

Ste. 270
7399 N. Shadeland Ave.
Indianapolis, IN 46250
November 3, 2007

FILED/ACCEPTED

JAN 15 2008

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

MARKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

06-121

Federal Communications Commission
Attn: Kevin J. Martin
445 12th St. NW.
Washington, DC 20554

Dear Republican Chairman Martin:

I want to first apologize for utilizing a fictitious name in getting this package to you, but it was the only legitimate chance of my package reaching you, especially at this late stage of the game. If, I would have used my actual name it is very probable that my package would have been intercepted by President Bush and his administration, as has happened several times in the past. I suspect I am the reason why President Bush (through an illegal signing statement) can now intercept and open the mail of U.S. citizens illegally without a warrant, at President Bush's discretion.

Simultaneously to contacting you I have also contacted :

- 1.) Republican FCC Commissioner Robert M. McDowell
- 2.) Republican FCC Commissioner Deborah Taylor Tate
- 3.) Democratic FCC Commissioner Michael J. Copps
- 4.) Democratic FCC Commissioner Johnathan S. Adelstein

&

- 5.) Mr. Victor F. Ganzi, the President & C.E.O. of the Hearst Corporation, as I am sure you know the Hearst Corporation owns the San Francisco Chronicle.

This communication to you and the other individuals that I have contacted is to address the issue of the following twelve (12) national news media organizations and individuals:

- 1.) The New Yorker Magazine

- 2.) The New York Times
- 3.) The Los Angeles Times
- 4.) The USA Today Newspaper
- 5.) The Fox Television News Channel, The Hannity & Colmes Show
- 6.) MSNBC Television, The Keith Olbermann Show (listed attachment A-1)
- 7.) The McClatchy Newspaper (listed attachment A-2)
- 8.) Joe Madison, a political news radio talk show host (listed attachment A-3)
- 9.) Tavis Smiley, a political news radio and television talk show host (listed attachment A-4)
- 10.) Michael Isacoff, a reporter for Newsweek magazine (listed attachment A-5)
- 11.) Ed Shultz, a political news radio personality (listed attachment A-6)

&

- 12.) The San Francisco Chronicle

Intentionally ignoring that:

MY MOTHER WAS BRUTALLY MURDERED, AND I DON'T BELIEVE HER BODY IS IN THE CASKET SHE WAS SUPPOSEDLY BURIED IN. MY CHURCH LEARNED OF HER BRUTAL MURDER AND AS A RESULT TO TRY AND SCARE ANYONE FROM TALKING, SOMEONE'S HEAD WAS CUT OFF AND THEIR BODY WAS BURNED, THEN THE DECAPITATED BURNT CORPSE WAS DUMPED AT ANOTHER CHURCH IN THE TOWN OF DAYTON, OH. ALL BECAUSE I AM A YOUNG BLACK MALE AND I AM LABORING TO PUT TWO ENHANCEMENT DRINKS ON THE WORLD WIDE MARKET THAT ARE PROJECTED TO MAKE \$10 BILLION DOLLARS WITHIN THE FIRST SIX (6) MONTHS ON THE MARKET!!!

Irrefutable evidence was provided that both established and confirmed that President Bush and his administration were responsible for my mothers brutal and savage murder. Listed below is when the majority of the irrefutable evidence was sent:

- 1.) The New Yorker Magazine (listed attachment A-7)
 - My enlightenment package was forwarded on Thursday September 28th of last year (2006), and **Delivered** on Monday October 2nd of last year (2006) at 2:36 p.m.
- 2.) The New York Times (listed attachment A-8)
 - My enlightenment package was forwarded on Thursday September 28th of last year (2006), and **Delivered** on Monday October 2nd of last year (2006) at 2:53 p.m.
 - The New York Times is owned by The New York Times Company
- 3.) The Los Angeles Times (listed attachment A-9)
 - My enlightenment package was forwarded on Saturday October 7th of last year (2006), and **Delivered** on Tuesday October 10th of last year (2006) at 9:07 a.m.
 - The Los Angeles Times is owned by The Tribune Company who is being bought by Mr. Samuel Zell
- 4.) I faxed a summary of my plight along with supporting documentation to the USA Today News Paper
 - The USA Today is owned by the Gannett Company, Inc.

&

- 5.) The San Francisco Chronicle* (listed attachment A-10)
 - My enlightenment package was forwarded on Saturday September 30 of this year (2007), and **Delivered** on Friday October 5th of this year (2007) at 10:30 a.m.
 - The San Francisco Chronicle is owned by The Hearst Corporation

*- My enlightenment packages contain concrete, irrefutable evidence illuminating my plight in great detail, which is an ever evolving situation, so each submission I forwarded to a national news media organization (over time) contains more information than my previous submission to a national news media organization, addressing occurrences that just recently took place.

In regards to the Fox Television News Channel, on Wednesday June 8th of 2005 on The Hannity & Colmes Show (which I have enclosed a DVD clip of (listed attachment A-11)). It was reported that Mr. Howard Dean, the Democratic Party Chairman, made the following statements during an interview with the San Francisco Chronicle (in regards to my plight involving President Bush and his administration):

“The Republicans are not very friendly to different kinds of people. They are a pretty monolithic

party they all behave the same, they all look the same. And it is pretty much a white Christian party. The Republicans are a white Christian party. You can't succeed if you're a person of color in the Republican Party. Republicans have never made an honest living, I hate Republicans. Republicans are evil, Republicans are brain dead, Republicans are mean, Republicans aren't nice people, Republicans are dark, Republicans are dishonest, Republicans are corrupt."

Newt Gingrich was interviewed by both Mr. Sean Hannity and Mr. Alan Colmes, he attempted to defend the Republican Party and disputed what Mr. Dean had to say. At the time of the interview which ran live, Mr. Gingrich had no idea why Mr. Dean would make the statements he made about the Republican Party. After this interview there was complete silence from Mr. Dean, Mr. Gingrich and the Fox News Channel, internally however my plight circulated very rapidly to all of the political (both Democrats and Republicans) and national press insiders. I don't believe there was ever a single moment that either Mr. Murdoch nor Mr. Roger Ailes, the Chairman & C.E.O. of the Fox News Channel, ever considered fulfilling their responsibility of broadcasting the actual news, in relation to my plight. **Throughout the years they have both established that their only concern and allegiance is to the Republican Party, even if it means ignoring savage and brutal murders that President Bush and his administration have committed on U.S. soil.**

President Bush and his administration have strenuously labored to cover-up their heinous and barbaric acts, all that has resulted from their efforts is an constantly expanding and widening murder conspiracy.

