

spent watching Jacob and changing his diapers. This works out well because it gives my wife a break and a chance to go out with my son James. Jacob takes melatonin at night, which helps him sleep. Ninety-five percent of the time now he sleeps a full night. Before he would stay up till 3 a.m. and wake up at 7 a.m. This was exhausting for me and my wife. He goes to bed at midnight now and wakes up at 10 a.m. To change jobs now would be very hard for me. I would like to, but my family needs this break every week. This disorder has limited my career, but I greatly appreciate the flexibility of my employer. When I found out a bill was sneaked into the Homeland Security Act, I was outraged that someone would try to cover this up. I am glad it was removed. As for a 3 year statute of limitations, this should not apply in thimerosal-induced autism. Nobody knowingly decided to inject a harmful substance into their child. We immunized our children because it was recommended to us by the health care industry. I am not proud to be an American. Our standard of living is good and this is also not just a U.S. problem, but a world-wide problem. Our country should have made sure that these immunizations were not given to children. Mercury is toxic! That's why it's not in thermometers. That's why they don't let kids play with it in science class anymore. As soon as they made this discovery about mercury, it should have been removed from the immunizations. I have heard they found out mercury was toxic to humans 20 years ago. But our country still let the Ely Lilly Co. manufacture it to be used in multidose vials of immunizations. Why is it recently that all the manufacturers removed thimerosal from the immunizations? Simply because they know it causes autism. I will only believe in this country again if every family in my situation is compensated, and I don't mean thousands, I mean millions of dollars for each family. And if chelation does work, it needs to be paid for by our government, NO QUESTIONS ASKED. Whoever put thimerosal in immunizations and knew it could cause autism, needs to be punished to the fullest extent of the law! A life sentence for these people would be getting off easy. Congressman BURTON, if you need any copies of my son's testing or medical records, please let me know. I hope the good people on your side of the government are able to overcome the people who knew about this and didn't care about hurting innocent children like my son Jacob.

Yours truly,

JAMES W. COLL.

SELLING MASSIVE TAX CUTS THAT THE AMERICAN PEOPLE DO NOT WANT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio (Mrs. JONES) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. JONES of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, for the last 2 weeks, President Bush and his advisers have traveled the country, including a visit to my home State, trying to sell their massive tax cut to the American people.

□ 1645

They are wrapping it in fancy paper and calling it a "stimulus package" or an "economic plan." But the American people are not buying it. In fact, many members of the President's own party disagree with this reckless proposal. They can dress this tax cut up any way they want and it is still just that: a tax

cut for the wealthiest 1 percent of Americans that does nothing to create jobs and will only sink our Nation further into debt. A tax cut of this size directed to the privileged few will not help our struggling economy no matter what it is called.

I represent the 11th congressional district of Ohio. Since 2001, Ohio alone has lost 167,800 jobs, which is more than 3 percent of its total workforce. In the city of Cleveland, 53,900 jobs have been lost since the President was sworn into office, which is 4.7 percent of its workforce.

Over the last few weeks, I have spoken with many members of the Cleveland business community and most agree on one thing: this tax cut is useless as a tool to help their struggling businesses. For example, local businesses tell me that they are much more likely to invest in new jobs and new technology if they are allowed to write off more of those investments on their taxes, and workers in the health care field feel they are best helped by increased provider reimbursements, not a dividend tax reduction.

What is more, the Republican budget will mean cuts in local services of all kinds. It means fewer qualified teachers in our public schools. It means fewer police to keep our neighborhoods safe. It means fewer firefighters and EMTs to respond to our emergencies, and it means fewer hospitals dedicated to caring for the veterans who have put their lives on the line to protect ours.

We can and we must do better than that.

Democrats are all for cutting taxes. The difference is that we believe in cutting taxes responsibly so that those cuts can serve as fuel to get our economic engines turning again. We believe responsible tax cuts take into account the future as well as the present and do not increase deficits, raise interest rates, or risk jobs.

