

want to do in the end things that I enjoy. . . . What does he think life is for? Why is business . . . more important than the acceptance and digestion of ideas? Than the academic life, say, or the artistic? What does it really matter in the end what you do, as long as you are being true to yourself?"

So Mellon changed his life. He gave up banking. He moved to Virginia. He started breeding horses. And then, in 1940, after having spent so many years at Cambridge and at Yale, Mellon went back to school. To St. John's College in Annapolis. To study the Great Books.

(Mellon later gave more than \$13 million to St. John's.)

His path had been determined. Though deflected by World War II—he joined the cavalry, then the OSS—Mellon would continue on it for the rest of his long life. As his friend the mythologist Joseph Campbell might have put it (it was Mellon who published Campbell's "The Hero With a Thousand Faces"), Paul Mellon had determined to follow his own bliss.

He was curious about mysticism, so he studied with Carl Jung. He liked deep, expansive books, so he began to publish the best he could discover. Bollingen Series, his book venture, eventually put out 275 well-made volumes, among them the *I Ching*, Andre Malraux's "Museum Without Walls," Ibn Khaldun's "The Muqadimah," Vladimir Nabokov's translations from Pushkin, and Kenneth Clark's "The Nude."

Because Mellon liked high scholarship, he started giving scholars money. Elias Caetti, who received his Nobel prize for literature in 1981, got his first Bollingen grant in 1985. Others—there were more than 300 in all—went to such thinkers as the sculptor Isamu Noguchi (who was paid to study leisure), the poet Marianne Moore, and the art historian Meyer Schapiro.

Because Mellon liked poetry, he established the Bollingen Prize for poetry. The first went to Ezra Pound, the second to Wallace Stevens.

Mellon loved horses. So he started buying horse pictures. He had had a great time at Cambridge—"I loved," he wrote, "its gray walls, its grassy quadrangles, its busy, narrow streets full of men in black gowns . . . the candlelight, the coal-fire smell, and walking across the Quadrangle in a dressing gown in the rain to take a bath."

Though America's libraries were full of English books, America's museums were not full of English art. It didn't really count. What mattered was French painting and Italian painting. Mellon didn't care. He thought that if you were reading Chaucer or Dickens or Jane Austen, you ought to have a chance to see what England really looked like. Mellon knew. He remembered. "huge dark trees in rolling parks, herds of small friendly deer . . . soldiers in scarlet and bright metal, drums and bugles, troops of gray horses, laughing ladies in white, and always behind them and behind everything the grass was green, green, green." So Mellon formed (surprisingly inexpensively) and then gave away (characteristically generously) the world's best private collection of depictive English art.

He knew what he was doing. As he knew what he was doing when he took up fox hunting, competitive trail riding and the 20th-century abstract paintings of Mark Rothko and Richard Diebenkorn.

He was following his bliss.

He didn't really plan it that way. He just went for it. "Most of my decisions," he said, "in every department of my life, whether philanthropy, business or human relations, and perhaps even racing and breeding, are the results of intuition. . . . My father once described himself as a 'slow thinker.' It ap-

plies to me as well. The hunches or impulses that I act upon, whether good or bad, just seem to rise out of my head like one of those thought balloons in the comic strips."

That wasn't bragging. Mellon wasn't a braggart. He wasn't being falsely modest, either. Mellon knew the value of what it was he'd done.

Mellon was a patriot, a good guy and a gentleman. He had a healthy soul. What he did was this:

With wit and taste and gentleness, with the highest self-indulgence and the highest generosity, he made the lives of all of us a little bit like his.●

NUCLEAR WASTE STORAGE

● Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I rise today to express my commitment to make the Nuclear Waste Storage Bill an early priority during the 106th Congress. More than 15 years ago, Congress directed the Department of Energy (DOE) to take responsibility for the disposal of nuclear waste created by commercial nuclear power plants and our nation's defense programs.

Today there are more than 100,000 tons of spent nuclear fuel that must be dealt with. One year has now passed since the DOE was absolutely obligated under the NWPA of 1982 to begin accepting spent nuclear fuel from utility sites, and DOE is no closer today in coming up with a solution. This is unacceptable. The law is clear, and DOE must meet its obligation. If the Department of Energy does not live up to its responsibility, Congress will act.

I am encouraged that the House of Representatives has begun to address this issue. A bill introduced by Representative FRED UPTON and ED TOWNS of the House's Commerce Committee would set up a temporary storage site at Yucca Mountain, Nevada, for this waste until a permanent repository is approved and built. It is good to see bipartisan cosponsors for a safe, practical and workable solution for America's spent fuel storage needs. This solution is certainly more responsible than leaving waste at 105 separate power plants in 34 states across the nation. There are 29 sites which will reach capacity by the end of 1999. All of America's experience in waste management over the last twenty-five years of improving environmental protection has taught Congress that safe, effective waste handling practices entail centralized, permitted, and controlled facilities to gather and manage accumulated waste.

