

Hill, a prestigious award named after the well-known philanthropist and scientist, John Motley Morehead III. Currently, Mr. McKnight shares his knowledge with aspiring students as an adjunct professor at both Wingate University and the University of North Carolina at Charlotte.

It is so critical that the Senate move quickly on this and other nominations so that our courts can get much needed relief. In the Western District, where Mr. McKnight is nominated, caseloads have increased significantly. The Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts has indicated that the three U.S. District Court judges in the Western district have the fourth-heaviest caseload per judge among the 94 federal judicial districts across the country. For instance, the number of case filed in the district grew from 1,321 in 1996 to 1,518 in the year 2001. The number of cases pending rose over the same time period from 1,209 to 1,522.

This backlog in our courts must be alleviated. Approving the nomination of Brent McKnight would place a qualified and credible jurist on the bench and provide the overburdened Western District with much needed relief.

Brent McKnight has my full support, and I would urge my colleagues to support his nomination.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will return to legislative session.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. SUNUNU. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the Senate proceed to a period for morning business.

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

RETIREMENT OF RONALD E. MADSEN

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I am grateful for the opportunity today to pay tribute to a wonderful man, dedicated public servant, and loyal friend, Ronald E. Madsen.

Ron is retiring from my Senate Staff after 21 years of dedicated service to the people of Utah, a time throughout which he worked tirelessly to promote and protect the values and ideals we all hold so dear.

Ron joined my staff in the early days of my Senate career and has always been a vital center of my Senate organization.

He has served in many capacities including Utah state director, environmental and lands advisor, and most recently as staff counsel.

Ron Madsen has been a guiding influence for me. Over the years, we have navigated through many challenges and enjoyed many successes.

He has always diligently strived to provide sound counsel and steady support as we have worked together on issues facing Utah and the Nation.

In addition, Ron has played a vital role in working with many Utah industries and associations.

He spent many years advising and helping to promote the tourism and air travel industries throughout Utah.

He is a strong advocate for the Second Amendment and was a key liaison for my office on issues affecting this important constitutional right.

Over the years, Ron has spent literally months traveling Utah, meeting with county and city officials and getting a good feel for the issues and challenges Utahns are facing throughout our State.

But perhaps the most important and lasting service Ron performed were the literally thousands of hours he spent listening to and counseling constituents who called my office looking for assistance with a myriad of problems.

In Ron, they not only found help, they made a good friend. He has always been willing to work with all constituents, no matter their circumstances.

The friendship and help Ron Madsen extended has been invaluable to hundreds if not thousands of Utahns and will be felt for many years to come.

Ron was born and raised in Provo, UT where his family played an integral role in the community. He attended Brigham Young University where he received a Bachelor of Science Degree and graduated with honors. He was then awarded a 3-year trustee scholarship to George Washington University School of Law in Washington, D.C., where he served on the Law Review.

Ron later received his Juris Doctorate Degree with honors and went on to establish a successful and prestigious law career and was admitted to practice law in Washington, D.C., Maryland, Utah, and before the United States Supreme Court.

In addition to the service Ron has rendered in his community and our office, Ron is a loving father and grandfather. He is the proud father of one son and 2 daughters, and grandfather to 5 grandsons and 1 granddaughter.

I have often admired the dedication and devotion Ron Madsen has always shown, not only to his children and grandchildren, but to his wife Kathryn who was sick for many years and is now deceased.

Ron stood by her side through her struggles with health and was a steadfast partner until the end.

Ron also has a true love for animals and has opened his home to many animals in need of shelter and care. He has helped his daughter, a veterinarian technician by trade, nurse many wounded creatures back to good health and improved their quality of life immeasurably.

He has sacrificed his talents, time and financial resources for the creatures of our earth—something truly noteworthy and honorable.

I am truly grateful for the service Ron Madsen has given to me, to his community and to Utah. He has been by my side for many, many years and I will always be extremely grateful for the service he has rendered.

I will miss Ron tremendously, but know that life holds many wonderful things for him to savor and enjoy.

And as Ron has always liked to quote—"you can go off the Hatch payroll, but never off the Hatch staff."

In the future, I plan to continue to rely on Ron Madsen for his very expert advice, for his guidance and support.

Ron is a truly dedicated public servant, fervently patriotic American, loving father and grandfather, and loyal and cherished friend.

I want to wish him the very best in retirement and pray for his continued good health, success and happiness.

