

using the resources of the communities in the States in which the Federal Government is doing business and costing those taxpayers money because of their presence, I think they owe those States, and those counties and local governments, their fair share of the property tax burden.

Another important program funded through the Interior appropriations bill is the Bureau of Land Management Oil and Gas Management Office. This is the office that is responsible for the leasing and permitting of onshore oil and gas wells. Throughout the West, there are very long delays in processing these permits, solely because the Bureau of Land Management lacks the staff to do it.

I have been told that each month of delay getting these wells on the line means that 28 million cubic feet of gas is not reaching the market. I believe that is critical. It is important to the Western States, but it is critical to the overall good of this country. Again, I commend the chairman for seeing the need and addressing the issue in this particular bill. But it concerns me when one considers the constrained supply and high prices all of our constituents are facing. So I am hopeful that down the line, we will be able to find some additional funding for these activities.

A program that is new to the Interior appropriations bill this year is the State and Tribal Assistance Grant Program, often called STAG. Just over \$2.5 million in STAG funds will be going to Colorado. The nice thing about this program is that it is based on grants, so for those communities that have true needs, that money is going to be available to them.

This program helps communities around the country fund upgrades to their drinking water treatment systems. It is especially important to small communities that have severely aging infrastructure and are disproportionately impacted by increases in requirements and water standards. We have gone through a recent change in water standards that is having a disproportionate impact on some of the smaller communities that I represent in the State of Colorado.

I would also mention a number of projects that are funded throughout this bill that are important to me and to the State of Colorado. These projects are not locale-designated projects. In other words, not one community or one county necessarily benefits, but they do tend to benefit a larger geographical area. As I go through these, I think you will begin to understand what I am trying to accomplish.

We get a lot of requests as Members of the Senate from specific cities and specific counties wanting projects designated specifically for their area. But I have tried to keep these generally spread out because then the entire State of Colorado benefits. There are a lot of needs out there.

We set aside some money for the High Elk Corridor. It is a migration

route for elk, and it is important in central Colorado, so we have set some money aside for that. The Platte River fish recovery project—this is for the entire drainage system of the south Platte and also the north Platte. It affects, actually, more States than just Colorado. It is an attempt to restore endangered species within the drainage system so the Endangered Species Act doesn't come into play in a way that impacts property rights, which is a very important issue as far as Western States are concerned.

I also have some money here for the Upper Colorado Fish Recovery Program. This is the Colorado River drainage system. Not only does it help the State of Colorado, but other States that are on the Colorado River, because we are trying to sustain an endangered fish population in that river system so that our water users do not get disproportionately impacted.

We have some money in there to complete a conservation easement on the Banded Peaks Ranch, and funds for the Colorado Canyons conservation area. We want to help sustain the conservation efforts there.

It is projects such as these that benefit the public as a whole, and I am pleased we were able to secure funding for them.

Finally, before closing, I again thank the full committee chairman and ranking member, Senators COCHRAN and BYRD, and the majority and minority leader for bringing this bill to the floor so quickly. Again, I also recognize the diligent effort by Senator BURNS and his ranking member, Senator DORGAN. This is the first appropriations bill we have up on the Senate floor this year. It reflects their hard work and commitment to getting us through this session in a timely way.

I believe it is very important that Congress meet its responsibilities to pass funding bills before the end of the fiscal year. I think that continuing resolutions and omnibus bills tend to be messy, and an inappropriate way to go about fulfilling our responsibilities to fund the Federal Government. I am pleased we seem to be on track to pass the appropriations bills on time this year.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Montana.

AMENDMENT NO. 1010

Mr. BURNS. Mr. President, on behalf of Senator VOINOVICH, I call up amendment No. 1010, which relates to Indian gaming.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Montana [Mr. BURNS], for Mr. VOINOVICH, proposes an amendment numbered 1010.

Mr. BURNS. I ask unanimous consent the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To prohibit the use of funds to take certain land into trust without the consent of the Governor of the State in which the land is located)

On page 254, after line 25, add the following:

SEC. 4 . . . None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to take land into trust on behalf of an Indian tribe for the specific purpose of gaming without the consent of the Governor of the State in which the land is located.