That is why Democrats have proposed cutting taxes by \$85 billion, and our tax cuts would go to those who really deserve it: hard-working Americans who are most likely to put the extra money back into our economy, and small businesses which need incentives to invest. Our tax cut is a part of a real stimulus package, a \$135 billion plan to put Americans back to work by investing in the things that are most important to them: homeland security, education, health care, and transportation. The difference between these two plans is clear. It is simply a question of priorities.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BURTON of Indiana). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. JONES) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. JONES of North Carolina addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

FCC TOO QUICK TO REVISE MEDIA OWNERSHIP RULES

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BURNS). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York (Mr. HINCHEY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HINCHEY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to bring to the attention of the House the fact that I am now introducing a resolution to express the sense of the House of Representatives that the Federal Communications Commission should not revise its media ownership rules without more extensive review and comment by the public.

I am doing this because the chairman of the Federal Communications Commission, Mr. Powell, made an announcement in March that he was going to further revise the rules of the Federal Communications Commission which would make it possible for fewer owners to control the information distribution system in America. In doing so, he is continuing a process which effectively began in the early 1980s when such things as the right of people in communities to express themselves over the airwaves when editorial positions were taken by radio stations with which they did not agree was abolished. This was a provision that existed in the rules of the Federal Communications Commission, and effectively in the laws of our country since the period of the Second World War.

As a result of that change and others, what we have seen is, for example, in the radio area, 80 percent of the radio audience being in effect controlled by three major corporations. In other words, three major corporations broadcast to 80 percent of the radio audience. We have lost diversity in our radio programming. We have lost the very important aspect of local control. We have lost the sense of community in radio and television broadcasting as a result of the changes that were begun during the Reagan administration in the 1980s and, now, are being attempted to continue under the jurisdiction of Mr. Powell, the present chairman of the Federal Communications Commission.

What Mr. Powell under the direction of the present administration is doing, is this: he is now going to go beyond the fact that fewer people can control the electronic media, radio and television; he is also going to issue an order, he says, which will allow those same people that control the electronic media to now control increasingly the print media as well. So if one owns a radio station and a television station in a particular service area, one will be able to own the newspapers in that area as well, thanks to the ruling that Mr. Powell is putting forward as chairman of the Federal Communications Commission.

Mr. Speaker, I think that this is a very dangerous thing. I think it is important for us to do everything that we

can to allow local aspects of communication to take place and local control of media, and diversity in the media and quality in the media. Much of this has been lost as a result of the present consolidation that has occurred over the course of now more than 20 years. Mr. Powell is now going to increase that and make it worse so that there will be less diversity of opinion, less local control, and more consolidation of views in our country. And he has done this, interestingly enough, without proper notice to the public and without adequate public hearings.

Now, one would think that a Federal agency embarking upon such a project would give adequate time for review by the Congress and, more importantly, by the general public. No, Mr. Powell has not conducted his activities in that way. One public hearing outside of Washington, DC was held. That was held conveniently in Richmond, Virginia. It is a very lovely city, but it is just down the road. There were no hearings held in Boston or San Diego or Chicago or Des Moines or Albuquerque or Dallas. No hearings held in other places across the country so that people could have an opportunity to understand what was happening to them, what was happening to the communication media in their country so that they could have an opportunity to react to it appropriately.

So this resolution, Mr. Speaker, which I am offering to the House of Representatives and I am asking my colleagues for their kind support, would call upon the chairman of the Federal Communications Commission to halt what he is doing, to provide for additional public hearings, to give the public ample time to understand what is happening with the communication media in our Nation. Because most of these activities have been below the radar. They have been carried out surreptitiously. They have been carried out in ways so as not to attract attention, and that has been done, I believe, consciously because the perpetrators of this activity have understood that if it attracted public attention, it would also attract public dissent and public opposition.

So we need to be more careful about the way in which the Federal Communications Commission acts. The Federal Communications Commission was set up by legislation passed by this Congress, but this Congress has not exercised its proper jurisdiction over the way the FCC operates. And, as a result, we are seeing this very invidious consolidation of communication which is acting contrary to the best interests of the American people.