When factual irrefutable evidence is provided that illuminates a murder conspiracy and the crime is completely ignored by the national news media, IT NOW BECOMES A CRIME WHEN THE FCC LICENSES THAT HAVE BEEN AWARDED IN GOOD FAITH ARE MISUSED. The president and C.E.O. of each of the national news media conglomerates I have contacted along with the upper management of each of these national news media organizations (who also were involved in making the decision to ignore the irrefutable proof provided of my plight) are willing participants within my mother's murder conspiracy.

Listed below are the four (4) venues I have utilized to both expose and resolve my plight:

- 1.) The National News Media
- 2.) The Inter-national News Media
- 3.) Publically Elected Officials from both the U.S. House of Representatives & the U.S. Senate
- 4.) Civil Litigation

Once I recognized that the national news media organizations that I had contacted had elected to remain silent about my plight, I had no choice but to direct my attention to the inter-national news media and enlighten them of my plight. **The problem with the national news media, is that it is no more than a simple case of collusion between them and the Republicans, President Bush, his administration, and some Democrats that are only Democrats in title but are truly Republican loyalists.**

The six (6) media conglomerates listed below (which are all President Bush and Republican supporters) that have cornered the national television market, are :

1.) General Electric, which owns:

NBC

NBC Network News : The Today Show, Nightly News, Meet the Press, Dateline NBC, NBC News at Sunrise.

CNBC business television

MSNBC 24-hour cable and Internet news service (co-owned by NBC and Microsoft)

Court TV (co-owned with Time Warner)

Bravo (50%)

A&E (25%)

History Channel (25%)

Other Holdings:

GE Consumer Electronics

GE Power Systems: produces turbines for nuclear reactors and power plants

*GE Plastics: produces military hardware and nuclear power equipment

GE Transportation Systems: runs diesel and electric trains

*- GE being a military contractor has a financial incentive to keep the wars going as long as they can to increase their profits. **GE would also have access to an unlimited amount of explosives, that may be very relevant in regards to the Minneapolis bridge collapse, which is part of my plight.**

2.) Westinghouse, Inc., which owns:

(Mr. Frank Carlucci is head of the Board of Directors. Mr. Carlucci and President Bush's father are both part of the Carlyle Group.)

CBS

CBS Network News : 60 Minutes, 48 hours, CBS Evening News, CBS Morning News

Country Music Television, The Nashville Network

Other Holdings:

Westinghouse Electric Company: provides services to the nuclear power industry

Westinghouse Government Environmental Services Company: dispose of nuclear and hazardous wastes. Also operates 4 government-owned nuclear power plants in the U.S.
Energy Systems: provides nuclear power plant design and maintenance

3.) Disney, which owns:

ABC

ABC Network: Prime Time Live, Nightline, 20/20, Good Morning America, ESPN, Lifetime Television (50%), as well as minority holdings in A&E, History Channel and E!
Disney Channel/Disney Television, Touchtone Television

Media Holdings:

Miramax, Touchtone Pictures

Magazines: Jane, Los Angeles Magazine, W, Discover

3 music labels, 11 major local newspapers

Hyperion book publishers

Infoseek Internet search engine

Other Holdings:

Sid R. Bass (major shares) crude oil and gas

All Disney Theme Parks, Walt Disney Cruise Lines

4.) Viacom International, Inc. owns:

5.) Time-Warner TBS

6.) News Corporation LTD/ Fox Networks

Of the eleven (11) companies listed six (6) of the companies (again which are all President Bush and Republican supporters) dominate the U.S. Radio Market, they are:

1.) Clear Channel Communications

2.) Cox Communications

3.) Cumulus Media Inc.

4.) Disney

5.) Emmis Communications Group

6.) Entercom Communications

- 7.) Gannett
- 8.) General Electric
- 9.) News Corporation
- 10.) Time Warner Inc.
- 11.) Viacom

The news that is reported is very selective and slanted in whatever way the ownership wants it to be shaped. In many cases the national news that is broadcast is completely untrue, in order to intentionally mislead the public and carry out President Bush's and his administration's agenda.. **In order for President Bush and his administration to never be held accountable for their actions, it is critical that the exact same national news media conglomerates that control the majority of the national news now, not only maintain their control of the national news, but they increase their power and influence, and dispel any entity that is interested in broadcasting the actual news.** Another benefit that President Bush and his administration see in having a few national news media conglomerates be in control of the majority of the nation's news is that they will be easier to control. Should one or two of them ever get out of step with him or his administration, and attempt to either actually air/print the news or exposes any wrong doing by him or his administration. They don't feel it will be too difficult to convince and persuade them not to air/print any news story they dislike and want ignored. Their low ball tactics usually include either high dollar bribes or threats of violence or death to either whomever they are leaning on or their families.

While to best of my knowledge my plight has not been openly broadcasted internationally, I have seen and heard indirect international news that depicts both President Bush and his administration in a very unfavorable light. I strongly believe that my enlightenment packages are major contributing factors as to why for the most part President Bush and his administration is isolated on an island from the rest of the world.

The following Congressional members have been enlightened about my plight:

- | | |
|--|--|
| <p><u>Democrats</u>
<u>Congresswoman</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1.) Nancy Pelosi (listed attachment A-12) <p><u>Congressmens</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 2.) John Conyers, Jr.(listed attachment A-13) 3.) Henry Waxman 4.) Dennis J. Kucinich (listed attachment A-14) | <p><u>Democrats</u>
<u>Senators</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1.) Patrick Leahy (listed attachment A-15) 2.) Hillary R. Clinton (listed attachment A-16) 3.) Barack Obama (listed attachment A-17) 4.) Charles Schumer (listed attachment A-18) 5.) Byron L. Dorgan (listed attachment A-19) 6.) Bernie Sanders 7.) Russ Feingold |
|--|--|

**Republican
Congressmen**

- 5.) J. Dennis Hastert
6.) **John A. Boehner** (listed attachment A-20)

**Republican
Senators**

- 8.) **Mich McConnell** (listed attachment A- 21)
9.) **Lindsey Graham** (listed attachment A-22)
10.) Johnny Isakson
11.) Jim DeMint
12.) Orrin G. Hatch
13.) Trent Lott
14.) Richard C. Shelby
15.) John Cornyn
16.) John McCain
17.) Ted Stevens
18.) Saxby Chambliss
19.) Joe Lieberman
20.) Arlen Specter

I strongly encourage and urge you to contact one of the publically elected officials listed in bold print, which can brief you about the latest occurrences of my plight.

