

elected and appointed Government officials.

Observations from our trip provide some important perspectives for consideration in the United States:

Nuclear energy has been implemented in France with strict attention to minimizing environmental consequences. Waste products are reduced at each step in their process.

The French nuclear energy system enables them to achieve world-class standards for minimal environmental impact from power generation. They are justifiably proud of their record. Their carbon dioxide emissions per capita are about one-third those in the United States.

French reliance on a "closed fuel cycle" has enabled recycle and recovery of the energy content of spent fuel while also dramatically reducing the volume and toxicity of waste products below those in the United States with our "open fuel cycle."

Transportation and interim storage of spent fuel are done carefully in France, with virtually no negative impacts. Interim storage is essential in implementing their fuel cycle.

At each site in France, attention to protection of the environment is outstanding. For example, while the United States left corrosive waste from uranium enrichment in tens of thousands of steel casks at places like Paducah, Kentucky and Portsmouth, Ohio, the French have routinely extracted commercial products from the same waste and stored only inert products.

The nuclear industry in France is structured around a closed fuel cycle, which recycles much of their spent fuel. This requires reprocessing of the fuel, a step that the U.S. banned in 1977. That decision by President Carter sought to avoid availability of separated plutonium with its proliferation concerns. The French, along with other countries, were equally concerned about proliferation; but they simply ensured careful safeguards on the plutonium and today are seeking to increase their reuse of plutonium to minimize plutonium reserves. Excellent security and international safeguards were obvious in their facilities.

When the French reprocess spent fuel, they reuse plutonium in mixed oxide or MO_x fuel, consisting of a mixture of plutonium and uranium oxides. Their reprocessing allows the plutonium and uranium to be reused and dramatically reduces the toxicity and volume of their waste below the U.S. open cycle. In contrast, we just plan to bury our spent fuel with no attempt to recycle the valuable energy content of the spent fuel or reduce its volume or toxicity. The resulting waste volume from 20 years of a family of four in France is about 2.5 cubic inches, about that of a pack of cards. And after 200 years, the radiotoxicity of their waste is only about 10% of the value of our spent fuel.

The French have gone to great lengths to educate their public about

nuclear issues, and extensive environmental monitoring information is routinely shared with the citizens from all the activities we saw.

Transportation of spent fuel is required in the French system. But the French have never experienced a radioactive spill in any traffic accident. Simple interim storage is routinely used in France, without the political debates we face in the United States over this necessary step towards a credible fuel cycle.

A 1991 French law prescribed a 15 year period to assess options for disposition of their final waste products, whereas we precluded our options and focused on a permanent repository with the Nuclear Waste Policy Act of 1982. Under this program, they are actively studying further reductions in the toxicity of their waste. We learned that they would welcome strong collaboration in this field with the U.S. The Accelerator Transmutation of Waste program, funded for the first time in the current Energy and Water Appropriations Bill, is one program they singled out for enhanced cooperation.

The French do not justify their closed cycle with economic arguments, instead they point to its sensitivity to environmental issues and the minimal legacy left for future generations. In fact, with uranium prices currently extremely low, the closed cycle may be slightly more expensive than our open cycle, at least in the near term. Partly for that reason, partly because of the large investment required if the U.S. tried to now duplicate the French system, and partly because there are now alternative options to achieve a closed cycle, we do not recommend that the U.S. simply adopt the French closed cycle.

New closed cycle options should be considered driven by technological advances in the decades since the French initiated their system. We believe that these new options deserve evaluation here to enable the U.S. to consider the benefits of a closed fuel cycle. Some of these newer options would provide benefits similar to the French system, plus some would avoid proliferation concerns by never separating plutonium. Some of the new nuclear initiatives funded for next year should explore these attractive options. Almost any of these options, however, require interim storage of spent fuel—our trip only adds to the strength of current arguments for prompt implementation of this simple and important step.

In summary, there are important lessons from the French system for our use of nuclear energy. In the next session of Congress, we look forward to working with you to improve our system, drawing upon these lessons where appropriate.