Mr. BURNS. Mr. President, I think that is about the only amendment that we have to be offered in today's business. We have kind of run our trap lines. Senator DORGAN?

Mr. DORGAN. I don't know of any amendment also intended to be offered today. I do know we have had some colleagues talking to us about amendments they wish to offer on Monday, but at least on this side, I know of no amendments to be offered for the remainder of the day. My understanding about the amendment the Senator has just laid down on behalf of Senator VOINOVICH is we are not going to dispose of that amendment at this point. We have some issues we need to discuss. We will begin to think about action on that on Monday; is that right?

Mr. BURNS. That is correct. We will huddle on that, on this amendment and others that will be coming to the floor later on.

Mr. DORGAN. I ask unanimous consent to speak for as long as I continue.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is recognized.

Mr. DORGAN. I will not speak for a lengthy time, but I wanted to thank my colleague from Montana as he leaves. He will be back on Monday as we take up this bill again, and I look forward continuing to work with him. We put together a pretty decent bill.

As I indicated previously, this bill actually cuts by \$½ billion, slightly more, spending over the previous year. So it has been a chore to get this done because of the substantial cuts. But the Senator from Montana has been good to work with.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. BURNS. I ask unanimous consent that we now have a period of morning business with Senators permitted to speak for up to 10 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

CUBA POLICY

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, I do wish to mention two issues before we complete today. I talked a few moments ago about a soldier who is trying to see his sick children in Cuba. I put in a call to Secretary Snow to see if we can't make that happen. I will not go through all of that again. But, again, it is unbelievable to me that we are penalizing this soldier, who has earned a Bronze Star and is an American citizen who wants to see his sick child in

Cuba, and penalizing him because we are upset with Fidel Castro.

PUBLIC BROADCASTING

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, I want to make a comment today about actions taken yesterday by the Corporation for Public Broadcasting. I have spoken about this on the floor of the Senate previously. Let me describe just a bit of the history here.

I read some while ago that Mr. Kenneth Tomlinson, who is the Chairman of the Board of the Corporation for Public Broadcasting—again, Chairman of the Board of the Corporation for Public Broadcasting, was making the case publicly that public broadcasting has a liberal bias. He was relentlessly making the case that public broadcasting has a liberal bias—public television, public radio, and so on. Maybe he thinks Big Bird is a Republican—or a Democrat. Maybe he thinks the Cookie Monster goes to precinct meetings someplace for some political party or other. I have no idea what he thinks. Frankly, he was concerned about Bill Moyers, who was doing a program called “NOW.” He was sufficiently concerned about that, having made allegations that there is a liberal bias in the public television, that he hired a consultant to do an evaluation of the program that Bill Moyers does.

This consultant was paid for with public funds. So I wrote Mr. Tomlinson and I said: You believe there is a liberal bias here with public broadcasting. You have paid taxpayers’ monies to have a consultant—who himself, by the way, is a partisan—a consultant to evaluate a specific set of programming. I would like the results of that.

So he sent me the raw data, which is about I think maybe 70 pages. It is a rather large stack of raw data—no summary. So I called him back and said: I really want the summary. There wasn’t a summary, he said. He said he is making a summary, preparing a summary. He said he would have it to me, I think, a week ago now. And I have not yet received the summary, but the raw data was interesting. At least in portions, this program was evaluated, by a particular consultant who himself was a partisan, as is Mr. Tomlinson, the raw data was evaluating segments in public television, particularly in the NOW program, on whether they were anti-Bush or pro-Bush. Anti-Bush, anti-Bush, anti-Bush. Apparently the lens or prism through which they are evaluating public broadcasting was: Do they support the President or not?

One was interesting. For example, in one case, it was labeled “antidefense” because it was a program about waste in the Pentagon. My colleague from Oklahoma talked about waste a little earlier. He said there is a lot of waste in the Pentagon. If you talk about waste in the Pentagon, you, apparently, are “antidefense.” Unbelievable.

I mentioned previously, my colleague, Senator CHUCK HAGEL from Ne-

braska, a red-blooded American patriot who served this country, a Republican conservative, by all accounts, who serves in the Senate, someone with whom I am proud to serve, was on one of the programs. He apparently said something that was at odds with the President’s policy, so he was labeled a “liberal.” Yes, my friend, CHUCK HAGEL, conservative Republican Senator from Nebraska, is labeled liberal because he was on public broadcasting and said something at odds with the policy of the Bush administration. Unbelievable.