Mr. President, the management of used nuclear fuel should capitalize on this knowledge and experience. Nearly 100 communities have spent fuel sitting in their "backyard," and it needs to be moved. This lack of storage capacity could very possibly cause the closing of several nuclear power plants. These affected plants produce nearly 20% of the United States' electricity. Closing these plants just does not make sense.

Nuclear energy is a significant part of America's energy future, and must remain part of the energy mix. Amer-

ica needs nuclear power to maintain our secure, reliable, and affordable supplies of electricity at the same time the nation addresses increasingly stringent air quality requirements. Nuclear power is one of the best ways America can address those who say global warming is a problem—a subject I'll leave for another day.

Both the House and the Senate passed a bill in the 105th Congress to require the DOE to build this interim storage site in Nevada, but unfortunately this bill never completed the legislative process. I challenge my colleagues in both chambers of the 106th Congress to get this environmental bill done. The citizens, in some 100 communities where fuel is stored today, challenge the Congress to act and get this bill done. This nuclear industry has already committed to the federal government about \$15 billion toward building the facility. In fact, the nuclear industry continues to pay about \$650 million a year in fees for storage of spent fuel. It is time for the federal government to live up to its commitment. It is time for the federal government to protect those 100 communities.

To ensure that the federal government meets its commitment to states and electricity consumers, the 106th Congress must mandate completion of this program—a program that includes temporary storage, a site for permanent disposal, and a transportation infrastructure to safely move used fuel from plants to the storage facility.

Mr. President, this federal foot dragging is unfortunate and unacceptable, so clearly the only remedy to stopping these continued delays is timely action in the 106th Congress on this legislation.●

RECOGNITION OF NATHAN SCHACHT

● Mr. GORTON. Mr. President, I rise today to commend and congratulate Nathan Schacht of Walla Walla, Washington, who was awarded the rank of Eagle Scout rank, the Boy Scout of America's highest honor, on January 19, 1999.

Nathan is the son of Don and Margaret Schacht and a sophomore at DeSales Catholic High School. He began scouting five years ago with the Eastgate Lions Troop 305 and moved onto the Cub Scout program with Pack 309.

Nathan and I share a common love for the outdoors. During his tenure with the Boy Scouts he logged over 70 miles of hiking and 70 miles of canoeing; earned the 50 Miler Afloat award; camped 63 nights and earned 31 merit badges. He recently completed his term as Senior Patrol Leader for Troop 305. He has been a member of the Order of the Arrow since 1996 and was awarded his Eagle Cap Credentials in 1997.

His Eagle project involved building a recycling center for Assumption Elementary School. He spent over 115 hours planning and carrying out this

project which included contacting donors for the materials and working with the volunteers in all phases of the project. He secured over \$700 in donated materials and 261 hours of volunteer time.

Nathan also participates in other activities in his school and community. He participates in the football, basketball, and golf programs at DeSales High School, as well as band, drama and National Honor Society. He has served as a page in the Washington State House of Representatives and as an altar server for the past seven years at Assumption Catholic Church.

I am confident that Nathan will continue to be a positive role model among his peers, a leader in his community and a friend to those in need. I extend my sincerest congratulations and best wishes to him. His achievement of Eagle Scout and significant contributions to the Walla Walla community are truly outstanding. •

ON THE MOTIONS TO OPEN TO THE PUBLIC THE FINAL DELIBERATIONS ON THE ARTICLES OF IMPEACHMENT

• Mr. LEAHY. In relation to the earlier vote, I have these thoughts. Accustomed as we and the American people are to having our proceedings in the Senate open to the public and subject to press coverage, the most striking prescription in the "Rules of Procedure and Practice in the Senate when Sitting on Impeachment Trials" has been the closed deliberations required on any question, motion and now on the final vote on the Articles of Impeachment.

The requirement of closed deliberation more than any other rule reflects the age in which the rules were originally adopted in 1868. Even in 1868, however, not everyone favored secrecy. During the trial of President Johnson, the senior Senator from Vermont, George F. Edmunds, moved to have the closed deliberations on the Articles transcribed and officially reported "in order that the world might know, without diminution or exaggeration, the reasons and views upon which we proceed to our judgment." [Cong. Globe Supp'l, Impeachment Trial of President Andrew Johnson, 40th Cong., 2d Sess., vol. 4, p. 424.] The motion was tabled.