SCHIZOPHRENIA

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I don't know how many Senators saw an

article in the Washington Post today, in section B of the Washington Post, called "Tears Of Blood." I have the article in front of me. I ask unanimous consent it be printed in the RECORD.

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

[From the Washington Post, July 31, 1998]

TEARS OF BLOOD

(By Megan Rosenfeld)

First there was the gruesome and heart-breaking news of Russell Weston's attack on the U.S. Capitol. Then came word that he is a paranoid schizophrenic, information that resonated for one set of families with unsettling emotions: recognition mixed with horror, and in some cases thankfulness that it wasn't the faces of their sons or sisters flashing across the television screen.

The families of schizophrenics, like those of other seriously mentally ill people, suffer a particular kind of torment. Years of bewildering and sometimes destructive behavior usually precedes a diagnosis; years of false starts or abandoned treatment often follow. Even when a mother or father recognizes mental illness—as opposed to drug addiction, rebelliousness or eccentricity—discovering the legal barriers to involuntary commitment is yet another body blow.

"Parents always feel it's your responsibility to help your children, but we were powerless to help him," says Jacqueline Shannon, whose son Greg began behaving strangely in his last year of college. Now 35, Greg Shannon has been stabilized for more than six years with the drug clozapine—although it took four hospital commitments before that medication was prescribed.

A publication by the Canadian-based Schizophrenia Society lists some of the emotions family members are likely to feel: sorrow ("We feel like we've lost our child"); anxiety ("We're afraid to leave him alone or hurt his feelings"); fear ("Will he harm himself or others?"). They also list shame, bitterness, isolation, anger and "excessive searching for possible answers."

"You want not to be blamed that your family member has become deranged," says David Kaczynski, whose brother, Ted, is notorious as the Unabomber. "And you don't want people to hate your brother or son, to form judgments that are not based on compassion for the fact that this person is mentally ill." There are so many complicated emotions, he said. "You recognize this family member you love is also an enemy."

Kaczynski recalls taking some of his brother's letters to a psychologist in the early 1990s—before he knew that Ted had been mailing lethal bombs—and was told that his brother was very ill and needed treatment. And also that there was very little David could do about that.

For years Ted Kaczynski's primary method of communication with his family was through long, irrational letters, in which he blamed his parents for his loneliness and fears, and even for the fact that he was three inches shorter than David.

"I have got to know, I have GOT TO, GOT TO, GOT TO know that every last tie joining me to this stinking family has been cut FOREVER and that I will never NEVER have to communicate with any of you again," he wrote David in 1991. "I've got to do it NOW. I can't tell you how desperate I am. . . . It is killing me."

It was five years and hundreds of letters later that David, recognizing similarities between things his brother had written and the excerpts from the Unabomber manifesto printed in The Washington Post and the New York Times, went to the FBI, Ted Kaczynski

had never agreed to treatment or to the idea that his mental state was out of his control.

David Kaczynski said he and his mother were greatly comforted by numerous letters they received from other families of the mentally ill—including one from the mother of abortion clinic assassin John Salvi. In fact, Wanda Kaczynski and Ann Marie Salvi had a long telephone conversation, commiserating over the mystifying madness that turned their sons into killers.

Remembering how grateful he was to the people who wrote and told him they knew he loved his brother, David has written Russell Weston's parents. It is not their fault, he told them; they did what they could. "I think they have shown great courage," he said, referring to the numerous interviews the Westons have given explaining the difficulties they had with Russell.

Shannon's son never became violent. Indeed, Kaczynski, Salvi and would-be Reagan assassin John Hinckley are rare explosions in a population of approximately 2 million schizophrenics who, if properly treated with medication and therapy, can lead peaceful if unorthodox lives.

Greg Shannon's problems, which became evident when he was 22, confounded his parents. (Schizophrenia generally surfaces between the ages of 16 and 25, according to research. The illness is characterized by hallucinations and delusions; schizophrenics are unable to differentiate their warped perceptions or obsessive thoughts from reality.) "We are considered educated people," said Shannon, a retired elementary school teacher in San Angelo, Tex. "But mental illness did not occur to us. We thought it had something to do with drugs or alcohol."

