

us, guiding us, encouraging us, and above all, joining us together so that we can move confidently towards the goal that he was setting, and make this world a safer place for his grandchildren and ours and the children yet unborn. Thank you, Alan, for being who you were. Thank you.

CRUZ REYNOSO. I once read that 'The most powerful weapon on earth is the human soul on fire.'

Alan's soul was always on fire for the welfare of those in need, for the strength of our democracy, for human dignity, and for a world at peace.

It must have been 1959 or 1960 when my wife and I, with others from the El Centro Democratic Club from Imperial Valley (the center of the world) traveled to Fresno for the annual convention of the CDC, Council of Democratic Clubs. A featured speaker was Alan Cranston. To this day, I remember being inspired—he spoke of the role of government in helping the disadvantaged, of the need for economic democracy, of the right we all have in equal protection and fairness, and government's responsibility in protecting those rights, and of our responsibility to be active participants. That a person with his soul on fire for those ideals I held dear could actually be elected to state wide office was, to me, a marvel and inspiration. I never forgot.

A decade later I found myself as director of California Rural Legal Assistance. CRLA was the leading legal services for the poor. Many entrenched interests, including the state government, found themselves on the loosing side of many lawsuits CRLA brought on behalf of its clients—farmworkers, Medical recipients, working poor. Those interests fought back. Alan worked closely with CRLA to protect our professional independence and assure our continued existence. As I saw it, there was little political gain for Alan—it was his devotion to fairness and to the concept of human dignity that brought us together. Eventually, it was President Nixon who overrode the state veto of CRLA, thereby saving legal services.

And years later Alan's son, Kim, I and countless others joined Alan in our mutual efforts to register thousands of new voters, an effort to include all in our democratic society.

Not all efforts were on a grand scale. My last, and still ongoing task, has been to represent a prisoner who is in Soledad for a life term. Alan was convinced that the prisoner was fully rehabilitated. He called to see if I could help. My associate, Tom Gray, and I worked with Alan. We will continue.

Not all was work. I remember those wonderful conversations as we dined in the Senate restaurant. Once, Alan invited me to a marvelous San Francisco eatery. At the end of the evening Alan invited me to join his Washington, D.C. office in a position of considerable responsibility. Unfortunately, I could not accept the offer, but the food had been great.

Alan's interest went beyond prison walls or the fifty United States. His efforts have sought peace for this globe. John Amos Gomenius, the Czech Religious and Educational leader wrote about 350 years ago:

"We are all citizens of one world, we are all of one blood. To hate a man because he was born in another country, he speaks a different language, or because he takes a different view on this subject or that, is a great folly . . . Let us have one end in view, the welfare of humanity."

Alan's soul was always on fire—for the welfare of an individual human being—or the welfare of all humanity.

JONATHAN GRANOFF. My name is Jonathan Granoff. I've had the privilege of working with Senator Cranston on the abolition of

nuclear weapons with Lawyer's Alliance for World Security, with the State of the World Forum, with the Middle Powers Initiative, and most recently, with the Global Security Institute.

Recently, some journalists from Japan were here in the beginning of December interviewing Senator Cranston, and I was there, and they asked me what I did as the CEO of the Global Security Institute. So I said, and I meant this, when a tree is ripe with fruit, an intelligent person will sit beneath the tree and gather the sweet fruit. Alan is still giving us fruit. And Alan's example of being a true human being is the sweetest fruit that we could be given, because Alan taught by seamlessly integrating the highest human values with his daily life.

He exemplified decency and elegance in action. He lived without prejudice. People say they live without prejudice; Alan didn't say it, he just lived it. He didn't harbor any doubts or suspicions about others, he never engaged in backbiting or any pettiness, and he was tranquil in the midst of an extraordinary dynamism, like a smooth, powerful river.

He was full of grace. Alan Cranston remains for us a statesman in a state of grace. His grace was exemplified in the ease he had in the midst of conflict, because that ease rested on a real faith in the intrinsic goodness of humanity. Because he had found that goodness in himself, and for those of us who had the privilege of working with him, we know that's how he got us to do things, because we knew that he never asked anybody to do anything he wouldn't do; he's the guy who would be up at two in the morning, and then up again at six-thirty.

Adversaries were only so as to the issue at hand, but never as to the person, because Alan honored everyone. His inner clarity and strength was coupled with this unique ability, and even desire, to hear everyone's point of view, not as a political ruse, but because Alan honored everyone.

