

the Senate. They have said they want to make progress with our gun laws, and they have it within their power to do so.

The Senate-passed juvenile justice bill is not an overreaching statement of where we want to go with gun control. I, for example, believe we should have universal registration and licensing of firearms, and in the next session I will introduce my legislation. I believe we should allow the Federal Government to set safety and consumer standards for guns, and I believe we should ban outright possession of military-style assault weapons. But none of these measures were even discussed in the Senate debate.

The provisions, rather, are very small in our bill. They are reasonable, and they can make a difference in the lives of our children. None of them are controversial, and every one of them, by virtually every poll, has a dominant majority of the American people supporting them. Let me describe what I am talking about.

That bill contains just four commonsense provisions to address gun violence. Does anyone in this Nation truly believe juveniles should be able to buy assault weapons? The answer is going to be no. That is one provision in Senator ASHCROFT's bill which would prohibit juveniles from possessing assault weapons.

Does anyone in this country truly believe the children from Columbine who went to a gun show and bought two assault weapons as juveniles with no information, no data check, no nothing—does anyone believe that loophole should not be closed? I do not believe so.

In Memphis, TN, not too long ago, a 5-year-old took a pistol off his grandfather's bureau and brought it to kindergarten to kill the teacher because the teacher had given that child a timeout the day before. Stories are legion about children mistaking real guns for play guns and shooting their friends.

The third provision is simple. It would require a safety lock with every gun sold. Does anyone believe guns should not be sold without safety locks? I do not believe so.

Finally, there is my provision which would plug a major loophole in the 1994 assault weapons legislation. That legislation, in fact, says you cannot today manufacture, transfer, sell, or possess a clip, drum, or strip of more than 10 bullets manufactured in the United States. That is the law today. The loophole is to permit the foreign importation of these clips, and they are coming into this country by the tens of millions with literally tens of thousands of them in drums of 250 rounds. They come in, as a matter of fact, from the United Kingdom, and they come in from 20 different countries throughout the world.

My provision would simply close that loophole and prohibit the importation. It actually passed the House by unani-

mous consent, and both the Speaker and the chairman of the House Judiciary Committee have assured me personally that they see no problem with it and would support it.

These are the four provisions relating to guns. Other than that, this bill contains countless provisions to stem the tide of youth violence. I sit on the Judiciary Committee. I have worked on this bill. I have worked on it with Senator HATCH. Part of this bill is a gang abatement act. It provides a Federal helping hand to local law enforcement agencies to fight criminal street gangs that are now crossing State lines and moving into so many of the cities of our Nation. You, Mr. President, were mayor of a great city. You know this to be the fact. This is an important part of this legislation.

It also contains the James Guelff Body Armor Act which contains reforms to take body armor out of the hands of criminals and put it in the hands of police. It is named after a San Francisco police officer by the name of James Guelff who went to a call at the corner of Pine and California Streets and came across a Kevlar-clad sniper with thousands of rounds of ammunition and a number of guns. He had a .38 revolver. As he speed loaded his revolver, this officer was shot in the head and killed. It took 150 police officers to equal the firepower of one sniper clad in Kevlar with high-powered weapons.

The Senate bill also establishes a new \$700 million juvenile justice block grant program for States and localities, representing a significant increase in Federal aid to the States for juvenile crime control programs. These programs include additional law enforcement and juvenile court personnel, juvenile detention facilities, and prevention programs to keep juveniles out of trouble before they turn to crime, something both of us know, as past mayors, is vital if we are going to reverse juvenile crime in this country.

The bill encourages increased accountability for juveniles, and it implements a series of graduated penalties that ensure that subsequent offenses are treated with increasing severity, so that if you are going to be a continuing offender, the sentences are going to reflect that.

The bill also reforms juvenile record systems through improved record keeping and increased access to juvenile records by police, courts, and schools, so that a court or school dealing with a juvenile in my State, California, can know if they have committed violent offenses in Arizona, or a juvenile in your State, Ohio, had committed violent offenses in another surrounding State.

