

taken to bring it into compliance, and when it will be in compliance.

“(q) The Under Secretary for Nuclear Stewardship shall keep the Secretary, the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives, the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate, the Committee on Governmental Affairs of the Senate, the Committee on Commerce of the House of Representatives, the Select Committee on Intelligence of the Senate, and the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence of the House of Representatives fully and currently informed regarding any actual or potential significant threat to, or loss of, national security information, unless such information has already been reported to the Senate Select Committee on Intelligence and the House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence pursuant to the National Security Act of 1947, as amended.

“(r) Personnel of the Agency for Nuclear Stewardship who have reason to believe that there is a problem, abuse, violation of law or executive order, or deficiency relating to the management of classified information shall promptly report such problem, abuse, violation, or deficiency to the Under Secretary for Nuclear Stewardship.

“(s)(1) The Under Secretary for Nuclear Stewardship shall not be required to obtain the approval of any officer or employee of the Department of Energy, except the Secretary, or any officer or employee of any other Federal agency or department for the preparation or delivery of any report required by this section.

“(2) No officer or employee of the Department of Energy or any other Federal agency or department may delay, deny, obstruct or otherwise interfere with the preparation of any report required by this section.

“(t) For purposes of this section—

“(1) the term ‘personnel of the Agency for Nuclear Stewardship’ means each officer or employee within the Department of Energy, and any officer or employee of any contractor of the Department (pursuant to the terms of the contract), whose—

“(A) responsibilities include carrying out a function of the Agency for Nuclear Stewardship; or

“(B) employment is funded primarily under the—

“(i) Weapons Activities; or

“(ii) Nonproliferation, Fissile Materials Disposition or Naval Reactors portions of the Other Defense Activities budget functions of the Department;

“(2) the term ‘nuclear weapons production facility’ means the following facilities—

“(A) the Kansas City Plant, Kansas City, Missouri;

“(B) the Pantex Plant, Amarillo, Texas;

“(C) the Y-12 Plant, Oak Ridge, Tennessee;

“(D) the tritium operations facilities at the Savannah River Site, Aiken, South Carolina;

“(E) the Nevada Test Site, Nevada; and

“(F) any other facility the Secretary designates.

“(3) the term ‘national security laboratory’ means the following laboratories—

“(A) the Los Alamos National Laboratory, Los Alamos, New Mexico;

“(B) the Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory, Livermore, California; and

“(C) the Sandia National Laboratories, Albuquerque, New Mexico, and Livermore, California.

“(u) The Agency for Nuclear Stewardship shall comply with all applicable environmental, safety, and health statutes and substantive requirements. The Under Secretary for Nuclear Stewardship shall develop procedures for meeting such requirements. Nothing in this section shall diminish the authority of the Secretary to ascertain and ensure that such compliance occurs.

“(v) The Secretary shall be responsible for developing and promulgating departmental secu-

rity, counterintelligence and intelligence policies, and may use his immediate staff to assist him in developing and promulgating such policies. The Under Secretary for Nuclear Stewardship is responsible for implementation of all security, counterintelligence and intelligence policies within the Agency for Nuclear Stewardship. The Under Secretary for Nuclear Stewardship may establish agency-specific policies unless disapproved by the Secretary.

“(w) In addition to any personnel occupying senior-level positions in the Department on the date of enactment of this section, there shall be within the Agency not more than 25 additional employees in senior-level positions, as defined by title 5, United States Code, who shall be employed by the Agency for Nuclear Stewardship and who shall perform such functions as the Under Secretary for Nuclear Stewardship shall prescribe from time to time.”.

“(d) Within 180 days of the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall report to the Senate and the House of Representatives on the adequacy of the Department’s procedures and policies for protecting national security information, including national security information at the Department’s laboratories, nuclear weapons facilities and other facilities, making such recommendations to Congress as may be appropriate.

“(e) The following technical and conforming amendments are made:

“(1) Section 5314 of title 5, United States Code, is amended by striking ‘Under Secretary, Department of Energy’ and inserting ‘Under Secretaries of Energy’ (2), one of whom serves as the Director, Agency for Nuclear Stewardship’.

“(2) Section 202(b) of the Act is amended in the third sentence by striking ‘Under Secretary’ and inserting ‘Under Secretaries’.

“(3) Section 212 of the Act is amended by striking subsection 212(b) and redesignating subsection 212(c) as subsection 212(b).

“(4) Section 309 of the Act is amended by striking ‘Assistant Secretary to whom the Secretary has assigned the functions listed in section 203(a)(2)(E)’ and inserting ‘Under Secretary for Nuclear Stewardship’.