In regards to civil litigation, I have contacted well over seventy (70) lawyers from around the country to solicit their assistance in helping me resolve my plight within the civil court system. A number of lawsuits have been filed on my behalf seeking a total of well over **\$200 billion dollars + all attorney fees**. Verizon Wireless and Nextel are two of the defendants in some of the filed lawsuits. Even if President Bush and his administration are successful in getting congress to give all of the telecom companies “blanket immunity” from lawsuits for assisting them in illegally spying on U.S. citizens, it will still not grant them protection from lawsuits that have been filed against them on my behalf.

Prior to drawing this document up I knew nothing about the FCC, in both researching and reading recent news articles about the FCC, I was very disappointed and disheartened with what I had found. **Due to how you and your two fellow Republican FCC Commissioners (Mr. Robert M. McDowell & Ms. Deborah Taylor Tate) are currently running the FCC, it is more productive for me to speak about how all of you are currently running the FCC, rather than for me to continue to speak to you directly, which would be a “complete waste of ink.” It is clearly apparent that none of you in the Republican majority of the FCC are concerned with what is in the best interest of the national populous. It is also very clear that all of you are deeply involved within the Republican scheme of ensuring that President Bush and his administration are never held accountable for their actions.** If what is

currently wrong, is ever going to get corrected, **then this communication is going to have to be reviewed by both the general public and Congressional members of the U.S. House of Representatives & the U.S. Senate. The synopses of the following two news articles supports my premise:**

1.) "FCC cleared by own inquiry"

2.) "Plan Would Ease Limits on Media Owners"

While in some ways I found the L.A. Times news article titled "**FCC cleared by own inquiry**", by Jim Puzzanghera dated Saturday October 6th of this year (2007)(listed attachment A-23) very humorous considering it was no more than a "glossy charade." It lays out what the FCC is truly about under its current leadership, and what the leadership's agenda is. The findings of both studies confirm the conclusions I had come to for some time. The pertinent excerpts of the news article are:

1.) The seventh (7th) paragraph, reads:

"One of the studies, done in 2004, showed the locally owned TV stations broadcast more local news than stations not locally owned. The other study, for 2003, was a periodic look at the effects of deregulation on the radio industry, finding that the number of radio station owners declined even as the number of stations rose."

- While the report in 2004 on the surface seems much more milder than the 2003 report, they are actually identical reports that share the same overall theme.

The 2004 report confirms the ideal that the TV stations that aren't locally owned are only concerned with broadcasting the news they are interested in broadcasting. Depending on what is going on with the political power structure and the agenda/message that needs to be relayed to the public in a certain regions, anything can be broadcast from actual news to false manipulated news in an attempt to sway the opinion and outlook of the public to be in step with the political power structure. The only problem with this strategy is that once you no longer have any credibility and no one believes you, it does work long term. Which is what's currently happening with the Bush administration.

In reference to the 2003 report the reach of a few media conglomerates have expand their views and political ideologies around the country, while not allowing any other points of views to be expressed. However, there are much broader parameters involved in radio than there is concerning TV. Given this a lot more inaccurate information can be communicated to the public that in the majority of cases is never corrected. The Republican Party as a whole values this venue much more than they value the TV stations, simply because they have gotten a lot more milage out of radio than they have gotten out of TV.

2.) The second (2nd) half of the ninth (9th) paragraph, reads:

“And the 34-page report cited some questionable activity, including a December 2003 e-mail written by then-FCC Media Bureau Chief W. Kenneth Ferree that he was “not inclined” to release the draft of the radio industry study because “this is not the time to be stirring the ‘radio consolidation’ pot.”

2a.) The tenth (10th) paragraph, reads:

“If we can change the focus and make it more positive...then perhaps we can do something like this again, “Ferree wrote, referring to the periodic radio report.”

2b.) The thirteenth (13th) paragraph, reads:

“One Media Bureau staffer recalled being told that Ferree directed employees to respond to any requests for the radio study by saying the bureau did not have time to do one that year, according to the report. The investigators found it troubling that there may have been “an attempt to conceal the existence” of the study, and if Ferree were still working for the FCC “we suspect...we would have to refer the matter to the chairman”for possible disciplinary action.”

2c.) The second (2nd) sentence of fifteenth (15th) paragraph, reads:

“Ferree declined to comment, saying he had not read the entire report.”

- Mr. Ferree’s actions and intentions are very clear cut. Much like a spineless snake Mr. Ferree’s strategy was to sliver away from the findings of both of the studies and then change the focus of the studies and project a false and inaccurate illumination that would of warmly been embraced by the FCC’s current management. However, in thinking his strategy through Mr. Ferree realized there was no way for him nor any of the FCC’s current management to cover up the truth, so Mr. Ferree instructed the FCC’s employees to lie to anyone that inquired about the radio study by saying the bureau did not have time to do one that year. The FCC’s management knew Mr. Ferree had “crossed the point of no return” when he first attempted to falsify the findings of the radio study. It’s obvious that both Mr. Ferree and the FCC’s current leadership concluded that the only way to protect Mr. Ferree from any type of disciplinary action was for him to resign. In that the inspector general stated, “if Ferree were still working for the FCC “we suspect...we would have to refer the matter to the chairman”for possible disciplinary action.”

It is very telling that Mr. Ferree declined to comment on the report, saying he had not read the entire report.

3.) The first (1st) and second (2nd) paragraphs, reads:

“Results of a Federal Communications Commission investigation released Friday dismissed

allegations made last fall that agency officials had suppressed two media ownership studies because they disliked the results”.

“But the findings by the FCC’s inspector general, which included an e-mail from a former senior agency official that appeared to call for squelching one of the draft studies, didn’t put to rest the concerns raised by the allegations.”

3a.) The twelfth (12th) paragraph, reads:

“The inspector generals report said Ferree’s reasons for not releasing the study “appear to be legitimate and based on valid agency considerations”, and there was no evidence Ferree tried to “twist or conceal facts.”

3b.) The sixteenth (16th) paragraph, reads:

“The report bends over backward to give the benefit of the doubt to the commission management, said Andrew Jay Schwartzman, president of the Media Access Project, a public interest law firm that filed the suit that halted the FCC’s 2003 media ownership rule change.”

