

march toward easing media ownership rules.

The FCC has taken a series of destructive actions in the past two decades that, I believe, have undermined the public interest. Now they appear prepared to do it again. The FCC is working to have a rewrite of media ownership rules completed just next month. Now this seems like a massive rush to me and a big mistake. How will the public interest be served by attempting to rush through a plan to relax ownership rules?

We don't need more concentration of ownership in radio and television stations and a green light for cross ownership between newspapers, radio and television stations. Further consolidation of media ownership at all is an affront to common sense. But even if we disagree with the rules the FCC issues, and even if we think the FCC should break up the big media companies rather than allow them to consolidate, the FCC must go through an honest and thorough process. They must study the questions that affect a decision of whether to adjust ownership limits. They have not done this. They have not put the final rules out for comment for a meaningful amount of time, they have not given the necessary consideration to the issue of localism, and they do not know enough about the impact of consolidation on localism or female and minority ownership.

The Media Ownership Act of 2007 ensures that the FCC allow enough time for comment on the actual rule changes. It requires that the FCC put out the final rules proposed by the Commission for 90 days of comment.

The bill also requires that the FCC complete a separate proceeding on the promotion of local programming and content by broadcasters and newspapers. In 2003, Chairman Powell set up a task force to promote localism in broadcasting and they began some hearings and took in comments. Chairman Martin has wrapped those comments into this ownership proceeding and is finishing the last localism hearing as part of this rushed schedule. The bill requires that they must publish a final rule in a separate proceeding and allow 90 days of comment. This must be completed prior to the vote on ownership.

The bill requires that the FCC establish an Independent Panel on Ownership by Women and Minorities. The FCC must collect and provide this panel with data on the specific gender and ethnic makeup of media owners. The panel shall issue recommendations and the FCC must act on these recommendations prior to a vote on media ownership.

The last time the FCC tried to do rush to consolidate media ownership, the United States Senate voted to block it. On September 16, 2003, the Senate voted 55-40 to support a "resolution of disapproval" of the FCC's previous decision to allow further concentration. If we have to do this again

we will. A number of us have sent numerous letters to the FCC stating what needs to be done prior to a vote on media ownership limits and yet the Chairman is on track to move this proceeding to a vote. The FCC is clearly not listening and legislation is now necessary.

This is again a bipartisan effort to stop the FCC from destroying the local interests that we have always felt must be a part of broadcasting.

It is time to ensure that we first protect localism and diversity, which the FCC appears to have long forgotten. Only then can we really review the rules of media ownership in a thorough process to see if it is actually in the public interest to reverse any of those rules, or if greater public interest protections are necessary.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be placed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the text of the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 2332

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Media Ownership Act of 2007".

SEC. 2. MEDIA OWNERSHIP REFORMS.

Section 202 of the Telecommunications Act of 1996 (Public Law 104-104; 110 Stat. 110) is amended by—

(1) redesignating subsection (i) as subsection (l); and

(2) by inserting after subsection (h) the following:

“(i) NOTICE AND PUBLIC COMMENT REQUIREMENT.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—In modifying, revising, or amending any of its regulations related to broadcast ownership, including any ownership rule or limitation set forth under sections 73.3555, 73.658(g), or 76.501 of its regulations (47 C.F.R. 73.3555, 73.658(g), 76.501), the Commission shall—

“(A) not later than 90 days prior to any vote by the Commission on the adoption of such modification, revision, or amendment publish such prospective modification, revision, or amendment in the Federal Register;

“(B) after such publication provide the public at least 60 days on which to comment on the prospective modification, revision, or amendment; and

“(C) upon the expiration of the 60-day comment period described under paragraph (2), have not less than 30 days in which to reply to any such comments.

“(2) EFFECTIVE DATE.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The notice and public requirements under paragraph (1) shall apply to any attempt by the Commission to modify, revise, or amend its regulations related to broadcast and newspaper ownership made after October 1, 2007.

“(B) FAILURE TO COMPLY.—If the Commission fails to comply with the notice and public requirements under paragraph (1) with respect to any modification, revision, or amendment to which such requirements apply, then such modification, revision, or amendment shall be vitiated and shall be of no force and effect.