Their son would get into irrational arguments with them, stayed in his room for days on end (as did Kaczynski) and seemed to perspire a lot. His college roommate called to say Greg had talked about suicide. "It was a frightening time," his brother Brian recalls.

Like other families, they tried for a while to "normalize" Greg's behavior: He was different, he was going through a rough patch—let him stay in his room if he wants.

Because he was an adult, he could not be forced to see a counselor. But they couldn't get through to him themselves. Finally family members went to the county judge and began the legal process of getting Greg involuntarily committed to a private hospital, which involved affidavits from two doctors. Then one evening the sheriff and a couple of deputies arrived to take Greg Shannon away.

"It was awful," Jackie Shannon says. At the same time, there was some relief. And the process was only beginning.

"The family members are hurt, bewildered and confused," says Moe Armstrong, a paranoid schizophrenic who, with the help of medication and many therapeutic programs, works to help other patients in Massachusetts. Now 54, he had his first breakdown during his four-year hitch in the Marine Corps. His parents, he says, did not understand anything about mental illness. And he no longer blames them. "A lot of us defy rationality. The way our minds work are not the way people's minds work out there. . . . One day this person is all right and the next anything goes."

His advice: "It requires a lot of patience. You can make suggestions, but only one or two, and you have to make them over and over again. Most people want to say to A,B,C,D, tie your shoes, get a job and everything will be all right. They say things like 'take your meds,' but not 'What meds are you taking? What effect are they having?'" Life for the relatives of the chronic mentally ill is often filled with regrets, if not guilt, and the agonized wish they had known more,

and sooner. "I wonder if we had started the commitment process earlier, or if they'd prescribed clozapine earlier if he would have avoided permanent damage," says Brian Shannon, "Maybe not."

One thing all family members share: Having a mentally ill child or sibling changes your life forever. In some cases, as with the Shannons, it has led to volunteer work on behalf of people like Greg. Jackie Shannon is now president of the board of directors of the National Alliance for the Mentally Ill.

Brian Shannon knows that someday he will be responsible for his brother, and consulted a genetic counselor before having a child. David Kaczynski, who works with youthful runaways in a shelter in Albany, N.Y.—as he did before his brother was arrested—faces a lifetime of secondhand notoriety and residual pain.

"I still believe in some way he does love me," he says.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, this is an article that follows on the tragedy that happened here in Washington when a man, 41 years of age, obviously suffering from a very serious disease called schizophrenia, was off his medication and, because of his disease, did the kind of things that have shocked our country and shocked our Capitol. The story is about four or five people in the United States who have family members with the same disease, schizophrenia, and have suffered the consequences of their relative, son or daughter, being off the medication—because there is a propensity on the part of those with this ailment to not want to be on medication. Sometimes it offends them a bit. Sometimes it causes extreme obesity. Sometimes it causes some muscular jittering. But whatever the case, it is hard to keep them on their medication.

I believe we might turn this terrible incident into a constructive response to a very destructive event because, as this article points out, there is little that the parents and relatives can do in their communities to help when they begin to feel the desolation and absolute loneliness when a member of their family, a daughter or son who has this dread disease, decides not to stay on the medication or the medication needs to be changed to be effective. The loneliness is absolutely incredible. As a matter of fact, in this marvelous land of ours, it is fair to say that only in a few places is there any help at all for these people. I don't know how many Americans saw Russell Weston, Sr. and his wife when they met with the press and talked about their son, their son, the 41-year-old who burst through a door here in our Capitol. We all know about the events, and feel great, great sympathy and empathy for the family of the two fallen officers. We have almost been, as a nation, in mourning since that event occurred. And that is as it should be.

Mr. President, I am not going to say much more about this, other than to say that I have worked with the mentally ill in this Nation. I have worked hard to get more and more people to recognize that this is a disease and that we ought to cover this disease

with insurance just as we cover heart failure. That causes some difficulty. Nonetheless, today I don't rise on that score. I merely rise to say: Maybe, maybe this great land of ours, and maybe this institution called the U.S. Senate, and maybe groups across America that are worried about this, might just see if there is a way we can prevent this from happening, if we could prevent it from happening even a couple of hundred times. We frequently see schizophrenics committing acts of murder and degradation, and we all know why it is happening. As a matter of fact, we can almost say with certainty, I say to my friend, Senator BYRD, that if most of those people were on the right medicine they would not be perpetrating these kinds of acts. I hope we would use this to stimulate our collective thinking on what we might do about it.