- It is clearly apparent that an FCC insider utilized their power to make a potentially very damaging situation go away, despite what the facts reveal. What is interesting is that even in disposing of the FCC’s problem the inspector general acknowledges Mr. Ferree was merely being sympathetic to the FCC’s leadership’s concerns and considerations. Which is to have a few media conglomerates control all the national news media. Yet the inspector general makes an enormous contradiction to the facts found in stating “there was no evidence Ferree tried to twist or conceal facts.”

4.) The sixth (6th) paragraph, reads:

“The inspector general’s report concluded that the evidence did not support allegations from Boxer and a former FCC attorney, Adam Candeub, that senior officials suppressed the studies. The purported reason for hushing them up; that their findings conflicted with the agenda of then-FCC Chairman Michael Powell to loosen regulations on ownership of TV and radio stations, allowing further concentration of media in fewer hands.”

4a.) The first (1st) half of the ninth (9th) paragraph, reads:

“But the investigators noted they were not able to speak with Candeub, the former FCC attorney who is now an assistant law professor at Michigan State University. He said Friday that he did not participate because he feared a whitewash.”

4b.) The first (1st) sentence of the fifteenth (15th) paragraph, reads:

“Powell did not respond to messages seeking comment.”

- This confirms that it has long been the goal of the Republican party to consolidate the national news media into the control a few media conglomerates, so the majority of the news being broadcasts would always be controlled.

How subjective was the inspector general’s investigation, when Mr. Candeub was not even spoken to, even though he along with Senator Boxer are the key individuals making the allegations against the FCC?

It is very telling that Mr. Powell did not respond to messages seeking comment.

5.) The third (3rd) paragraph, reads:

“Sen. Barbara Boxer (D-Calif.), who requested the investigation last fall along with two other senators after she was sent copies of the studies, disagreed with the inspector general’s conclusions and might ask congressional investigators to look into the matter, spokesman Natalie Ravitz said.”

- **Senator Boxer is a significant indirect player in my plight in regards to the Minneapolis bridge collapse**, for the most part she seems to be about the right thing, but there are times I question what she is really about.

6.) The fourth (4th) & fifth (5th) paragraphs, reads:

“FCC Commissioner Michael J. Copps also criticized the findings.

“The nagging feelings remains that we don’t yet have the entire story”, said Copps, a Democrat.

- These two excerpts are very encouraging and shows a possible independence from the FCC’s current Republican leadership.

The pertinent excerpts from the New York Times news article titled “**Plan Would Ease Limits on Media Owners**” by Stephen Labaton dated Thursday October 18th of this year (2007) (listed attachment A-24), are:

1.) The first (1st) paragraph, reads:

“The head of the Federal Communications Commission has circulated an ambitious plan to relax the decades-old media ownership rules, including repealing a rule that forbids a company to own both a newspaper and a television or radio station in the same city.”

1a.) The fourth (4th), fifth (5th), and sixth (6th) paragraphs, reads:

“The proposal appears to have the support of a majority of the five commission members, agency officials said, although it is not clear that Mr. Martin would proceed with a sweeping de-regulatory approach on a vote of 3 to 2, something his predecessor tried without success. In interviews on Wednesday, the agency’s two Democratic members raised questions about Mr. Martin’s approach.”

“Mr. Martin said he was striving to reach a consensus with his fellow commissioners, both on the schedule and on the underlying rule changes, although he would not say whether he would move the measures forward if he were able to muster only three votes.”

“We’ve had six hearings around the country already; we’ve done numerous studies; we’ve been collecting data for the last 18 months; and the issues have been pending for years, “Mr. Martin said in an interview. “I think it is an appropriate time to begin a discussion to complete this rule-making and complete these media ownership issues.”

1b.) The seventh (7th) and eighth (8th) paragraphs, reads:

“Officials said the commission would consider loosening the restrictions on the number of radio and television stations a company could own in the same city.”

“Currently, a company can own two television stations in the larger markets only if at least one is not among the four largest stations and if there are at least eight local stations. The rules also limits the number of radio stations that a company can own to no more than eight in each of the largest markets.”

1c.) The sixteenth (16th) paragraph, reads:

"Advisers to Mr. Martin said he hoped to gain the support of at least one of the Democrats, probably Mr. Adelstein, but Mr. Adelstein said in an interview on Wednesday that Mr. Martin's proposed timetable was "awfully aggressive."

-The timing of Mr. Martin’s announcement coincides with the desperate need of the Bush administration’s need to control the majority of the nation’s news media. The swift speed in which Mr. Martin wishes to enact these sweeping changes is to try and finalize everything before any opposition can be organized to thwart his efforts. Through out my plight, the Bush administration has a long history of both applying pressure to and making request of fellow Republicans without explaining why they are making the requests. In many cases, possibly similar to Mr. Martin’s case in complying with the Bush administration’s request they unknowingly (at least initially) become full participants within my mother’s murder conspiracy. Then when I communicate to them the entire murder plot, they learn they are just as guilty as those that have brutally and savagely killed my mother.

Mr. Martin, seems to be a very intelligent individual, who is fully aware of some of the surface pitfalls he is now facing, and is attempting to “walk the tight rope” of carrying out what the Bush administration has requested of him and is also trying to appear as a fair and compromising chairman who works with the Democratic commissioners of the FCC. However, Unbeknownst to Mr. Martin and his fellow Republican commissioners, with the swift and sweeping changes he would like the FCC to make, he has now made himself and his fellow Republican commissioners key participants within my mothers murder conspiracy. Mr. Martin is wise enough to know that if he goes with a 3 to 2 vote that is a party line split, the swift and sweeping changes will not be able to withstand any type of scrutiny nor public, congressional, or judicial oversight. With both of the Democratic commissioners raising questions about Mr. Martin’s approach, the first hurdle may be prove to steep to overcome.

Mr. Martin now reveals what he is really about, on explaining why he would like the FCC to conduct his proposed swift and sweeping rule changes. On the surface, to the unaware individual, who Mr. Martin and the Republican’s are counting on, the fact that there have been six (6) hearings around the country, there have been numerous studies done, a substantial amount of data collected, and the issues have been pending for years; Mr. Martin’s intentions seem very reasonable. However, factoring in Mr. Ferree’s career with the FCC which I touched upon earlier in this communication, it is apparent what agenda Mr. Martin has for the FCC, which is to provide assistance to President Bush and his administration, controlling the majority of the news. This is a goal the Republicans have always wanted to accomplish, but because of the trouble that President Bush and his administration is now in, it is now a goal that the Republicans feel they have to accomplish.