THE NOMINATION OF WILLIAM PRYOR

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, it is with reluctance and disappointment that I must rise in opposition to another cloture vote for a judicial nominee. But once again, the extreme ideology of a nominee has left us with no other option. But even if there were no questions about Mr. Pryor's ability to apply and interpret the law fairly, the open questions surrounding Mr. Pryor's ethical fitness, the unfinished investigation in the Judiciary Committee, and the fact that his nomination was reported out of committee in violation of committee rules, should compel the Senate to delay voting on this nomination. For both substantive and procedural reasons, Mr. Pryor's nomination should be put on hold. For that reason, I must oppose cloture.

I would remind my colleagues that we have invoked our right to unlimited debate with great rarity. Since President Bush took office, Democrats have been eager to cooperate in the nomination and confirmation of qualified judges who will enforce the law and protect the rights of all Americans. And we are proud of our record. When the Democrats held the Senate, we confirmed 100 of the President's judicial nominees. We rejected only two, Charles Pickering and Priscilla Owen. This year, we have already approved 40 more judges, and only 2 nominees, Miguel Estrada and Priscilla Owen, have previously met with sustained opposition. Democrats have sought compromise and consensus. And today, there are 140 judges sitting on the bench who serve as testimony to our cooperation.

But the importance of the Federal judiciary is too important to stand silently by and allow a nominee who has expressed hostility to the laws that protect the rights of all Americans. Mr. Pryor has repeatedly put his own personal and political beliefs above the dictates of the law. Throughout his career, he has been unable to find constitutional protection for even those rights that are clearly written and firmly established in case law. Not civil rights. Not voting rights. Not the right to privacy. In fact, Mr. Pryor has argued before the Supreme Court that it should cut back on the protections of

the Age Discrimination in Employment Act, the Civil Rights Act of 1964, the American with Disabilities Act, and the Family and Medical Leave Act. He referred to a recent decision reaffirming Miranda rights as "preserving the worst examples of judicial activism." And he was, in fact, the only State attorney general in the country to challenge the constitutionality of the Violence Against Women Act. Adhering to an extreme interpretation of States rights, Mr. Pryor has stated that, "Congress . . . should not be in the business of public education nor the control of street crime." Mr. Pryor has taken this position, even as President Bush has touted the importance of the Federal role in education and the COPS Program has put tens of thousands of new police officers on patrol in American towns and cities, contributing to the historic reduction in the crime rate of the 1990s.

But even if we disagree on the merits of Mr. Pryor's record, there can be no disagreement on the incompleteness of this debate. The Senate rules have preserved the right of unlimited debate because, as a deliberative body, we have an obligation to wait until all relevant information is available. In the case of Mr. Pryor's nomination, there are vitally important outstanding questions regarding his ethical fitness to serve. There was a bipartisan investigation that could have settled these questions once and for all. But in order to shield this nomination from legitimate questions, the chairman of the Judiciary Committee shut the investigation down. Then, in clear violation of the committee's rules, he pushed the nomination out of committee and onto the Senate floor. In the process, the chairman has not only allowed a cloud of suspicion to hang above Mr. Pryor's nomination, he has denied the Judiciary Committee the right to determine whether or not the nominee was forthright.

Esteem for the Federal bench, and the Judiciary Committee, should prevent such questions from going unanswered. And I would hope that my colleagues would share that view. This is a body of rules. And this is a country of laws. I cannot imagine that there is ever a time that any one of us ought to be in a position to say the rules in this case are simply not going to apply. But that is precisely what was done by the chairman of the Judiciary Committee—ironically the committee which passes judgment on those who will interpret the rule of law. Members of the committee called attention to this extraordinary development with grave concern about its implications, about its precedent, about the message it sends. After assurances by the majority leader that this would not occur, this nomination has nonetheless made it to the floor. We should not reward this disregard for the rules of the Senate by permitting the nomination to go forward.

Amazingly, this is not the ugliest aspect of this debate. Because we have

expressed our opposition to Mr. Pryor, Democrats have been accused of anti-Catholic bigotry. Of course, nothing could be further from the truth. I am proud of my Catholic faith. That pride is shared by many members of our caucus. Many of us grew up listening to our parents or grandparents tell stories of seeing signs that said No Catholics Need Apply on storefront windows. In 1960, the Democratic nominee for President, John Kennedy, faced questions regarding whether a Catholic could be sufficiently independent of church doctrine in order to serve his country. John Kennedy put those questions to rest and a generation of Catholics have been able to serve their country without being forced to justify their loyalty or patriotism.