I don't have the answers. But I have talked to a few Senators. I have talked, in particular, to Dr. FRIST, Senator FRIST from Tennessee, who concurs with me that there is little help available. For, you see, in the case of Mr. Weston, if they wanted him to be taken care of, they had very few options. They could call the police. I think across America it is pretty obvious, police will come by and they will say, "This is a medical problem. We can't help you." They could take him to a hospital. A normal hospital would say, "We can't help you." They could put him in an institution for a few weeks to try to get him back on board and on the medication, but they had already done that.

So this Washington Post article called "Tears of Blood; For Families of Schizophrenics, a Gunman's Shots Strike at Their Hearts" is something we should all take cognizance of.

I hope by these remarks—and some others in this community, I understand, are interested in this—that we will find a way to start meeting together in groups, trying to figure out what should an American response be? Maybe it is a State response. Maybe it is not a Federal response. But we might be the ones to stimulate some real thinking about a responsibility. In this case, we could really be preventers, we could be preventers of serious, serious acts of violence because that can be prevented. It is just we do not help at the time they need help. And we don't have a system set up to provide such help.

I thank the Senator for listening, and, in particular, for giving me a few extra moments this morning. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from West Virginia.

ORDER OF PROCEDURE

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I note on the floor the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma, Mr. NICKLES, who is the assistant majority leader. I wonder if he has a plane to catch? I am sure he may have some Senate business. If he does, I will be happy to defer. I have no

particular time problem myself. I will be glad to defer to the Senator.

Mr. NICKLES. Mr. President, the Senator from West Virginia is so courteous, as usual. I have about a 10- or 15-minute speech, but I will be happy to listen to my colleague and then I will follow my colleague from West Virginia and I thank him, again, for his courtesy.

Mr. BYRD. I thank the Senator.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may be recognized immediately after Mr. NICKLES is recognized, at which time I will proceed with the remarks. I ask unanimous consent that at that time I may consume such time as I may desire, but not to exceed 25 minutes.

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

Mr. NICKLES. Mr. President, again to my colleague, I am more than happy to defer. He is so kind and gracious, as he always is. He sets an example in the Senate, which I think all of us should follow and makes all of us proud to have the title of "Senator."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Oklahoma wish more than 5 minutes?

Mr. NICKLES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak as in morning business for not to exceed 15 minutes.

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

Mr. NICKLES. Again, I thank my colleague from West Virginia for his courtesy. I doubt I will take 15 minutes.

THE ROLE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. NICKLES. Mr. President, I come to the floor today with a very sober, very serious discussion. That concerns the role, the effectiveness, and the job that the Attorney General of the United States is currently doing. The Attorney General, under title 28 of the U.S. Code, section 515, is vested as the chief law enforcement officer of the country. That is a very important vesting of power. She is the chief law enforcement officer of the country. She has the responsibility of making sure the laws are carried out, as part of the executive branch.

Congress, some time ago, realized that every once in a while there might be a conflict of enforcing the law strictly, if there are allegations of impropriety with members of the executive branch, so the independent counsel statute was passed. It was passed as a follow-up to Watergate. Can you really investigate your own boss? Can the Attorney General investigate the President or Vice President or some other Cabinet official because they are serving with those individuals at their pleasure? As a matter of fact, Attorney General Reno was appointed and confirmed by the Senate in, I believe, 1993; and then there was some speculation she would be reconfirmed or re-

appointed by the President, and subsequently she was.

Since that time, I think all of my colleagues, and certainly all the country, know that this administration has had a lot of legal conflicts and problems. One of the biggest issues was the issue of campaign finance. Both the House and Senate have conducted hearings. I presently serve on the Governmental Affairs Committee that conducted an investigation all of last year over alleged campaign finance abuses. The committee, at least amongst the majority of the committee, albeit mostly Republicans, said, yes, there should be an independent counsel appointed. We made that recommendation to the Attorney General. She has ignored that recommendation, and regrettably so.