“(5) The table of contents of the Act is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 212 the following new item:

“Sec. 213. Agency for Nuclear Stewardship.”.

Mr. SHELBY. Mr. President, I ask consent that the Senate insist on its amendment, request a conference with the House, and the Chair be authorized to appoint conferees on the part of the Senate.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ABRAHAM) appointed Mr. SHELBY, Mr. CHAFEE, Mr. LUGAR, Mr. DEWINE, Mr. KYL, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. HATCH, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. ALLARD, Mr. WARNER, Mr. KERREY of Nebraska, Mr. BRYAN, Mr. GRAHAM of Florida, Mr. KERRY of Massachusetts, Mr. BAUCUS, Mr. ROBB, Mr. LAUTENBERG, and Mr. LEVIN; from the Committee on Armed Services, Mr. WARNER, conferees on the part of the Senate.

Mr. SHELBY. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

ORDER OF PROCEDURE

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, under the previous order, I am to reclaim the floor, is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, on the juvenile justice bill, the reason why I have encouraged the leadership to move as quickly as they are able to—and I say, in regard to what the distinguished Senator from Mississippi said earlier, I also know if he were to make the same request I made, he could face an objection. What I am urging is that we find a way to move forward because to have the full impact in the United States of our juvenile justice bill, which passed by a 3-to-1 margin in the Senate, we have to get it on the President’s desk in its final form before the August recess so there is some chance of moving before school goes back in this fall. All of us, whether we are parents, grandparents, teachers, or policymakers, have been puzzling over the causes of children turning violent in our country.

Certainly all of us in our lifetimes have seen random acts of violence somewhere in the country. I don’t think any of us have seen the severity or the number, almost a regularity, of violence we are seeing today. The root causes are likely multifaceted, and we know that. But the Hatch-Leahy juvenile justice bill is a firm and significant step in the right direction. Passage of this bill shows when the Senate rolls up its sleeves and gets to work, we can make significant progress. But that progress amounts to naught if the House and Senate do not conference and proceed to final passage on a good bill.

Once conferees are appointed, there will be another point in the legislative process where we will have to roll up our sleeves to work out differences between the House- and Senate-passed legislation.

Every parent in this country is concerned this summer about school violence over the last 2 years. They are worried about the situation they are going to confront this fall. Each of us wants to do something to stop that violence. There is no single cause and there is no single legislative solution that will cure the ill of youth violence in our schools or on our streets. But we have an opportunity before us to at least start to do something, to do our part. Now, it is unfortunate we are not moving full speed ahead to seize this opportunity to act on balanced, effective juvenile justice legislation.

We should not repeat the delays that happened in the last Congress on the juvenile justice legislation. In the 105th Congress, the Senate Judiciary Committee reported juvenile justice legislation in July 1997, but then it was left to languish for over a year until the very end of that Congress. In fact, serious efforts to make improvements to this bill did not even occur until the last weeks of that Congress, when it was too late and we ran out of time.

The experience of the last Congress causes me to be wary of this delay in action on this legislation this year. I want to be assured that after the hard work so many Senators put into crafting a juvenile justice bill, that we go to a House-Senate conference that is fair, full, and productive. We have worked too hard in the Senate for a strong, bipartisan juvenile justice bill to simply shrug our shoulders when the House returns a juvenile justice bill rather than proceeding to a conference. I will be vigilant in working to maintain this bipartisanship and to press for action on this important legislation.

To this end, I circulated yesterday to the distinguished chairman of the Judiciary Committee the unanimous consent request that I made. It lays out a simple road map for us to proceed to a juvenile justice conference before the August recess and before the new school year begins. I understand the unanimous consent request cannot be accepted tonight, but if we could accept this, or a form of it, this is what it would do:

We would take up the House juvenile justice bill, H.R. 1501; we would substitute the Hatch-Leahy bill, S. 254, amended to eliminate the provision banning the import of high-capacity ammunition clips; pass the bill as amended; request a conference with the House; instruct the conferees to include in the conference report the eliminated provision on high-capacity ammunition clips—put it back in, because parliamentarily it would be allowed—and we would authorize the Chair to appoint conferees.

The fact that the House returned the Senate juvenile justice bill to us is not an insurmountable obstacle to get to conference on this important issue. This unanimous consent—or a form of it—would lay out a simple procedure for us to get to conference promptly, and the majority has the power to say: We agree, let's go to conference.

We know only too well that when it is something that has the commercial interests of Y2K liability protection, we can go over what seem to be insurmountable obstacles and enact legislation into law. There is no commercial interest. There is certainly far more. It is the safety of our children. It is allowing our children to have a youth. It is allowing our children to go to school, as we did, in safety. It is allowing our children to learn, to be young people, and not to be forced to grow up in violence.