PRACTICES OF FEDERAL PRISON INDUSTRIES COSTING AMERICAN JOBS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 2003, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. HOEKSTRA) is recognized for 60

minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Mr. Speaker, tonight I rise to set in context a bill that I introduced with my colleagues, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. FRANK), the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MALONEY), the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. COLLINS), the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. SENSENBRENNER), and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS), along with 98 other cosponsors just before the Easter recess. The bill is H.R. 1829. It deals with an issue of reforming Federal Prison Industries.

Some of our colleagues may ask, what is the importance of this bill? Or, what are you trying to get accomplished? Let me put that in a framework. What is Federal Prison Industries? Federal Prison Industries is a corporation, and many of the documents and many of the talking points that I will be using tonight come out of the annual report, which was just released by Federal Prison Industries within the last couple of weeks. But Federal Prison Industries was established on May 27, 1930 when Congress enacted H.R. 7412. One of the key provisions was to "reduce to a minimum competition with private industry or free labor." On June 23, 1934, this bill was signed into law, authorizing the establishment of Federal Prison Industries.

The key phrase is "reduce to a minimum competition with private industry or free labor." I am going to spend much of the evening talking about what Federal Prison Industries is doing to American workers and American companies. In effect, what Federal Prison Industries is doing is it is costing American workers and American taxpayers all across this country to lose their jobs, even though the underlying statute clearly states, "reduce to a minimum competition with private industry or free labor." Federal Prison Industries and this Justice Department has lost sight of the goal of this legislation and what the role of Federal Prison Industries was intended to be.

Now, some within the Justice Department today may say, this is our contribution to creating high-quality and high-paying jobs in America, and we will get into that in detail also as we go through this process. But the key point here is that when Federal Prison Industries was established, the mandate was you will reduce to a minimum the impact on American workers and free labor and American business.

The message from the current board of directors is very encouraging. It says on page 5 of their annual report, "Our mission is to do so without jeopardizing the job security of the American taxpayer." In 1930, the underlying statute says "reduce to a minimum." In 2003, reporting on their annual report for 2002 it says, "mission is to do so without jeopardizing the job security of the American taxpayer."

□ 1700

If we go a little further, we will start to see where I think we get into some problems.

Mr. Speaker, what we have talked about, laying the context, is in the 1930s up to 2003, the underlying legislation, the board says they should reduce to a minimum the impact on American workers, American taxpayers, their jobs, and free labor.

It is interesting, as we go to the ombudsman message in the annual report. The ombudsman says something different: "so that a balance can be achieved between protecting jobs for Americans while teaching inmates meaningful job skills." A balance.

It is a subtle shift, but it is a shift that FPI has been undergoing for the last 10 years. They have shifted from having a minimum impact on the American workforce to, in a number of different industries, having a devastating impact on American workers.

In Maine at Hathaway Shirts, that closed last year because of contracts, because of Federal Prison Industries going out and claiming contracts that otherwise would have gone to the private sector. Ask the workers at Hathaway Shirts as to whether Federal Prison Industries is having a minimal impact. I think they would tell us very clearly that when someone loses his job and the factory locks its doors, that is not a minimal impact; that is a devastating impact. Their jobs are gone. We have put more inmates to work.

It is outrageous that Federal Prison Industries and this Justice Department is talking about a balance as they are putting American workers out of business. What kind of balance is that? American taxpayers are out of a job and someone is asking for balance. It does not look like there is a whole lot of balancing going on. This Justice Department has no idea as to what a balancing act is when they weigh putting a prisoner to work at the expense of an American taxpayer.

By the way, when Members say, well, it is good to keep prisoners working, there is no debate with that. But what we do not want to do is we do not want to put them to work at the expense of American taxpayers.

On page 24, an interesting fact. They will say they make money for America. Here is what it says in their annual report about taxes: "As a wholly owned corporation of the Federal Government, FPI is exempt from Federal and State income taxes." That is not a bad deal. I wonder what kind of Federal and State income taxes Hathaway Shirts was paying. Of course, they are now out of business.

FPI is exempt from gross receipts taxes, and they are exempt from property taxes. That is an interesting thing. They pay no taxes, and they put Americans out of work. The Justice Department and FPI is looking for a balance. As far as I can see, it is an outrageous balance every time we put an American worker out of a job.