Alan understood fully two icons his parents did not have that we inherited from the Twentieth Century. The first is the awesome, horrific mushroom cloud arising from science and the quest for unbridled power, unreined by morality, law and reason, and the other icon is the picture of the planet from outer space, borderless, majestic, alive and sacred.

Alan honored all life by holding the second icon before him, and that is why he focused most intensely on the nuclear issue, because that and that alone can end all life on the planet, and it becomes the moral standard of our civilization. I had the privilege of traveling with Alan and going all over the world working on this issue, and one of the amazing things I would forget how old he was, because his body got old, but he didn't. He had found that secret of the joyous heart, he had found that place of tranquility in action.

George Crile is a CNN and 60 Minutes producer, beloved, very beloved of Alan, and he has put together some footage to give us all a sense of what it's like to be on the road with Alan Cranston.

[video insert]

Death is such a mystery, and the only comfort is the love that we bring to our lives, and the faithfulness with which we carry forth the mission that great men have given us. Alan, we will follow in your loving memory. We will stay the course. We will be vigilant until nuclear weapons are abolished.

We are guided by the philosophy that you held with you.

Lao-Tzu:

A leader is best  
When people barely know  
That he exists,  
Less good when

They obey and acclaim him,  
Worse when  
They fear and despise him.  
Fail to honor people  
And they fail to honor you.  
But of a good leader,  
When his work is done,  
His aim fulfilled,  
They will all say,  
"We did this ourselves."

Senator Cranston sought no honor for himself. He honored life itself through his service. Together and with your help, we will follow in his large footsteps, and on the day when the work is done, the aim fulfilled, we will know that we did not do it alone. Thank you, Alan. May God give you infinite peace, infinite bliss, infinite love, Amen.

ALAN JONES. We've come to the end of a deeply felt tribute to a great soul. And any celebration of a great soul confronts us with choices. And so I offer this final blessing.

There are only two feelings. Love, and fear. There are only two languages, love and fear. There are only two activities, love and fear. There are only two motives, two procedures, two frameworks, two results. Love and fear. Let us choose love.

The eye of the great God be upon you, the eye of the God of glory be upon you, the eye of the son of Mary be on you, the eye of the spirit be on you to aid you and shepherd you, and the kindly eye of the three be on you to aid you and shepherd you and give you peace, now and always, Amen.

#### ADMINISTRATION ACTS TO STALL ENVIRONMENT RULES

MR. REID. Mr. President, there has been much talk by the President and other members of the Administration about developing a comprehensive energy strategy that will help avert national supply shortages and protect the environment.

I hope we'll all work together on a balanced approach. That is a laudable goal. However, it seems the Administration may already have begun backpedaling or backslicing away from the bipartisan rhetoric and the environmental gains that we've recently made.

One matter, in particular, bothers me. That is the subject of dirty diesels and the recently issued EPA rules to clean up that source of pollution.

I would like to put in the RECORD a copy of a letter that I have just received from a broad coalition of groups that is concerned about the fate of this rule. They fear that the rule and its benefits to the public's health may be delayed or even withdrawn entirely. It's an impressive group that the Administration should heed.

I understand that the Administrator is considering acting to delay the implementation of the final rule to cut down on emissions from heavy-duty diesel engines and reduce sulfur in diesel fuel. In addition to the fact that this potential action and others already taken by agencies to delay recently issued rules to protect the environment do not appear to comply with the Administrative Procedures Act, it's just plain bad policy.

On December 18, 2000, EPA promulgated a final rule that mandates a 97 percent reduction in the sulfur content of diesel fuel by September 2006, from

approximately 300 to 15 parts per million.

The rule also requires that diesel engines emissions get much cleaner. They must reduce particulate matter and nitrogen oxide emissions by 90 and 95 percent, respectively, from today's levels. As a result, diesel vehicles will finally be on par with emissions from gasoline vehicles.

The public health and environmental benefits from this rule will be tremendous. Quantified benefits are expected to total \$70.3 billion by 2030 when the new, cleaner fleet of vehicles is fully phased in. This rule means fewer hospital admissions, probably less lung cancer, and major reductions in other respiratory illnesses and premature deaths.

I don't begrudge the Administration time to review existing laws and regulatory requirements. But, there is a legal and substantive process to be followed, not a political one. This rule has already been through that wringer and should not be further delayed.

