

someone who understood that even as he remained vigilant defending the needs of the homefront in California, he was also a global citizen who knew this institution had global responsibilities.

Through four terms as a United States Senator, he remained a man of enormous humility on his answering machine he was simply "Alan"—as he was to so many who knew him. This personal sense of place and restraint made it easy to underestimate the contributions he made to the Senate, and to our country. Certainly he never paused long enough to personally remind us of the impact of his service, of the history he was a part of and the lives he touched.

I first met Alan in 1971 when I had returned from Vietnam and many of our veterans were part of an effort to end a failed American policy in Vietnam. In Alan Cranston we found one of the few Senators willing not just to join in the public opposition to the war in Vietnam, but to become a voice of healing for the veterans of the war a statesman whose leadership enabled others, over time, to separate their feelings for the war from their feelings for the veterans of the war. At a time when too many wanted to disown its veterans, Alan offered Vietnam veterans a warm embrace. He was eager to do something all too rare in Washington: listen—and he listened to veterans who had much to say, much of it ignored for too long. He honored their pride and their pain with sensitivity and understanding.

That's when I first saw the great energy and commitment Alan brought to the issues affecting veterans, especially those of the Vietnam era. He was deeply involved on veterans' health care issues, among the first to fight for recognition of post-Vietnam stress syndrome, and a leader in insisting on coverage under the V.A. for its treatment. When the Agent Orange issue came to the fore, Alan insisted on getting answers from an unresponsive government about the consequences of exposure to dioxin, making sure that veterans and their families got the health care they needed. Under his leadership Congress grudgingly increased GI Bill benefits for Vietnam veterans—veterans who too often had to fight for benefits they should have been guaranteed without question—indeed, for veterans who had to fight if only to have a memorial and if only to have the government recognize that they fought in a war and not a police conflict Alan's leadership made all the difference. It is a sad truth in our country's history that a weary Nation seemed eager to turn its back on so many Vietnam veterans who simply sought their due; it should forever be a source of pride to the Cranston family that Alan was chief among those who insisted that America honor that service and keep faith with sons who left pieces of them-

selves and years of their lives on the battlefield in that far-away Nation.

This was a man who fought with the greatest of passion for those who had fought in a difficult war—even as he was also the Senator who fought against all that war represents—remembering that war, brutality, and killing are the ultimate failure of diplomacy.

Alan Cranston was above all a man of peace. With him it was not just a policy but a passion. Remember: This was a man who, in 1934, found himself in the same room as Adolf Hitler. Five years later, he wrote a critical English translation of Adolf Hitler's "Mein Kampf" in an effort to reveal the German leader's true plans. He wore Hitler's ensuing lawsuit as a badge of honor, proud that he had stood up to try and warn the English-speaking world about the evils of Nazism.

Throughout the rest of his service he used public office to force Americans to listen to other prescient warnings—about nuclear arms, about a dangerous arms race spiraling beyond our control, and about hopes for peace that he refused to give up even as others chose to beat the drums for war.

Senator Cranston came to his famous commitment to arms control after meeting with Albert Einstein in 1946. He left that meeting convinced that the threat of atomic weapons had to be stemmed—and he spent the balance of his life arguing that conviction before the Nation.

As a member of the Senate leadership and a senior voice on the Democratic side of the Foreign Relations Committee he worked to reduce the nuclear threat. One of his most important efforts was one of the least publicized. Throughout the 1970s and the 1980's, Alan convened a unique arms control study group the "SALT Study Group". This senators-only gathering met monthly in his office, off the record, and face to face to define common ground. He knew the impact quiet diplomacy could have on the issues he cared about most of all.

He loved what the Peace Corps does, and he fought for it. He fought to attach human rights conditions on aid to El Salvador and to halt contra aid. He was a leading national advocate for a mutual verifiable nuclear freeze. He was always an idealist whose increase in political power was always met by progress for the issues he cared about so deeply. It was not just the work of a career, but of a lifetime—after he left the Senate he chaired the State of the World Forum and joined with former Soviet leader Mikhail Gorbachev as chairman of the Gorbachev Foundation/USA and in 1999, he founded the Global Security Institute.

