislative Office, 119 C Street SE, Washington, DC 20003
Phone: 202.547.2991 • Fax: 202.547.2992