Mr. President, I might mention a few things. I said she is in charge of making sure the laws are enforced. I am looking at one, and I could spend hours going through the law and stating allegations that I think this administration was in violation of, that she has not enforced, or to give reason for the appointment of an independent counsel so there would not be this conflict of interest. I will mention a couple of laws.

Title 18, section 607, United States Code, states in clear and unequivocal terms:

It should be unlawful for any person to solicit or receive any contribution in a Federal building.

I could go on and mention the conflict of covered persons. Covered persons under this statute are the President, the Vice President. Vice President GORE has now admitted to making 52 fundraising calls from the White House. And the so-called coffees: There were 103 coffees in the White House attended by 1,241 people. They raised \$26.4 million and I think are in direct violation of the statute. President Clinton hosted an average of two coffees per week during the reelection cycle; Vice President GORE attended over 100 coffees in 22 months before the election; 92 percent of the coffee attendees contributed to the DNC in the 1996 election cycle.

I could mention the overnights. President Clinton, in a handwritten note to a memo on January 5, 1995, told his staff he is "ready to start the overnights right away" and asked for a list of \$100,000 and \$50,000 contributors. Altogether, there were 178 guests who were listed as long-time friends, public officials or dignitaries, or Arkansas friends, who contributed over \$5 million to the DNC. Overnight DNC donors paid an average of \$44,000 per family to sleep in the Lincoln Bedroom. The White House was for sale, I think in clear violation of the law, Mr. President.

I will mention a statement that Attorney General Reno made to the House Judiciary Committee on October 15, 1997. I ask unanimous consent that excerpts of Attorney General Reno's statement be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Since they began their work, I have met with them regularly to hear what they have found and to ask them questions. I check on their progress several times a week, discussing with them what evidence they have found and how they are proceeding. Most important of all, I have told them from the start that they are to contact me immediately if they ever believe that the evidence and the law justified triggering the Independent Counsel Statute. I and Director Freeh check with them regularly to insure they have adequate resources.

* * * * *

As I stated then, the fact that we don't trigger a preliminary investigation under the Act does not mean we are not investigating a matter. We are fully prepared to trigger the Independent Counsel Act and pursue any evidence that a covered person committed a crime, if any should arise in the course of our investigation. We continue to investigate every transaction brought to our attention. We will not close the investigation of a matter without Director Freeh and I signing off on its closure.

Mr. NICKLES. Mr. President, keep in mind that was last year, when the campaign investigation was going, and going very strongly. She had this to say concerning the investigation. She was talking about the investigators:

Since they've begun their work, I have met with them regularly to hear what they found and ask them questions. I check on their progress several times a week discussing with them what evidence they have found and how they are proceeding. Most important of all, I told them from the start that they are to contact me immediately if they ever believe that evidence and law justify triggering the independent counsel statute. I and Director Freeh check with them regularly to ensure they have adequate resources.

Later in her statement:

As I stated then, the fact that we don't trigger a preliminary investigation under the act does not mean we are not investigating the matter. We are fully prepared to trigger the Independent Counsel Act and pursue any evidence that a covered person committed a crime if any should arise in the course of our investigation. We continue to investigate every transaction brought to our attention. We will not close the investigation of a matter without Director Freeh and I signing on its closure.

She made a commitment that basically the major decisions would be made by the Attorney General and the FBI Director, former Federal judge, Mr. Freeh. I mention that because evidently Mr. Freeh made a detailed report, evidently a 27-page report, to the Attorney General in November of 1997 calling for an independent counsel. I am not inserting that report in the RECORD. I am going to read a couple of excerpts that Senator THOMPSON made before the Judiciary Committee, where Attorney General Reno testified on July 15 of this year, where he outlined several things that were in Director Freeh's memo.

I will be very quick and maybe I will insert several pages of this in the RECORD. This is Senator THOMPSON talking about Director Freeh's investigation. He pointed out that the FBI's