It extends Federal sentences for juveniles who commit serious violent crimes.

All of these commonsense provisions now remain in legislative purgatory. I am here to urge, once again, the majority to proceed with the conference, come to a compromise, and move this

bill. That compromise should preserve intact the Senate-passed gun control legislation—four targeted measures—commonsense, reasonable; I call them no-brainers. Every poll shows a dominant majority of Americans supporting each of these. And they represent together a bare minimum of what we should do this year to stem the gun violence that is increasingly common on our streets and in our schools.

School has now been back in session for several months, and this Congress is about to adjourn for the year. So far, it looks as if we are going to be receiving a failing grade from the American people. There is still time to buckle down, to do the work, to pass the test that this Nation gave us so many months ago. What a wonderful Christmas gift it would be for the people of America.

I thank the Chair and yield the floor.
The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. COLLINS). The Senator from Montana.

Mr. BAUCUS. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to speak as in morning business.

Mr. BYRD. Reserving the right to object, and I will not object, would the Senator mind stating how long he wishes to speak?

Mr. BAUCUS. I would be very happy to tell the Senator. Less than 10 minutes.

Mr. BYRD. I have no objection. I thank the Chair and thank the Senator.

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

Mr. BAUCUS. I thank the Senator.

SATELLITE TV ACCESS TO NETWORK PROGRAMMING

Mr. BAUCUS. Madam President, I would like to make a few remarks about a serious problem for people in our country who do not live in our Nation's cities; that is, the loss of satellite TV access to network programming.

We all know that modern technology has made it possible to broadcast TV programming directly from satellites. Nationwide, over 11 million households subscribe to satellite TV. That number increases by over 2 million households every year.

Rural areas have come to depend on network coverage that satellites provide.

In my State, Montana, where over 35 percent of homes depend solely on satellite broadcasting for their TV reception, obviously this development has been a real boon.

While satellite broadcasting has improved the quality of life for folks in rural America, it has not been perfect. Satellite systems have not been able to carry local broadcast stations. So local viewers have not always been able to get local broadcasting.

This is not just a problem for satellite subscribers; it is a problem for local television broadcasters and for the fabric of local communities. Local

broadcasters play a key role in our communities. They provide local news, local weather, and public service programming.

Viewers depend on these local broadcasts to find out what is going on in their community: When the school board, the PTA, and the city council are meeting, or when there is a parade or a fundraiser for their church or a civic group.

Local broadcasters are vital to our communities. They provide jobs, and they allow local businesses to grow through advertising. In short, the importance of local broadcasting is evident in all parts of community life.

Local broadcasters also provide network programming: NBC, ABC, CBS, and FOX. Nineteen of the 20 TV stations in Montana are affiliated with some of these networks or with PBS. These stations air national news, sports, and entertainment at times of the day when people with jobs and kids can watch them.

Without local broadcasts, you might miss the evening network news because it comes on before you get home from work or because it airs late at night. People want local network coverage because it works in their own lives and in their local community.

Until now, technology has not provided for rebroadcast of local signals by satellites. Many rural residents have not been able to get decent reception over the air.

Of course, we in the Senate cannot change technology or geography, but what we can do is change the law. We can make local-into-local broadcasting a reality, and we should.

Last spring, we passed H.R. 1554. At the time, we neglected an important responsibility. The language we passed would have required the turnoff of network programming to many rural satellite viewers. It would have done nothing to help the many local broadcasters in smaller cities and towns. It was an oversight.

Following the vote, I wrote a letter to the conference asking they pay attention to the needs of the many viewers, communities, and stations that had been ignored. Twenty-three of my colleagues, from both sides of the aisle, signed the letter.

As you know, Madam President, the conference on the satellite bill has paid little attention to our request. The language of the conference report, now titled the "Intellectual Property and Communications Omnibus Reform Act of 1999," includes some important new provisions.

It does allow satellite viewers in poor reception areas, the so-called "grade B contour" viewers, to continue to get network programming from satellites. Without this, many satellite viewers will lose their network TV at the end of next month.

