

With a few improvements to the House-passed or to the Senate-passed bills we can get this job done for rural America.

We need to make sure that the federal guarantee can cover providing high-speed Internet access to rural Americans. As long as we are going to help finance a satellite we should get the biggest benefit out of it by having it also help break down the digital divide.

Also, some of the bill provisions consist of such atypical, and onerous, credit requirement that I do not think that any lenders will want to participate.

I have two basic concerns with the proposed language, and have serious concerns about the extraneous House provisions on cell telephones and the like.

I also understand through lobbyists that efforts are being made to include language that would take away FCC authority to approve the new "Northpoint" technology that could provide local-into-local television in many areas of the country. My understanding is that some of the satellite providers are concerned that Northpoint could compete with them.

In terms of the credit provisions of the bill, I am worried that potential borrowers may have long-term existing contractual obligations or security agreements whose contract terms would be abrogated by this law if they were to participate in this loan guarantee program.

If they received a guaranteed loan under the bill, their lenders could pull back existing credit lines for violating their contracts by complying with the new law.

With respect to the default language, even a minor default could lead to liquidation which would reduce the ability of the United States to protect its own interests and, in addition, could trigger unnecessary defaults on loans or projects which the borrower may have with the United States, or other lenders.

The additional problem with the superpriority bankruptcy language is that it is a backdoor "taking" of property because it would take the property rights of creditors that have other prior perfected security interests in the borrower's property.

These contract property rights—which would be destroyed after the fact—could be very valuable and the bill could take them away.

Mr. President, I have provided language to most interested offices some months ago to resolve these points which may appear at first blush to be technical but, in fact, could make it impossible for this program to work.

I have also proposed language to ensure that rural Americans are able to receive high-speed Internet access under this bill. The section on prerequisites for the loan does not list high-speed Internet access as a purpose for the guarantee.

I recommend adding "high-speed Internet access" to that section so that

the Board could approve a guarantee which would include that purpose, as a secondary consideration.

I have pointed out before on the Senate floor that, "computers are on a development path that improves performance by a factor of 10 every five years," according to Scientific American.

However, without high-speed linkage of these constantly improving computers rural America will be left behind.

In America, there is a growing disparity between the digital "haves" and "have-nots" as portions of our society get left behind at the same lightning pace at which the Internet develops.

I would like the bill changed so that we can close the "digital divide" that keeps rural America from fully participating in America's economic boom under President Clinton.

I know that some are fighting to keep this disparity—but this disparity between rural and urban America is self-defeating as the Internet becomes an increasingly important thread of our business and social fabric.

So I hope all my colleagues will join with me in working together to get this program in operation before Congress goes out of session.

#### APPROPRIATIONS—INTERIOR AND RELATED AGENCIES

Mrs. LINCOLN. Mr. President, I rise today to talk about the Interior Appropriations Bill for fiscal 2001 and our efforts here in the Senate to enact the Conservation and Reinvestment Act to provide permanent funding for land, water, and wildlife conservation programs in this nation.

With the passage of the Interior Appropriations Bill for fiscal year 2001, we have taken a step in the right direction toward providing a permanent conservation fund for this nation—but it is only a step.

The Interior Appropriations bill funds many important programs and projects in Arkansas including refurbishing the historic Hot Springs National Park Bathhouses, constructing a visitors center at the White River National Wildlife Refuge, and funding needed construction and maintenance at recreation areas in the Ouachita National Forest.

The bill also increases the funding for the Land and Water Conservation Fund, Payments in Lieu of Taxes, Urban and Historic Preservation programs, State Conservation grants. And needed funding for tackling the maintenance backlog in our nation's park system. But it leaves many of the programs that we have pushed for in the Conservation and Reinvestment Act out completely. Specifically, it leaves out a permanent stream of funding for wildlife conservation and education programs.

By establishing a permanent funding source for state based wildlife programs, we can take steps now to prevent species from becoming endan-

gered. This would enable us not only to conserve the significant cultural heritage of wildlife enjoyment for the people of this country, but also to avoid the substantial costs associated with recovery for endangered species. In fact, all 50 states would benefit as a result of the important link between these wildlife education-based initiatives and the benefits of wildlife-related tourism.

CARA also would have provided a permanent funding source for rural community assistance and development funds, historic preservation, urban parks, conservation easements, and restoration of National Parks. These provisions would annually provide almost \$3 billion nationwide for land, water, and wildlife conservation programs and include over \$25 million in funding for Arkansas.

The 2001 Interior Appropriations bill is an important step toward providing for the conservation of this nation's land, water, and wildlife, but we can do so much more. We must not let this opportunity slip away to enact what may well be the most significant conservation effort of the century. I strongly urge my colleagues to continue to work toward passage of the Conservation and Reinvestment Act.

#### CONCEALED GUN LICENSES

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, in recent years, lobbyists for the National Rifle Association, NRA, have been pressing state legislatures around the country to pass so called "shall issue" laws. "Shall issue" laws require that licensing authorities shall or must issue concealed weapons permits to those who meet standard eligibility requirements. The state laws take discretion away from local law enforcement agencies, who would ordinarily use their own criteria to determine who should carry a concealed weapon.

When such a law was proposed in my home state of Michigan, every major law enforcement organization in the state spoke out against it. Athletes, entertainers, religious leaders and some lawmakers joined them in their public plea to keep concealed firearms off our streets. In the end, although both the State House and Senate passed the "shall issue" legislation, lawmakers yielded to public pressure and refused to proceed to a conference committee, thereby rejecting the law.

While Michigan's citizens acted quickly to ensure that lawmakers rejected the NRA backed proposal, other state legislatures embraced the law as their own. This week the Los Angeles Times published an extensive report on the effects of the relatively new law that gives Texans the right to carry concealed weapons into public places, including churches, hospitals, nursing homes, and amusement parks. The Times story reveals that since the "shall issue" law's inception in 1995,