“(j) PROMOTION OF LOCAL CONTENT IN MEDIA.—Before voting on any change in the broadcast and newspaper ownership rules, the Commission shall initiate, conduct, and

complete a separate rulemaking proceeding to promote the broadcast of local programming and content by broadcasters, including radio and television broadcast stations, and newspapers. Before issuing a final rule, the Commission shall—

“(1) conduct a study to determine the overall impact of television station duopolies and newspaper-broadcast cross-ownership on the quantity and quality of local news, public affairs, local news media jobs, and local cultural programming at the market level;

“(2) publish a proposed final rule in the Federal Register not later than 90 days prior to any vote by the Commission on the adoption of the rule;

“(3) after such publication provide the public at least 60 days on which to comment on the prospective rule; and

“(4) upon the expiration of the 60-day comment period described in paragraph (3), have not less than 30 days in which to reply to any such comments.

“(k) INDEPENDENT PANEL ON WOMEN AND MINORITY OWNERSHIP OF BROADCAST MEDIA.—

“(1) ESTABLISHMENT.—The Commission shall establish and convene an independent panel on women and minority ownership of broadcast media to make recommendations to the Commission for specific Commission rules to increase the representation of women and minorities in the ownership of broadcast media.

“(2) CENSUS.—The Commission shall—

“(A) conduct a full and accurate census of the race and gender of individuals holding a controlling interest in broadcast station licensee;

“(B) provide the results of the census to the panel for its consideration before it makes any recommendation to the Commission; and

“(C) study the impact of media market concentration on the representation of women and minorities in the ownership of broadcast media based on the data in the census and report the results of that study to the panel for its consideration before it makes any recommendation to the Commission.

“(3) CONSIDERATION OF PANEL'S RECOMMENDATIONS.—The Commission shall act on the panel's recommendations before voting on any changes to its broadcast and newspaper ownership rules.”.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 371—EX-PRESSING THE SENSE OF THE SENATE REGARDING THE ISSUANCE OF STATE DRIVER'S LICENSES AND OTHER GOVERNMENT-ISSUED PHOTO IDENTIFICATION TO ILLEGAL ALIENS

Mr. COLEMAN (for himself, Mrs. DOLE, Mr. MCCONNELL, Mr. LOTT, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. DEMINT, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. CHAMBLISS, Mr. VITTER, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. BURR, Mr. BOND, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. COBURN, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. GREGG, Mr. ALLARD, and Mr. CORKER) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. RES. 371

Whereas some States issue State driver's licenses to aliens who are unlawfully present in the United States;

Whereas by providing official government-issued identification to individuals who are in the United States illegally, States and

other government entities reward those who show disrespect and disregard for Federal immigration laws;

Whereas the very act of entering the United States illegally shows disrespect for the laws of the United States and should not be rewarded in any way; and

Whereas issuing driver's licenses to undocumented individuals presents a national security risk and enables election fraud: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That it is the sense of the Senate that States should not issue driver's licenses or other photo identification to aliens who are unlawfully present in the United States.

Mr. COLEMAN. Mr. President, I thank the majority leader. A few months ago, I stood on the floor of the Senate to decry the practice of sanctuary cities. Municipalities across this country had identified a loophole in the law and banned the practice of police officers inquiring about a suspect's immigration status, allowing cities throughout this country to become sanctuaries for illegal immigrants.

I said that following the attacks of 9/11, we made a promise to the American people to make this country safer; that we identified, on all levels, cracks in our system; and that we found when the left arm doesn't know what the right arm is doing, the consequences can be disastrous.

I stand here today again to condemn another policy that flies in the face of post-9/11 thinking. The State of New York will join eight other States in issuing driver's licenses to illegal immigrants. New Mexico is setting up a program where they will doublecheck the illegal immigrant's identity with the Government of Mexico.

Polish language newspapers have advertised the ease by which licenses from the State of Maine can be acquired. Tennessee recently stopped the practice of issuing driver's licenses to illegal immigrants in the wake of evidence that illegal immigrants from other States were coming to Tennessee to get licenses.

To some, issuing licenses to illegal immigrants may seem harmless, if not commonsensical. If they are going to be driving on the streets, why not ensure that they know the rules of the road? The answer is licenses are much more than a permit to drive. The driver's license is a gateway document to a myriad of other services. Providing illegal immigrants with a driver's license affords them access to bank accounts, airline flights, and other resources that the 9/11 hijackers used to attack this Nation. Beyond national security, driver's licenses allow a person to enter a Federal building, vote in elections, and apply for Government benefits. There is also a considerable question of fraud—when we cannot verify the materials brought to the Department of Motor Vehicles to establish a person's identity, which is certainly the case when we are dealing with noncitizens in an illegal status, you open the doors to corruption, multiple identities, and criminality.

In the Senate, we have been grappling for several years with the issue of

what to do with the 12 million or so undocumented people already in the United States. This Senator would like to find a solution that brings these folks out of the shadows. But the message we have received loudly and clearly from the American public is we cannot get the comprehensive immigration reform until we secure the borders and get serious about enforcing the rule of law when it comes to immigration.