He did that because he sensed that the end of the Cold War, with all the opportunity it afforded, created a more dangerous world, with aging nuclear

weapons in increasingly disparate and unreliable hands. He was haunted by the threat of nuclear terrorism. He was passionate about the nuclear test ban treaty and was angry when it went down to a shallow and partisan defeat in the Senate. We missed his voice in that debate; we miss him still more today.

When he left the Senate, Alan reflected upon his service and his accomplishments. Of his lasting legacy, he said simply: "Most of all, I have dedicated myself to the cause of peace."

That dedication was real and lasting—a legacy of peace for a good and peaceful man who gave living embodiment to Culbertson's simple, stubborn faith that "God and the politicians willing, the United States can declare peace upon the world, and win it." That belief was Alan Cranston and it is a belief worth fighting for.

HOME HEALTH CARE STABILITY ACT

Mr. BURNS. Mr. President, I rise today to add my name as a cosponsor to the Home Health Care Stability Act of 2001. I commend the leadership of my friends Senator COLLINS and Senator BOND and I am pleased to join my many other colleagues in support of this very important piece of legislation.

This bill is two-fold, it will permanently eliminate the automatic 15 percent reduction in Medicare payments to home health agencies that is currently scheduled to go into effect on October 1, 2002 and will also extend the temporary 10 percent add-on payment for home health patients in rural areas to ensure that these patients continue to have access to much-needed care.

Times are rapidly changing. Today more than ever, patients are spending less time in the hospital. More and more, we are seeing procedures done on an outpatient basis, with recovery and care for patients with chronic conditions taking place in the home. In addition, in my State of Montana, for example, the number of elderly who are chronically ill or disabled continues to grow. How do we care properly and compassionately for these individuals? As our population ages, the answer to this question becomes more and more important.

Increasingly, the answer for many is home health care. Home health care is an important part of Medicare in which seniors and the disabled can get the care they need, where they want it: in the comfort and security of their own homes. Additionally, home health care is a necessity because, for many, their health or physical condition makes it almost impossible to leave home. Not only is it convenient, but much more importantly, patients love it. They

love it because home health care allows seniors and others with disabilities a feeling of independence and dignity, despite their illnesses. Often home health is an alternative to more expensive services in hospitals, and, thus, is a cost-effective alternative to providing care.

However, folks, there is a home health care crisis—too many seniors and disabled who should be receiving health care services at home are not getting it. This is wrong. Many of our most frail and vulnerable have had to be repeatedly hospitalized with problems that could have been avoided had they been continuing to receive their home health benefits. Others are trying to pay for the care themselves, often on very limited means. Some are going without care altogether.

By the late 1990s, home health care was the fastest growing component of Medicare spending, growing at an average of 26 percent annually. We all know what happened next—in an effort to balance the budget and make the home health program more cost-effective and efficient, Congress in the Balanced Budget Act of 1997, BBA, tried to cut the growth in Medicare spending. Unfortunately, the real results of this action went much farther than we intended, in large part because of faulty implementation and excessive regulatory requirements of the Health Care Financing Administration, HCFA. As the cuts and regulations spun out-of-control, health care providers struggled to survive, while many were forced to close their doors entirely. Ultimately, patients suffered the most. This story applies to patients and providers in all parts of Medicare, hospitals, nursing homes, home health care providers, everyone.

Now, on the horizon, is yet another 15-percent cut that would put many of our already struggling home health agencies at risk and would seriously jeopardize access to critical home health services for millions of our Nation's seniors. In my State of Montana, access to home health care is already a problem for many, we cannot make this problem worse. Home health and, most importantly, the patients who depend on its services cannot afford this. We must act now.

I am indeed proud that last year we passed legislation, the Medicare, Medicaid, and S-CHIP Benefits Improvement and Protection Act, which provided some relief to struggling home health agencies. However, I do not think that it went far enough. First, we must eliminate the 15 percent cut completely. The simple fact is that an additional 15 percent cut in Medicare home health payments would spell death for those low-cost agencies which are currently struggling to hang on, and it would further reduce seniors' access to critical home care services. We have already delayed this 15 percent

cut three times—the time has come to do away with it once and for all. Secondly, we must also make permanent the temporary 10 percent add-on for home health services furnished patients in rural areas. This, too, was included in last year's legislation, this bill would make it permanent.