I actually agree with Mr. Martin, when he says it is the appropriate time to begin a discussion to complete this rule-making and complete these media ownership issues. Due to what I have had to withstand in regards to the national news media being silent to my plight, even though they were provided all of the irrefutable facts. **There does need to be swift and sweeping changes brought about by the FCC to the national news media that are exactly the opposite of what Mr. Martin is laboring to accomplish.**

Two changes that I feel need to be made immediately are:

- 1.) Multiple substantial fines for both intentionally broadcasting inaccurate information to the public, as well as ignoring factual evidence of crimes submitted to them to be broadcast to the public, to the point it will be difficult to remain in business if numerous violations are committed for both radio, TV, and newspapers.
- 2.) NO MORE MONOPOLIES!!!!!!!!!!!! THE MONOPOLIES NEED TO BE BROKEN UP!!!!!!!!

These are just to name a few, I am sure more needed changes will be proposed once the national

populous gets involved in this process.

What I find very interesting is that Mr. Martin and the Republicans don't attempt to hide or disguise what they are laboring to accomplish, which is to have a select few control the majority of the national news media. Necessity, desperation, and lack of creativity has caused Mr. Martin and the Republicans to explain every detail of their deceptive and underhanded plan, for all to see, even down to which Democratic commissioner (Mr. Jonathan S. Adelstein) they are targeting to be complicit in their scheme, but Mr. Adelstein doesn't seem to agree with Mr. Martin's aggressive approach.

2.) The second (2nd), and third (3rd) paragraphs, reads:

"Kevin J. Martin, chairman of the commission, wants to repeal the rule in the next two months-a plan that, if successful, would be a big victory for some executives of media conglomerates."

"Among them are Samuel Zell, the Chicago investor who is seeking to complete a buyout of the Tribune Company, and Rupert Murdoch, who has lobbied against the rule for years so that he can continue controlling both The New York Post and a Fox television station in New York."

2b.) The fourteenth (14th) paragraph, reads:

"Supporters of the changes say that the rules are outdated and that there is ample empirical evidence to support their repeal. A small number of media companies, including The New York Times Company, are able to own both a newspaper and a radio station in the same city because the cross-ownership restrictions, which went into effect in 1974, were not applied retroactively."

2c.) The twenty-first (21st), and twenty-second (22nd) paragraphs, reads:

"But in recent days, Mr. Martin has proposed to expedite the rule-making and hold a final vote in December. In part, he has told commission officials, he was reacting to criticism by Mr. Copps about temporary waivers that have allowed companies to own newspapers and stations in the same market."

"Mr. Zell has said he wants to complete his \$8.2 billion buyout of Tribune Company by the end of the year. Tribune had been granted with were supposed to be temporary waivers to the rule to allow it to control newspapers and television stations in five cities: New York, Chicago, Los Angeles, Hartford and the Miami-Fort Lauderdale area."

-Mr. Martin is looking at roughly a two month time frame to finalize the FCC's swift and sweeping changes. Interestingly enough, this would be a huge victory for two Republican far right leaning billionaires. One an established media conglomerate President and C.E.O. (Mr. Rupert Murdoch, who I have already identified previously in this communication), and the other an aspiring media conglomerate President and C.E.O. (Mr. Samuel Zell). **Both of these**

individuals are fully aware of my plight, and are intentionally concealing it.

Mr. Zell, is a very interesting individual in the midst of a very unique and (at least on the surface) strange acquisition. I now cite the following International Hearld Tribune news article titled "**New Owner Sparks dismay at the Los Angeles Times**" by Laura M. Holson and Sharon Waxman dated Tuesday April 3rd of this year (2007)(listed attachment A-25). When I distributed out my enlightenment packages containing irrefutable evidence of my mother's murder conspiracy to the various national news media organizations, it was with the intent to have my plight exposed to the general public through the national news media organizations I contacted.

I was neither aware, nor even really conscious of what the relationship was between the individual national news media organizations and their parent ownership organizations. Given this, I was shocked at the first (1st) four (4) paragraphs of the news article, which reads:

"The Los Angeles Times was nothing but trouble for the Tribune Co., and it may prove even more of a challenge for its new owner, Samuel Zell."

"Ever since Tribune bought the Times Mirror Co. in 2000 - and, with it The Los Angeles Times - there has been a culture clash between the Chicago-based owners at Tribune and its marquee California newspaper. The schism seems to have helped fuel things like the public criticism that the paper is out of touch and the recent battles in the newsroom that have led to high-profile resignations."

"The tension has been particularly pronounced throughout the deal-making process, which pitted Zell, a Chicago resident, against a pair of Los Angeles businessmen, Ronald Burkle and Eli Broad. Also in the running was a Hollywood mogul, David Geffen, who on Monday reaffirmed his interest in either acquiring The Los Angeles Times outright or buying a stake in it and running it."

"But the backdrop of wounded civic pride was only one factor that provoked cries of dismay from the newsroom and the community Monday at the news that Zell had prevailed. There was also the fact that Zell has stated that he has no interest in newspapers, and that he is taking the corporate reins at a critical time of declining circulation."

- For those in the "know" it is quite obvious both why Mr. Zell prevailed over the other contenders (through substantial Republican influence) and why he stated "he has no interest in newspapers" (because he legitimately doesn't). If there is still any lingering doubt surrounding why Mr. Zell is interested in acquiring the Tribune Company it is quickly dispelled when you look up both the media investments and political patronage of Mr. Zell's online biography, which reads:

Media Investments

On April 2, 2007, the Tribune Company announced their acceptance of Zell's offer to buy the Chicago Tribune, the Los Angeles Times, and other media assets. Zell reportedly will take the company private, sell off the Chicago Cubs after the 2007 season, and sell the company's 25 percent interest in Comcast SportsNet Chicago. Pending shareholder approval, Los Angeles billionaires Ron Burkle and Eli Broad may submit a higher bid, in which case Zell would receive a \$25 million buyout fee. Since the Zell announcement, David Geffen announced that he is still interested in acquiring the Los Angeles Times. Zell is expected to close on the Tribune Company in late 2007 and at that time will become Chairman.