Thus far, we have been willing to work with the President on his nominees and have not delayed their confirmations unduly. Now it is time for the Administration to reciprocate. Administration actions to delay rules with major public health and environmental benefits will pollute that atmosphere of good will.

Mr. President, I ask consent that the letter be printed in the RECORD.

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

FEBRUARY 8, 2001.

Hon. CHRISTINE TODD WHITMAN,  
*Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, Washington, DC.*

DEAR ADMINISTRATOR WHITMAN: We, the undersigned, represent an unusually diverse coalition of groups united in our strong support of the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency's December 21, 2000 final rulemaking that sets onroad heavy-duty diesel emission and fuel standards. Together, we write to you today to urge that this extremely important regulation be upheld, intact.

The rulemaking process that produced this regulation was not only extensive, it was thoughtful and inclusive. We are very pleased that the result is a comprehensive program that most responsibly takes full advantage of the opportunity to reduce a wide variety of diesel emissions by applying a systems approach that sets aggressive engine standards and, necessarily, a commensurately low cap on sulfur in diesel fuel. The framework established under this rule which includes a particulate matter standard of 0.01 grams per brake horsepower-hour (g/bhp-hr) to take full effect in 2007, a nitrogen oxide standard of 0.20 g/bhp-hr to be phased in between 2007 and 2010 and a national cap on sulfur in diesel fuel of 15 parts per million, to take effect June 1, 2006 represents a critical and delicate balance that will help enable the successful achievement of a 90-percent reduction in particulate matter emissions, a 95-percent reduction in nitrogen oxide emissions and a 97-percent reduction in levels of sulfur in highway diesel fuel. These reductions will translate into enormous public health and environmental benefits all across the nation.

We are proud to have contributed to the open process that led to this landmark rule

and equally proud, and supportive, of the result. Each of us now looks forward to doing our respective part to implement the important programs that have been established, so that our nation can begin to reap the benefits on schedule. To this end, we urge you not to allow this rule to be delayed or, in any way, compromised. Rather, we look to you to ensure that the rule will be upheld, intact. In addition, we request an opportunity to meet with you at your earliest convenience to discuss the vital importance of this rule to our respective organizations.

Sincerely,

Alliance of Automobile Manufacturers; American Lung Association; Association of International Automobile Manufacturers; Association of Local Air Pollution Control Officials; California Trucking Association; Clean Air Network; International Truck and Engine Corporation; Manufacturers of Emission Controls Association; Natural Resources Defense Council; Northeast States for Coordinated Air Use Management; Sierra Club; State and Territorial Air Pollution Program Administrators; U.S. Public Interest Research Group; and Union of Concerned Scientists.

Mr. LIEBERMAN. Mr. President, I rise to express my concern regarding the possibility that the Bush administration will delay the effective date of the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency's December 21, 2000 final rulemaking that sets onroad heavy-duty diesel emission and fuel standards—also known as the diesel/sulfur rule.

This rule, the result of years of work and negotiations, would provide essential protections for the public health and the environment by drastically reducing emissions from diesel engines. It is sorely needed. Heavy-duty vehicles are significant contributors to elevated levels of ozone, fine particulate matter, and the primary emissions of several key toxic air pollutants, particularly in the Northeast. Together, highway and non-road heavy-duty engines are responsible for roughly 33 percent of all nitrogen oxide emissions, 75 percent of motor vehicle related PM, and 60 percent of aldehyde emissions in the northeast corridor. In addition to fouling our air, diesel exhaust has also been classified as a probable human carcinogen by the National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health (NIOSH), the International Agency for Research of Cancer and the US EPA.

This rule will greatly reduce the health and environmental risks resulting from these pollutants, with a projected 90-percent reduction in particulate matter emissions, a 95-percent reduction in nitrogen oxide emissions and a 97-percent reduction in levels of sulfur in highway diesel fuel. In particular, the rule would bring badly needed relief to my home state of Connecticut, and to the Northeast in general, which need to drastically reduce both nitrogen oxides and volatile organic compounds in order to fulfill the requirements of their state implementation plans.

In light of the environmental and health benefits of the rule, I would be troubled if the administration were to

consider modifying the rule without providing the essential due process and thoughtful consideration required by the Administrative Procedure Act. The effective date of a rule is an integral part of the rule, and the Administration must not cut corners when considering changing that date. Legal requirements aside, I think it is critical for the Administration to consider the voices of the public—whose health and environment are at stake with this rule-making as well as the affected industry before changing the effective date or instituting any other changes to the rule.