It is a gift we could give to the children of America. It is something we could do before they go back to school. It is something we should do.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. LEAHY. Yes.

Mrs. BOXER. It is a very brief question.

I have just gone over with my colleague and some of our staff the fact that the House sent this bill over 3

weeks ago. We did our work. They did their work. And when our friend, the majority leader, says we are dragging our feet, we certainly didn't drag our feet on the juvenile justice bill.

I ask my friend if he agrees that we have not dragged our feet on that bill and that we have acted as we should. God knows, we want to make sure we do something to make things better.

As I see it, on June 23, 1999, this bill was placed on the calendar. No one is dragging their feet on this bill. Both Houses have done their work, and it is time to move forward to avoid another tragedy.

I ask my friend if he agrees with that.

Mr. LEAHY. The Senator from California is correct. We have moved very quickly on it. I hope we do not run into the situation that happened last year. We spent a lot of time on the juvenile justice bill, and then it languished and languished after coming out of committee. It sat so long that by the time we got to it, the time of the session ran out. In fact, the end of the Congress ran out.

Here we are not right at the end of a Congress, but we are facing a school year, and we should begin.

I promised the distinguished senior Senator from New Hampshire that I would wrap up. I believe I have wrapped up.

Mr. GREGG. I thank the Senator from Vermont.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SMITH of Oregon). The Senator from New Hampshire.

DEPARTMENTS OF COMMERCE, JUSTICE, AND STATE, THE JUDICIARY, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2000

Mr. GREGG. Mr. President, I ask the Chair to lay before the Senate Calendar No. 153, the fiscal year 2000 Commerce, Justice, and State appropriations bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative assistant read as follows:

A bill (S. 1217) making appropriations for the Departments of Commerce, Justice, and State, the Judiciary, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2000, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. GREGG. Mr. President, I bring before the Senate today, on behalf of myself, the Senator from South Carolina, and members of the Appropriations Committee, the bill to fund the Departments of Commerce, Justice, and State, the judiciary, and related agencies, which I want to spend some time discussing.

But before I do that, let me begin by thanking, for the extraordinary amount of work and effort that they put into this bill, my staff and the staff of the Senator from South Carolina. They have put in so many hours. It is incredible. They spent evenings here.

They spent nights here. And they spent weekends here, all at the expense of their families. I, for one, am extraordinarily appreciative of that.

PRIVILEGE OF THE FLOOR

Let me mention a few folks. I ask unanimous consent that all of these people be granted full floor privileges during the consideration of this bill.

Jim Morhard, of course, who is the clerk of the staff and chief operating officer, Paddy Link, Kevin Linskey, Eric Harnischfeger, Clayton Heil, Dana Quam, Meg Burke, Vas Alexopoulos, Jackie Cooney, Brian McLachlan, Lila Helms, Emelie East, and Tim Harding. These folks work incredible hours. We very much appreciate it.

Mr. President, this bill recommends a total of \$35.3 billion in spending for the fiscal year 2000. The bill provides, however, \$918 million less than was appropriated in fiscal year 1999.

In fact, if you include in it the fact that we have had the significant increase in the amount of money that is being spent on the census over what was spent last year, because we are headed into a census period, the real reduction below last year's spending in this bill is closer to about \$2.6 billion. It is, of course, significantly less than the President's request.

Much of this reduction, however, from the President's request, is the result of the fact that we decided not to fund advanced appropriations, something I very much oppose, and I think is bad policy. The President included in his budget request advanced funding requests of considerable amounts. We simply did not proceed with those.

In fact, his advanced funding initiatives covered 6 years out. So I hope the President won't be putting out press statements that we are "denying" him something. When we get to those years, we will take a hard look at his request and, hopefully, be able to address them in a way that we can agree on them, should we all be in our present positions.

The Committee chose not to add a great deal of money for many of the President's requests that are new initiatives. We instead took a very strong, fiscally conservative approach. We stay within our budget allocation, which was \$918 million below last year's level.

The Administration's proposed programmatic spending increased by 29.5 percent over last year's enacted budget. We decided that was a mistake. Ironically, considering the amount of the increase, the President's budget still underfunded what we considered to be critical functions of these agencies under our jurisdiction.

Specifically, the Border Patrol was underfunded by \$185 million; and targeted programs that the Committee relies upon, such as the State and local law enforcement block grants, cut by \$522 million; juvenile crime funding by \$250 million; and State prison grants by \$665 million. These were all reductions in the President's budget, even though the President's budget was a high number.