Political Patronage

Zell has donated to both Republican and Democratic candidates – with more money going to the former – as well as to lobbying groups representing the real estate industry. According to an analysis of Federal Election Commission records by the Center for Public Integrity, "Zell has given more than \$100,000 in political contributions since the 1998 election cycle, most of it supporting Republican causes."

Like most right wing billionaires Mr. Zell plays both political sides so no matter who is in power, he is able to have political influence. But, when you look at where the majority of his money goes it is to the Republican Party. The way the game is played favors are given back and forth and the majority of the time Republican loyalist are put in situations where they are able to reap large amounts of money both for their personal bank accounts and their various business interests, sometimes within the billions of dollars, but that money has strings attached to it, and if a Republican loyalist is needed whatever the circumstances or situation, no resistance is tolerated. I believe Mr. Zell was recruited by the Republican Party, President Bush, and his administration to help secure a national news media organization (the Los Angeles Times) that I had enlightened about my mother's murder conspiracy and take the entire ownership group private, so he would have full control of the Los Angeles Times. I don't believe the Republican Party, President Bush, nor his administration has ever had (nor currently has) firm control of the Los Angeles Times, and full control of the Los Angeles Times is something they had to have especially as President Bush's support both inter-nationally and domestically is quickly eroding. Mr. Zell however wanted to provide himself with cover should the scheme he is involved in ever become exposed by stating "he has no interest in newspapers". What is also telling is that Mr. Zell is conducting a full scale fire sale after his acquisition is finalized, which of course will earn him much more money than he put in, but it is very probable that the money to purchase the Tribune Company came from contributions from additional right wing Republican billionaires along with Mr. Zell's contribution.

b.) The fifth (5th) and sixth (6th) paragraphs, reads:

"It's scary," said Nick Goldberg, editor of the paper's op-ed page. "The problem is, as of right now we know nothing about the guy"

"He hasn't expressed any real philosophy about the company, to my knowledge, or any indication of what he plans to do. We're just sitting here waiting to hear."

- The two things that have been very consistent throughout my plight in dealing with the Republican Party, President Bush and his administration, and are currently in play with the Los Angeles Times are:

1.) There is not, nor has there ever been any over all commination among the Republicans, President Bush, or his administration in regards providing any type of reasoning as to why they are doing what they are doing. No attempts have ever been made to alleviate the anxiety of those that are directly effected by the schemes that are enacting at the top.

2.) The majority of time there is no thought out game plan, things are done because they are possible to do, and there is never really a concern for the possible consequences of their actions.

c.) The seventh (7th), eighth (8th), ninth (9th), and tenth (10th) paragraphs, reads:

"At the newspaper's headquarters on Spring Street, the newsroom ground to a halt Monday as several hundred members of the staff attended a video conference by the Tribune chairman, Dennis FitzSimons, who has been the focus of much of the tension between Los Angeles and Chicago."

"FitzSimons explained details of the deal with Zell, which involves a complex component of employee ownership, and fielded questions. But he did not have an answer to a question about Zell's vision for the company, and Zell did not speak at the event."

"At the meeting, David Hiller, the publisher of The Los Angeles Times, depicted the change in ownership as a positive step, suggesting that the company, which will become privately owned, would be under less pressure to produce short-term profits."

"You can plan for the next five years, rather than the next five months," Hiller said at the meeting, according to people who were there. But he also said that the newspaper was going ahead with planned staff reductions, which are expected to cut \$7.5 million in costs, but have served as a flash point for controversy in the newsroom."

-Sensing the natives were getting restless about Mr. Zell, Mr. FitzSimons knew he had to address the Los Angeles Times as a company. What is very telling is that Mr. FitzSimons only touched upon how Mr. Zell coming aboard could possibly benefit the employees, by being eligible to own a % of the company, but given it is identified as a complex component of the deal, it makes you

wonder just how many employees will actually be eligible? The fact that Mr. Zell did not speak for himself, nor did Mr. FitzSimons have an answer for Mr. Zell's vision for the company, it is very clear that the purchase is not be made thinking about the future but to ensure the news being reported is fully controlled.

Mr. Hiller reveals Mr. Zell's true intention with the Los Angeles Times in the tenth (10th) paragraph, which is simply to gut the national news media organization and reduce both its presence and effectiveness as a news entity. **What has really amazed me through out my plight and does even more, in breaking down Mr. Zell's probable reasoning for purchasing the Tribune Company is that the Republicans, President Bush, and his administration have the arrogance and audacity to not only get very upset with both individuals and entities that attempt to do the right thing and expose their illegal activities, but to attack them as well, when they are the ones in the wrong.**

d.) The fourteenth (14th) and fifteenth (15th) paragraphs, reads:

"I can't sit here and tell you that Sam Zell has called to say 'Don't worry about a thing, 'but I don't see that it would make much sense to sell the L.A. Times, "James O'Shea, the paper's editor said. "From what I understand, the way Mr. Zell thinks about the future of newspapers and the internet, this would be a key element of his ownership"

"Media analysts said that the way Zell's deal is structured, it would make little sense financially to sell The Times soon, because the tax bill would eat up about 40 percent of the sale price. They said a proposal by Geffen, the entertainment executive, to pay \$2 billion for the paper would probably be insufficient for that reason."

-From Mr. O'Shea's statement, it is pretty clear he made a deal with the devil, and he is trying to convince himself that everything will be ok, when it is obvious he knows it is not going to be ok. **I addressed my enlightenment package to the Editor of the Los Angeles Times, given that Mr. O'Shea was the individual that received my enlightenment package..**

When the Republicans, President Bush, and his administration are given time to plan they have proven themselves to be very shrewd planners. **The way that Mr. Zell's deal is structured, it is of course not financially feasible for him to sell the Los Angeles Times, until the Los Angeles Times is completely gutted.**

It is now all about rallying the Republican supporters to Mr. Martin's agenda who states the current FCC rules are outdated, they are not interested in speaking specifics when they claim there is ample empirical evidence to support their repeal. Given, all of the national news media organizations that I (including the New York Times Company) contacted have colluded with each other to ignore my plight, there should be no more cross-ownership, including those companies that were in existence prior to 1974 that are currently exempt for the restrictions.

It is pretty clear that Mr. Martin wants to hurry his sweeping changes through as quickly as he can, because he knows the temporary waivers that the Tribune Company have been awarded and Mr. Zell is buying himself into are going to be a difficult issue for Mr. Zell to contend with. It is very probable that Mr. Martin, the Republicans, President Bush, and his administration in no way wants Mr. Copps' criticism of the temporary waivers to turn into any type of attention nor investigation of whether there should be an extension of the temporary waivers for Mr. Zell that could possibly expose his true reasoning for acquiring the Tribune Company.