In that vein, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to submit the attached letter to be printed in the RECORD, signed by a broad coalition of industry, public interest groups, and regulators, which calls upon US EPA Administrator to implement the diesel/sulfur rule without delay or alteration.

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

FEBRUARY 8, 2001.

Hon. CHRISTINE TODD WHITMAN,  
*Administrator, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Washington, DC.*

DEAR ADMINISTRATOR WHITMAN: We, the undersigned, represent an unusually diverse coalition of groups united in our strong support of the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency's December 21, 2000 final rulemaking that sets onroad heavy-duty diesel emission and fuel standards. Together, we write to you today to urge that this extremely important regulation be upheld, intact.

The rulemaking process that produced this regulation was not only extensive, it was thoughtful and inclusive. We are very pleased that the result is a comprehensive program that most responsibly takes full advantage of the opportunity to reduce a wide variety of diesel emissions by applying a systems approach that sets aggressive engine standards and, necessarily, a commensurately low cap on sulfur in diesel fuel. The framework established under this rule—which includes a particulate matter standard of 0.01 grams per brake horsepower-hour (g/bhp-hr) to take full effect in 2007, a nitrogen oxide standard of 0.20 g/bhp-hr to be phased in between 2007 and 2010 and a national cap on sulfur in diesel fuel of 15 parts per million, to take effect June 1, 2006—represents a critical and delicate balance that will help enable the successful achievement of a 90-percent reduction in particulate matter emissions, a 95-percent reduction in nitrogen oxide emissions and a 97-percent reduction in levels of sulfur in highway diesel fuel. These reductions will translate into enormous public health and environmental benefits all across the nation.

We are proud to have contributed to the open process that led to this landmark rule and equally proud, and supportive, of the result. Each of us now looks forward to doing our respective part to implement the important programs that have been established, so that our nation can begin to reap the benefits on schedule. To this end, we urge you not to allow this rule to be delayed or, in any way, compromised. Rather, we look to you to ensure that the rule will be upheld, intact. In addition, we request an opportunity to meet with you at your earliest convenience

to discuss the vital importance of this rule to our respective organizations.

Sincerely,  
Alliance of Automobile Manufacturers;  
American Lung Association; Association of International Automobile Manufacturers; Association of Local Air Pollution Control Officials; California Trucking Association; Clean Air Network; International Truck and Engine Corporation; Manufacturers of Emission Controls Association; Natural Resources Defense Council; Northeast States for Coordinated Air Use Management; Sierra Club; State and Territorial Air Pollution Program Administrators; U.S. Public Interest Research Group; and Union of Concerned Scientists.

#### RESTORING THE MINIMUM WAGE

Mr. ROCKEFELLER. Mr. President, today I rise to voice my support of Senator KENNEDY's effort to restore the minimum wage. The Fair Minimum Wage Act of 2001 would raise the minimum wage by \$1.50 in three incremental steps, benefitting over 11 million workers. We owe a pay raise to the hard-working Americans who would be affected by a minimum wage increase. To do so would demonstrate the real value of their hard work.

Care givers in our preschools and nursing homes, service workers in our retail and restaurant industries, the domestic workers in our homes and offices—these are the real people upon whom each of us relies every day. These are the workers who deserve to have their wages restored to a level that will afford them a reasonable standard of living.

In West Virginia alone, over one-fifth of our workers will directly benefit from a \$1.50 increase in the minimum hourly wage. This would mean an increase of almost \$3,000 a year for full-time workers. In more concrete terms, this translates into more than a year of groceries, rent for seven months, seventeen months of utility bills, or a year of tuition at a two-year college. Currently, a full-time minimum wage earner with two children may be faced with difficult decisions when trying to both feed and clothe her children. We need to make sure that a mother or father who works forty hours a week does not have to decide between groceries for the family and paying the electric bill.

Ultimately, we must acknowledge that the minimum wage standard has been allowed to slowly erode over the past thirty years. At present, the \$5.15 hourly minimum has reached its lowest purchasing power in two decades, which has aggravated problems for the working poor. Today, the real value of the minimum wage is \$2.90 below what it was in 1968. As our country continues to make unprecedented economic gains, this is simply unacceptable. We have an obligation to the working families in West Virginia, and across the Nation, to raise the minimum wage to a level that will lift them out of the day-to-day struggle of meeting their most basic needs.