It also includes a loan guarantee that will make it possible for all local stations to broadcast on satellite, not just those in the very largest cities and towns.

Without this, the other local-into-local provisions of the act are an empty promise to rural and small town America that depends on satellites.

Last week, the House passed the conference language by a near unanimous vote. But in the Senate, a few Members—and I might say, on the other side of the aisle—are blocking a vote on this conference report. They say: We promise to have more hearings. We should have another committee look at this.

They might as well say: Let them watch the radio.

The Senate should act now to ensure that the conference report language becomes law. It is clear the majority of the Senate is ready to vote to approve the measure, just as the House did. Instead, we are offered a weakened version attached to the omnibus appropriations bill, which we will get sometime soon, and a weak promise to do something next year.

This is a no-brainer. There are many people in rural America who would like to add satellite TV, network programming from their local stations. It is that simple. We have it within our power today to very simply pass a provision and provide for the financing, a loan guarantee. We all know it is going to pass. We all know we are going to do it. But there is one Senator who wants it in his committee. And I say, that one Senator represents a State where there are a lot of people who I think want local-into-local broadcasting from the satellites.

There are millions of Americans who depend on their satellites and want local network coverage—not national network coverage—or at least the option to get both local and national.

This is a no-brainer. I get more mail on this subject than any other subject. I daresay, Madam President, you probably get a lot of mail on this subject, too. I know a lot of Senators probably get as much mail on this one subject as any other. And we can simply solve it today very easily. It makes no sense for us not to.

Madam President, I yield the floor.

NOMINATION OF T. MICHAEL KERR

Mr. NICKLES. Mr. President, I want to make a few comments regarding the nomination of T. Michael Kerr to be Administrator of the Wage and Hour Division of the Department of Labor. I held up this nomination until I could secure an agreement regarding the issue of unauthorized break time from the Secretary of Labor, outlined in a letter I will submit for the RECORD.

The need for this agreement with the Secretary was precipitated by a case pending before the Wage and Hour Division regarding an employee exceeding the allotted time for a rest/period break, and an employer deducting from the employee's compensation the time taken in excess of the break time.

The Fair Labor Standards Act does not require employers to provide its

employees with a rest period/breaks. Nevertheless, many employers offer short breaks to their employees. Although the duration of a voluntary break is up to the employer, the breaks generally run between 5 and 20 minutes.

The Department of Labor does recognize that employers have the flexibility to determine the number of breaks and the length of breaks that they offer to their employees. The Department of Labor has taken the position that when an employer allows its employees to take a short break and an employee abuses the break time policy by exceeding the time that the employer allotted for the break, the employer must still compensate the employee for the first 20 minutes of the break.

Further, the Department of Labor has taken the position that if an employer offers its employees a compensable break of less than 20 minutes in duration, and an employee's break time exceeds the time that the employer allotted for the break, then the employer's only recourse against the employee is disciplinary action (such as a reprimand or termination), or elimination of the rest period.

Under the agreement I reached with the Secretary, the Department of Labor will conduct a complete review of its policy regarding unauthorized breaks. That review will be completed by February 1, 2000. Upon completion of the review, the Department of Labor will submit its findings in writing to the Chairman and Ranking Members of the relevant committees in the House and the Senate. The review will include consideration of what outcome is in the best interest of the employee if the employee exceeds the allotted time of a rest period/break: disciplinary action against the employee (such as a reprimand or termination); elimination of the rest period/break option; or deductions of compensation for the time in excess of the allotted break time.

Also, the Secretary committed the Department of Labor will assure that the resolution of any cases in which unauthorized break times are at issue, will be consistent with the findings in their review.

This is an important review of what is clearly an outdated policy. I look forward to the outcome of their review, and I thank the staff at the Department of Labor for working in good faith with my office, and the Secretary for working to a quick resolution of this issue so this nomination can move forward.

I ask unanimous consent that a letter from the Secretary of Labor be printed in the RECORD.

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