The man that has nothing to say now wants to talk, Mr. Zell says he wants to complete his \$8.2 billion buyout of the Tribune Company by the end of the year (2007). Letting his fellow Republicans know when he will need the path cleared for him for complete 100% private ownership and Mr. Martin is of course doing all he can to comply.

3.) The ninth (9th) paragraph, reads:

"The de-regulatory proposal is likely to put the agency once again at the center of a debate between the media companies. Which view the restrictions as anachronistic, and civil rights, labor, religious and other groups that maintain the government has let media conglomerates grow too large."

3a.) The eleventh (11th) paragraph, reads:

"In recent months, industry executives had all but abandoned the hope that regulators would try to modify the ownership rules in the waning days of the Bush administration."

3b.) The fifteenth (15th) paragraph, reads:

"Mr. Martin faces obstacles within the agency to overhauling the rules. One Democrat on the commission, Michael J. Copps, is adamantly opposed to loosening the rules. The other, Jonathan S. Adelstein, has said that the agency first needs to address other media issues, including encouraging improved coverage of local events and greater ownership of stations by companies controlled by woman and minorities."

3c.) The seventeenth (17th), and eighteenth (18th) paragraphs, reads:

"Three years ago, the commission lost a major court challenge to its last effort, led by Michael K. Powell, its chairman at the time, to relax the media ownership rules. The United States Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, in Philadelphia, concluded that the commission had failed to adequately justify the new rules. Mr. Martin's proposal would presumably include new evidence aimed at fending off similar legal challenges."

"Mr. Powell's effort, which had been supported by lobbyists for broadcasters, newspapers and major media conglomerates, provoked a wave of criticism from a broad coalition of opponents."

Among them were the National Organization for Women, the National Rifle Association, the Parents Television Council and the United States Conference of Catholic Bishops."

3d.) The nineteenth (19th), and twentieth (20th) paragraphs, reads:

"The agency was flooded with nearly three million comments against changing the rules, the most it has ever received in a rule-making process."

"Since the appeals court struck down the de-regulatory changes, the commission has continued to study the issues at a leisurely pace, and it held a series of hearings around the nation. It had not made any new proposals, and industry executives had not expected the agency to move again so soon."

- The desperation that Mr. Martin, the Republicans, President Bush, and his administration has in finalizing Mr. Martin's intended changes, is very apparent in that several of the opposition groups that feel the government has let media conglomerates grow too large, contains a number of civil rights groups. In laboring to conceal a racially motivated murder conspiracy it is not a wise nor intelligent move to openly go against any civil rights group in any forum, let alone opposing multiple civil rights groups openly. Mr. Martin has now made the FCC the focus of attention, considering the current climate and the grave consequences of being identified as a participant within my mother's murder conspiracy, that is a very questionable position that he is allowing himself to be in.

It speaks volumes that after a number of unsuccessful attempts and industry executives had all but abandoned their hope to modify media ownership rules in the waning days of the Bush administration, Mr. Martin is suddenly trying to cram it all through very quickly.

Mr. Martin's desired course of action is an up-hill battle with-in the FCC in regards to swaying the two Democratic Commissioners. It is very encouraging that Commissioner Copps is adamantly opposed to loosening the rules, and that Commissioner Adelstein feels that one of the top priorities of the FCC should be greater minority media ownership.

Considering Mr. Powell lead an unsuccessful effort to relax the media ownership rules that was thwarted in court three years ago, Mr. Martin now has to provide a completely different argument than Mr. Powell argued.

I suspect the same cast of characters that supported Mr. Powell are behind Mr. Martin, but I also think the majority of them realize the odds are greatly stacked against them.

Factoring in, both the broad coalition of opponents, and the three million comments from the general public that opposed Mr. Powell's efforts against changing the FCC's rules, there is a great possibility that both the various groups and the general public will learn of my mother's murder conspiracy because of Mr. Martin's hasty actions.

All that can be gathered from the fact that the FCC has worked at a leisurely pace and not made any new proposals since the appeals court struck down the de-regulatory changes. And, industry executives had not expected the agency to move again so soon; is that it is a great possibility that Mr. Martin's current stance might not entirely be independently his own.

4.) The twenty-Third (23rd), twenty-fourth (24th), and twenty-fifth (25th) paragraphs, reads:

"Mr. Copps, who for years has waged a campaign against media consolidation, said that it would be hard for the commission to proceed during an election year because media consolidation has provoked deep public skepticism in the past."

"He said Mr. Martin's proposal to complete a relaxation of the rules in December would require procedural shortcuts, giving the public too little time to comment on the proposals and industry experts too little time to weigh their impact on news operations."

"We shouldn't be doing anything without having a credible process and nothing should be done to get in the way of Congressional oversight and more importantly, public oversight, "Mr. Copps said in a telephone interview from London. "We've got to have the public scrutiny. That was one of the big mistakes that Mr. Powell made, and he was taken to the woodshed by the Third Circuit. I fear it is deja vu all over again."

- Mr. Copps seems like a sincere voice of reason at the FCC, however I don't really know his over all views other than what has been covered in the news articles I have read. He makes a number of legitimate points as to why the hasty course of action Mr. Martin is interested in partaking in is not wise. What I respect the most however, is the wisdom that Mr. Copps exercises, in acknowledging that anything the FCC does that is not credible will be overturned by either Congressional or Judicial oversight, driven by public displeasure. He actually welcomes public scrutiny, which says a great deal about who he is and what he stands for. Unfortunately, he likens Mr. Martin to Mr. Powell, who in Mr. Copps' words "was taken to the woodshed" by the Third Circuit. Mr. Copps fears this all deja vu all over again, I disagree with Mr. Copps. I can assure him we are all in waters no one has ever been in before.

5.) The tenth (10th) paragraph, reads:

"As advertising increasingly migrates from newspapers to the Internet, the newspaper industry has undergone a wave of upheaval and consolidation. That has put new pressure on regulators to loosen ownership rules. But deregulation in the media is difficult politically, because many Republican and Democratic lawmakers are concerned about news outlets in their districts being too tightly controlled by too few companies."