In the 130 years that have passed since that time, the Senate has seen the advent of television in the Senate Chamber, instant communication and rapid news cycles, distribution of Senate documents over the Internet, the addition of 46 Senators representing 23 additional States, and the direct election of Senators by the people in our States.

Opening deliberations would help further the dual purposes of our rules to promote fairness and political accountability in the impeachment process. I supported the motion by Senators HARKIN, WELLSTONE and others to suspend

this rule requiring closed deliberations and to open our deliberations on Senator BYRD's motion to dismiss and at other points earlier in this trial. We were unsuccessful. Now that we are approaching our final deliberations on the Articles of Impeachment, themselves, I hope that this secrecy rule will be suspended so that the Senate's deliberations are open and the American people can see them. In a matter of this historic importance, the American people should be able to witness their Senators' deliberations.

Some have indicated objection to opening our final deliberations because petit juries in courts of law conduct their deliberations in secret. Analogies to juries in courts of law are misplaced. I was privileged to serve as a prosecutor for eight years before I was elected to the Senate. As a prosecutor, I represented the people of Vermont in court and before juries on numerous occasions. I fully appreciate the traditions and importance of allowing jurors to deliberate and make their decisions privately, without intrusion or pressure from the parties, the judge or the public. The sanctity of the jury deliberation room ensures the integrity and fairness of our judicial system.

The Senate sitting as an impeachment court is unlike any jury in any civil or criminal case. A jury in a court of law is chosen specifically because the jurors have no connection or relation to the parties or their lawyers and no familiarity with the allegations. Keeping the deliberations of regular juries secret ensures that as they reach their final decision, they are free from outside influences or pressure.

As the Chief Justice made clear on the third day of the impeachment trial, the Senate is more than a jury; it is a court. Courts are called upon to explain the reasons for decisions.

Furthermore, to the extent the Senate is called upon to evaluate the evidence as is a jury, we stand in different shoes than any juror in a court of law. We all know many of the people who have been witnesses in this matter; we all know the Republican Managers—indeed, one Senator is a brother of one of the Managers; and we were familiar with the underlying allegations in this case before the Republican Managers ever began their presentation.

Because we are a different sort of jury, we shoulder a heavier burden in explaining the reasons for the decisions we make here. I appreciate why Senators would want to have certain of our deliberations in closed session: to avoid embarrassment to and protect the privacy of persons who may be discussed. Yet, on the critical decisions we are now being called upon to make our votes on the Articles themselves, allowing our deliberations to be open to the public helps assure the American people that the decisions we make are for the right reasons.

In 1974, when the Senate was preparing itself for the anticipated impeachment trial of former President Richard

Nixon, the Committee on Rules and Administration discussed the issue of allowing television coverage of the Senate trial. Such coverage did not become routine in the Senate until later in 1986. In urging such coverage of the possible impeachment trial of President Nixon, Senator Metcalf (D-MT), explained:

Given the fact that the party not in control of the White House is the majority party in the Senate, the need for broadcast media access is even more compelling. Charges of a 'kangaroo court,' or a 'lynch mob proceeding' must not be given an opportunity to gain any credence whatsoever. Americans must be able to see for themselves what is occurring. An impeachment trial must not be perceived by the public as a mysterious process, filtered through the perceptions of third parties. The procedure whereby the individual elected to the most powerful office in the world can be lawfully removed must command the highest possible level of acceptance from the electorate." (Hrg. August 5 and 6, 1974, p. 37).

Opening deliberation will ensure complete and accurate public understanding of the proceedings and the reasons for the decisions we make here. Opening our deliberations on our votes on the Articles would tell the American people why each of us voted the way we did.

The last time this issue was actually taken up and voted on by the Senate was more than a century ago in 1876, during the impeachment trial of Secretary of War William Belknap. Without debate or deliberation, the Senate refused then to open the deliberations of the Senate to the public. That was before Senators were elected directly by the people of their State, that was before the Freedom of Information Act confirmed the right of the people to see how government decisions are made. Keeping closed our deliberations is wholly inconsistent with the progress we have made over the last century to make our government more accountable to the people.

Constitutional scholar Michael Gerhardt noted in his important book, "The Federal Impeachment Process," that "the Senate is ideally suited for balancing the tasks of making policy and finding facts (as required in impeachment trials) with political accountability." Public access to the reasons each Senator gives for his vote on the Articles is vital for the political accountability that is the hallmark of our role.

I likewise urge the Senate to adjust these 130-year-old rules to allow the Senate's votes on the Articles of Impeachment to be recorded for history by news photographers. This is an momentous official and public event in the annals of the Senate and in the history of the nation. This is a moment of history that should be documented for both its contemporary and its lasting significance.

Open deliberation ensures complete accountability to the American people. Charles Black wrote that presidential impeachment "unseats the person the