I believe that raising the minimum wage over the next two years is essential to help families and to reinforce the fundamental American values of hard work and self-sufficiency. The goal of the country's minimum wage is to ensure that working Americans earn a living wage that makes work a truly better choice than welfare or other public assistance. The fact that 70 percent of workers earning minimum wage are adults over the age of twenty, that 60 percent are women, and that nearly half have full-time jobs means that this is an issue central to millions of hard-working families in our country. In West Virginia alone, almost 14 percent of our work force earn at the minimum wage, and our state has one of the largest populations of workers receiving the minimum wage. I am proud to join Senator KENNEDY and my colleagues to work together to enact this essential bill for working Americans.

#### HIGH SCHOOL SHOOTING

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, last Friday, at least one gunshot was fired at Detroit's Osborn High School. The gunshot hit a classroom window and two students and a teacher were injured as glass shattered across the room. Although the shooting produced no substantial physical injuries, it created great anxiety for the students and families of Osborn High School, who no doubt will sustain the emotional injuries of such a shooting for some time.

The students and teachers at Osborn High School are not alone in their anxiety. Around the nation, students and their families are seriously concerned about safety in their schools. Students deserve to feel safe in their learning environments rather than feeling anxious and fearful. For the students at Osborn High School and everywhere else in America, Congress must work to limit the accessibility that young people have to guns, and reduce the gun violence in our schools and community places.

#### THE SOCIAL SECURITY BENEFITS TAX RELIEF ACT 2001

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. President, last week I introduced legislation which I hope is the first of several steps taken by Congress to correct a terrible injustice currently imposed on seniors who have worked hard all of their lives and are receiving Social Security benefits.

Many people do not realize that, after they have paid Social Security taxes throughout their work careers, up to 50 percent or 85 percent of the monthly benefit they receive from Social Security may be taxed again.

Prior to 1993, up to 50 percent of Social Security benefits were taxable for individuals with incomes above \$25,000, and couples with incomes above \$32,000. In 1993, after President Clinton raised the portion of Social Security benefits which are taxable up to 85 percent for

individuals with incomes over \$34,000, and couples with income over \$44,000.

President Clinton's 1993 tax increase on senior citizens made a bad policy even worse. Essentially, this graduated tax scheme penalizes seniors with fixed incomes who have worked hard to ensure their retirement security.

S. 237, the Social Security Benefits Tax Relief Act, which I have introduced along with my colleagues, Senators COCHRAN, FRIST, INHOFE, LOTT, MURKOWSKI and WARNER, would repeal the 1993 Clinton tax increase on Social Security benefits and rolls the tax levels back to their pre-1993 levels.

By eliminating the taxation of Social Security benefits, we will allow seniors to have more money to pay for prescription drugs, medical care, housing and food. This legislation provides greater tax fairness for increasing numbers of middle-income seniors.

It is widely agreed that Social Security was never intended to be the sole source of income for retirees. In light of Social Security's financial troubles, now is the time to remove disincentives for those who wish to save and plan early for their retirement. Hopefully, this legislation is a first step toward the repeal of all taxes on Social Security benefits.

I urge my colleagues in the Senate to provide tax relief to seniors by passing this important legislation and by examining ways to make the system as fair as possible for all beneficiaries who have paid into the system and who may or may not be subject to taxes on their benefits.

#### LITHUANIAN INDEPENDENCE

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, on Sunday, February 11, 2001, Americans of Lithuanian descent will be gathering, in my home State of Michigan, to celebrate the 83rd anniversary of Lithuanian Independence.

Given the Lithuanian people's long history of successfully preserving and maintaining their culture and identity, there is reason for all those of Lithuanian descent to be proud. Such an achievement stands as an inspiration for people everywhere.

The Lithuanian people have long refused to be placed under the yoke of oppression. They became independent in 1918, fought the Nazis during the Second World War and refused to lose hope during many years of Soviet rule. Reflecting on these trials can be cause for great sadness but also much hope.

Since the collapse of the Soviet Union, Lithuania has experienced nearly eleven years of democracy and free markets. The Lithuanian people are to be commended for the significant steps they taken to ensure Lithuania's place in the free world. In 1999, I had the opportunity to meet with President Valdas Adamkus, and discuss many issues facing both our nations. Many of my colleagues may not know this, but so great is President Adamkus' love for