- The following two arguments, for loosening of the national news media ownership rules are:

1.) Advertisers are increasingly migrating from newspapers to the Internet

&

2.) Newspaper circulation is down

Both are legitimate corporate arguments for increasing a companies bottom line, and if it was simply about business, these would both be very convincing and persuasive arguments for loosening the national news media's ownership rules. However, the national news media is so much more than a business, when it is run properly and functioning as it should, it provides an invaluable fourth (4th) of state service to the nation. Unfortunately, things have currently run amuck with the national news media and we are a long way from where we need to be. The entire industry is in need of a complete overhaul. While I of course acknowledge that any business a person partakes in should be run soundly, in regards to the national news media the emphasis on making the greatest profit needs to be re-directed and re-focused on integrity, sound facts, honesty, and being committed to both broadcasting and printing news stories when there is pressure being applied not to expose the store to the public.

The previous paragraph gives the national news media the benefit of the doubt, that the majority of ownership companies are strictly interested in increasing their bottom line. However, **my dilemma illustrates what the national news media's real intent is, which is to control what news gets reported and what news gets ignored, regardless of what the facts state.**

6.) The twelfth (12th) and thirteenth (13th) paragraphs, reads:

"This is a big deal because we have way too much concentration of media ownership in the United States," Senator Byron L. Dorgan, Democrat of North Dakota, said at a hearing on Wednesday called to examine the digital transition of the television industry."

"If the chairman intends to do something by the end of the year, "Mr. Dorgan added, his voice rising, "then there will be a firestorm of protest and I'm going to be carrying the wood."

-Senator Byron L. Dorgan is more of a direct player within in my plight than is Senator Barbra Boxer (who as I have previously stated earlier in this communication is an indirect player within my plight), in that he has received one of my latest enlightenment packages and he is fully aware of my mother's murder conspiracy, and who is involved within it. **The fact that he feels we already have way too much concentration of the national news media ownership within the United States (a view in which I fully agree with), and that he is prepared to lead the charge against Mr. Martin's swift course of action; sets up a very smooth and easy transition into a congressional hearing for oversight and exposure of how the national news media that I have contacted has intentionally ignored my mother's murder conspiracy.** Even though when you factor in, who he is as a person he will really have no interest, but he may not have a choice.

Please now review both the enclosed **initial grievance, with the exception of listed attachment A-9 & A-10** (listed attachment A-26) against:

- 1.) Judge Alice M. Batchelder
- 2.) Judge Julia Smith Gibbons
- 3.) Judge Ronald Lee Gilman
- &
- 4.) Judge Michael T. Hall

And, my **additional submission to my grievance** (listed attachment A-27) against the four (4) listed judges. I won't reiterate what the grievances touch upon because everything is self-explanatory. What I will do however, is unmask what Mr. Martin's, the Republicans, President Bush's, and his administration's secret plan is; which is to simply make sure any legal suits filed against the FCC for finalizing Mr. Martin's sweeping rule changes, finds its way to the correct judges. That was the mistake (in their eyes) that Mr. Powell made, the Republicans have worked very hard to stack the judiciary with judges that will rule which ever way they are told to rule on all levels of the judiciary and have also stacked the Supreme Court, which is exactly how President Bush got elected the first time, the second time he simply cheated in Ohio. It was after my initial grievance was circulated which exposed the long standing Republican judicial scheme and the eve of the congressional break that the Minneapolis bridge collapse took place. The enclosed Fox news article titled, "**Boxer, Peters Clash Over Bridge Safety**" by Frederic J. Frommer, Associated Press Writer dated Thursday September 20th of this year (2007) (Listed Attachment A-28), **supports the premise I have laid out in my additional submission to my initial grievance.** The important excerpts of the article are:

In the first paragraph Mary Peters, Transportation Secretary, said, "the country does not face a safety crisis despite last month's deadly bridge collapse in Minneapolis".

-I really think Ms. Peters, is fully involved with possibly blowing up the Minneapolis bridge.

In the second paragraph Senator Barbara Boxer states to Ms. Peters:

"How can you say that everything is rosy when 13 people died?" "I don't get it."

-Senator Boxer has no idea why Ms. Peters is not concerned with the safety of the bridges within the U.S., but again if Ms. Peters was possibly involved with purposely blowing the bridge up, she would know that provided a bridge is not blown up, it will not collapse.

Further clarification of this point is in Ms. Peters statement to the Senate Environment & Public Works Committee in the third (3rd) & fourth (4th) paragraph, "While we can and must do more to improve the quality of our nation's infrastructure, it would be both irresponsible and inaccurate to say that the nation's transportation system is anything but safe." "Data before the collapse

indicated there was no problem, although the span was rated structurally deficient.”

The fifth (5th) paragraph is very important, it reads:

“More than 70,000 bridges are in that category (of structurally deficient), and the American Society of Civil Engineers says repairing them would cost at least \$9.4 billion a year for 20 years.”

-In my view, one of the major repercussions and back lashes of possibly purposely orchestrating the Minneapolis bridge collapse is now a great deal of money will be sought to fix all of the bridges within the U.S. that the Bush administration will have no interest in providing. The sixth (6th) paragraph is crucial to who all is possibly involved in this conspiracy and exactly how wide reaching it is, it reads:

“Federal officials do not know what caused the bridge to collapse. Peters said it probably will take the National Transportation Safety Board a year to do so.”

-This was the same time frame Mr. Mark Rosenker, the National Transportation Safety Board Chairman, utilized. I feel they are hoping that in time the Minneapolis bridge collapse will leave the nation’s consciousness.

The seventh (7th) & eighth (8th) paragraph gives insight into how the Bush administration has elected to move forward from the collapse, they possibly caused, it reads:

“Echoing comments she made to a House committee two weeks ago, Peters said better use of money not more money is the solution to fixing bridges.”

“The answer is not to spend more,” she said. “It is to spend more wisely.”

In paragraphs nine (9) & ten (10) the real crux of the situation arises, they read:

“Peter opposes a proposal by Democratic Rep. Jim Oberstar, chairman of the House Transportation and Infrastructure Committee, to raise the federal gasoline tax by 5 cents per gallon to pay for a bridge trust fund.”

“Boxer said she does not support a higher gas tax, but she pressed Peters on how to come up with money to fix bridges. Other senators also questioned whether there is enough money in the system to maintain bridges.”

-The Bush administration does not want to give any more money towards bridges than the money that is already allocated for bridge repair. Ms. Peter’s assigned task is to make sure that is the course the Senate takes.