The followimg is a prepared statement. I agree with everything it says. Is is, of course, in reference to the programming decision made by Sinclair in regards to the partisan material they are broadcasting this week. It is unfortunate that there is no legal mechanism at work, right now, forcing the company to offer a truly balanced view.

Sinclair Broadcast Group's recent actions have illustrated the dangers to localism caused by media consolidation.

Sinclair uses the public airwaves free of charge, and is obligated by law to serve the public interest. But when large companies control the airwaves, we get more of what's good for the bottom line and less of what we need for our democracy. Instead of something produced at "News Central" far away, it's more important that we see real people from our own communities and more substantive news about issues that matter.

Sinclair's actions show why we need to strengthen media ownership rules, not weaken them. They show why the license renewal process needs to involve more than a returned postcard. Thank you.