In Montana, we know too well how very expensive it is for home health agencies to deliver services to rural patients. They have to travel long distances, and it takes a long time to reach those patients. That all adds to the cost.

The Home Health Care Stability Act will provide essential relief for our home health agencies that are struggling to make ends meet. I am proud to add my name as a cosponsor of this important piece of legislation. I hope we can get quick action on this bill to ensure that seniors and the disabled have appropriate access to quality home health care.

PUBLIC MEDAL OF VALOR ACT

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I am pleased to cosponsor the Public Safety Officer Medal of Valor Act, S. 39, which was introduced by Senator STEVENS. I thank him for his hard work on this important piece of legislation.

I supported and cosponsored the Public Safety Officer Medal of Valor Act in the last Congress as well. I was disappointed that this legislation did not become law then. In April and May, 1999, I made sure that the Senate acted on this bill. On April 22, 1999, the Senate Judiciary Committee took up that measure in regular order and reported it unanimously. At that time I congratulated Senator STEVENS for introducing the measure and thanked him for his leadership. I noted that we had worked together on a number of law enforcement matters and that the senior Senator from Alaska is a stalwart supporter of the men and women who put themselves at risk to protect us all. I said that I looked forward to enactment of this measure and to seeing the extraordinary heroism of our police, firefighters and correctional officers recognized with the Medal of Valor.

On May 18, 1999, I was privileged to be on the floor of the Senate when we proceeded to consider S. 39 and passed it unanimously. I took that occasion to commend Senator STEVENS and all who had worked so hard to move this measure in a timely way. That was during National Police Week nearly two years ago. The measure was sent to the House of Representatives where it lay dormant for the remainder of the 106th Congress.

Instead, the House, in the last Congress, insisted that the Senate take up, fix and pass the House-passed version of this measure, H.R. 46, if it were to become law. House members indicated

that they were prepared to accept most of the Senate-passed text, but insisted that it be enacted under the House bill number. In order to get this important measure to the President, we did that on December 15, 2000. We discharged the House-passed version of that bill from the Judiciary Committee, adopting a complete substitute, and sent it back to the House. Unfortunately, the House failed to act on our good faith effort last year, and the Public Medal of Valor was never enacted.

This year, I have again worked with Senator STEVENS, Senator HATCH, and others to get this important bill passed. I urge my colleagues to work towards improvements to ensure that the Medal of Valor Board will work effectively and efficiently with the National Medal of Valor Office within the Department of Justice. Our legislation should establish both of these entities. It is essential that they work well together to design the Medal of Valor and to create the criteria and procedures for recommendations of nominees for the award. The men and women who will be honored by the Medal of Valor for their brave deeds deserve nothing less. I hope the Senate will quickly act on these changes to this important measure.

BLACK HISTORY MONTH

Mr. KERRY. Mr. President, I'd like to make a few comments today in recognition of Black History Month. For a quarter-century, our country has held the month of February in special regard as a time to remember and reflect on the rich history and extraordinary achievements of African Americans. Today, I would like to speak about some important and influential African Americans from my home State of Massachusetts.

The diversity we celebrate during this month encompasses many areas. African-American leaders should be recognized not only for their achievements in the face of racial discrimination, but for the accomplishments they have made in a wide variety of occupations. Diversity stretches beyond race and crosses into gender, age, and occupation. The following men and women cover a wide spectrum of interests, eras, and accomplishments, and each has made a significant contribution to the Massachusetts community.

In 1845, Macon B. Allen became the first African American officially admitted to the bar, and he practiced law for many years in Worcester, Massachusetts before moving to South Carolina, where he became one of the first black Federal judges in the Nation. Mr. Allen set a precedent that opened many doors for the minority attorneys and judges who followed in his footsteps.

Dr. W.E.B DuBois has long been recognized as a figure of leadership in African-American history. Dr. Dubois