Anti-Bush, anti-Bush, liberal, antidefense. What an unbelievable thing to have done to hire a partisan consultant to evaluate for a liberal bias in public broadcasting.

Is Big Bird a Democrat? What a weighted question.

So Mr. Tomlinson, Chairman of the Board of the Corporation for Public Broadcasting, was not only embarking on this effort to prove an allegation he had been making—that is, there is a liberal bias in public broadcasting—but also working to put in a new president of the Corporation for Public Broadcasting.

So who does Mr. Tomlinson want as the head of the Corporation for Public Broadcasting? The former Co-Chair of the Republican National Committee. Yes, that is right.

You say, well, that cannot be.

Of course, that is exactly right. In fact, that person was just hired in a split vote by the Board of Directors of the Corporation for Public Broadcasting. It is unbelievable.

The Chairman spends his time alleging the organization he heads has a liberal bias, hires a partisan to try to prove it, to put together work papers that come from evaluating programming, and then embarks on an effort to decide there should be a former Co-Chair of the Republican National Committee to run the Corporation for Public Broadcasting.

I don’t know, maybe it is hard to take a level look when you are a partisan. But public television has a program that deals with the Wall Street Journal editorial board. No one would suggest the Wall Street Journal editorial pages are anything other than solid, hard-rock Republican. No question about that. They don’t pretend. There is no veil over their secrecy about their politics. That is what they are.

They have a program on public broadcasting with Tucker Carlson. I don’t know Tucker Carlson. I don’t know Tucker Carlson from a block of wood. He wears a bow tie. He is a conservative Republican, and so they hire him to do a program. I think he has just left. It is not as if public broadcasting has not had conservative voices. They are just upset with the “NOW” program by Bill Moyers. Why are they upset with Bill Moyers? Let me give one example.

Public broadcasting tackles subjects others will not tackle. One subject is

the concentration of media ownership in this country. What has happened with the radio and television industry is it has been gobbled up into huge packages. One company owns 1,200 radio stations. The Federal Communications Commission, under pressure from the broadcast industry, was going to change the rules on ownership, and they did. Pressure from the publishers, pressure from the television, pressure from the radio industry. The Federal Communications Commission did the most complete cave-in to corporate interests I have ever seen in my life. They have new ownership rules that say, *totus porcus*, you can own everything. Here is what they said in the rules: In the largest city in this country, or in the largest cities, it is okay for one company to own eight radio stations, three television stations, the dominant newspaper, and the cable company. That is all fine. That is nirvana.

That is absolutely nuts. Yet that was the rule the FCC came up with. Majority party, representing the interests of the President, says this is what we are doing. We will allow more concentration in broadcasting so that four, five, or six people will largely control what the American people see, hear, and read.

Guess what. A Federal appeals court decided they were going to stay those rules. Three-quarters of a million people wrote to the FCC saying, do not do this. It was the largest outpouring of letters I can recall. The FCC did it anyway, caved in to the corporate interests, and the Federal court stayed the rules, it went up to the Supreme Court, the stay was not lifted and it is back to the FCC to do over. We will see whether they cave in, once again, or whether the public interest might prevail.

My point of telling that story is this: Bill Moyers did stories on this issue about the concentration in the broadcasting industry. Do you think anybody else was interested in doing big stories about this? Do you think CBS would do a story about that? Or FOX? Or ABC? Or NBC? Not on your life, because they are the beneficiaries of those policies. They want to be bigger. They want more. They think it is fine if you live in one city, that one company will call the tune on information. One company will own eight radio stations, three television stations, the newspaper, and the cable company. They think that is fine.

You are not going to see stories as you peruse the television dial about this subject from the major companies. They will not do it. Guess who did it. Bill Moyers, on a program called “NOW.” Did that upset some people? I suppose, sure. They do not like that. But the fact is, public broadcasting has been independent. It was created as the independent source of news, oblivious and impervious to the pressures and partisan wins.

So the “NOW” program does a couple of programs on concentration of broadcasting and they collect a firestorm of