Similar to sanctuary cities, the issuance of driver's licenses to illegal immigrants is a setback for those who want to see comprehensive immigration reform because it shows we are not serious about enforcing the law. It flies in the face of what the American people expect their Government to do, which is to control our borders, know who is in the country, and appropriately penalize those who have broken our laws.

I was at a coffee this morning with a columnist, Tom Friedman, a native Minnesotan, who addressed a group today. Immigration came up, and he said in passing that to deal with the illegal immigration, he is for a wall but one with a big gate. We need to remain a country that is open to foreign talent. We benefit from having those with Ph.D's and advanced degrees and what they bring in terms of job creation. We need to look at the issue of immigration and at changes in our laws to encourage the best and brightest to come and contribute to our economy. Until we reestablish the rule of law in immigration policy, we will not be able to get the political consensus that is needed to make any reforms, let alone deal with the 12 million illegals here already.

Sooner rather than later, America is going to have to ask itself: Do we want to take immigration and the State of our Nation's security seriously? To the States that issue licenses to illegal immigrants and the cities that have sanctuary city policies on the books, we must ask the question: Why are you undermining immigration laws at the expense of the safety and security of this country?

Today I am joined by several of my colleagues in introducing a sense-of-the-Senate resolution to make the official position of the Senate that States that issue government identification to illegal immigrants, issue driver's licenses, are disrespecting and disregarding Federal immigration laws. The measure also finds these actions present a national security risk and enables election fraud.

Our colleague, Iowa Congressman TOM LATHAM, has introduced identical legislation in the other body.

I am a former mayor. I am, frankly, deeply concerned, that if there is another attack on U.S. soil and we find that the terrorist was here illegally, if the terrorist was able to obtain a license, if the terrorist was able to move freely about the country, was able to open a bank account, all without the

slightest bit of resistance, we are going to have to take a long look in the mirror and ask how we could let it happen. We shouldn't let it happen. It belies common sense to have a policy of States to issue driver's licenses to illegal immigrants. It makes it difficult to maintain the commitment we have to the American people, that we are committed to enforcing the rule of law. It makes it difficult for us who want to move forward on comprehensive immigration reform if we get to that point.

SENATE RESOLUTION 372—EX-PRESSING THE SENSE OF THE SENATE ON THE DECLARATION OF A STATE OF EMERGENCY IN PAKISTAN

Mr. KERRY (for himself, Mr. BIDEN, Mr. OBAMA, Mr. CASEY, and Mr. DURBIN) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

S. RES. 372

Whereas a democratic, stable, and prosperous Pakistan that is a full and reliable partner in the struggle against Al Qaeda and the Taliban and a responsible steward of its nuclear weapons and technology is a vital national security interest of the United States and essential to combating international terrorism;

Whereas General Pervez Musharraf became the President of Pakistan following a military coup in October 1999;

Whereas President Musharraf dismissed Pakistan's Chief Justice of the Supreme Court, Iftikhar Chaudhry, on March 9, 2007, resulting in massive street protests and a unanimous decision by the Supreme Court of Pakistan to clear him of any wrongdoing and reinstate him on July 20, 2007;

Whereas the Government of Pakistan announced on September 18, 2007, that, if re-elected President of Pakistan, General Musharraf would resign his position as Chief of Army Staff of Pakistan by November 15, 2007;

Whereas the Prime Minister of Pakistan, Shaukat Aziz, called this announcement "a clear reflection of President Gen. Pervez Musharraf's firm belief in democracy";

Whereas an amendment to the Constitution of Pakistan allowing President Musharraf to hold the Government of Pakistan's top civilian and military leadership positions expires on December 31, 2007;

Whereas President Musharraf and former Prime Minister of Pakistan Benazir Bhutto conducted extensive negotiations on a power-sharing arrangement that would allow Ms. Bhutto to return to Pakistan and lead the Pakistan People's Party in parliamentary elections in Pakistan scheduled for January 15, 2008;

Whereas President Musharraf was elected to another term by the lame-duck parliament and provincial assemblies of Pakistan on October 6, 2007;

Whereas the Supreme Court of Pakistan has been reviewing the constitutionality of this election and intended to issue a ruling in November 2007;

Whereas former Prime Minister of Pakistan Nawaz Sharif returned to Pakistan on September 10, 2007, and was immediately forced to leave the country in contradiction of a ruling by the Supreme Court of Pakistan;

Whereas former Prime Minister Bhutto returned to Pakistan on October 18, 2007, after