This line of attack has resuscitated a profoundly un-American idea. The charge that our opposition to Mr. Pryor is rooted in bigotry is repugnant and divisive. This is an egregious misuse of religion for profane political purposes. All Americans should be offended by this charge and disappointed that the discourse has degraded to such an extent. These are slanderous charges, and they have no place in this body. Each time Democrats have risen to oppose cloture on a judicial nomination, the majority's attacks against us have grown more vehement and abusive. We can't control that. But we can control our response. Each Member of the Senate has sworn an oath to uphold and defend our Constitution. That is precisely what we are doing today by opposing the nomination of William Pryor. No attack, no matter how offensive, will shake us from our duty.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, as I have mentioned a few times over the last few days, and as anyone watching the horrible display here on the floor last night knows, those opposing the confirmation of William Pryor to the Eleventh Circuit have been subjected to a despicable smear. Supporters of the nomination have turned reality on its head. They accuse us of imposing a religious test, but it was a Republican supporter of the nomination who was the only Senator to ask Mr. Pryor what his religion was and to use what they now term a code phrase "deeply held religious beliefs."

The scurrilous accusations against opponents of the nomination must be popular with the political gurus at the White House. It has been echoed in recent days by the Committee for Justice, a group closely associated with the President and his family, headed by the first President Bush's White House counsel. I know about the bias against immigrants and against Catholics. That was real discrimination. What is being spread this week is a falsehood uttered for partisan political purposes.

Those who know what real religious discrimination is have spoken out against the advertising campaign. Earlier today I mentioned the members of the Interfaith Alliance, who spoke so eloquently against this sort of smear.

Now I am pleased to recognize the Anti-Defamation League, so well known and well respected for their work against religious bigotry, for speaking out against the Committee for Justice's slurs. Abraham H. Foxman, the National Director of the ADL, and Glen A. Tobias, its National Chairman, have written to the head of the Committee for Justice, Mr. Boyden Gray, to object to his advertisements. They explain to Mr. Gray, that, "[t]o promote the view that Mr. Pryor's opponents object to his Catholic religious beliefs, rather than his views as expressed in his prolific legal writings and speeches and his answers to questions at his Judiciary Committee confirmation hearings, needlessly and wrongfully injects religion into the Senate's 'advise and consent' role in the nomination process."

I could not agree more. I appreciate that the ADL has added its voice to those trying to show the Committee for Justice the error of its ways. I ask unanimous consent the ADL's letter to Mr. Gray be printed in the RECORD.

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

JULY 30, 2003.

C. BOYDEN GRAY, Esq.
Chairman, The Committee for Justice, Wilmer, Cutler & Pickering, Washington, DC 20037.

DEAR MR. GRAY: On behalf of the Anti-Defamation League (ADL), we write to strongly object to the recent advertising campaign launched by the Committee for Justice (CFJ) that harshly criticizes opponents of judicial nominee William Pryor for "playing politics with religion." These misleading ads claim that "some in the U.S. Senate are attacking Bill Pryor for having 'deeply held' Catholic beliefs to prevent him from becoming a federal judge" and graphically illustrate the assertion with a picture of a sign hanging on the door to "Judicial Chambers" that reads, "Catholics need not apply."

We are unaware of any Senator who has attacked Mr. Pryor "for having 'deeply held' Catholic beliefs." To promote the view that Mr. Pryor's opponents object to his Catholic religious beliefs, rather than his views as expressed in his prolific legal writings and speeches and his answers to questions at his Judiciary Committee confirmation hearings, needlessly and wrongfully injects religion into the Senate's "advise and consent" role in the nomination process.

ADL does not as a practice endorse or oppose nominees to the bench. However, because Mr. Pryor has written and spoken so prolifically and so forcefully as an advocate on several issues of deep concern, we believe his positions merit close scrutiny by the Senate. Our objections to this nomination stem from Mr. Pryor's well-documented views, not his religious beliefs.

We believe that CFJ's ad campaign is misleading and inflammatory. We urge you to reconsider further promotion of this effort.

Sincerely,

GLEN A. TOBIAS,
National Chairman.
ABRAHAM H. FOXMAN,
National Director.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, I oppose the nomination of William Pryor to the Eleventh Circuit Court of Appeals. Mr. Pryor holds extreme views on a range of issues, has engaged in inflammatory rhetoric when expressing those views,

and has exhibited a questionable commitment to separating politics from the law.

Mr. Pryor has led Alabama's efforts to challenge Federal power and argue that the State should be immune from violations of Federal law. He has filed briefs challenging Congress' authority to enact parts of the Family and Medical Leave Act; he has argued against Congress' authority to protect disabled people from discrimination; and during Mr. Pryor's tenure as attorney general, Alabama was also the only State to file an amicus brief opposing the Government in a case limiting Congress' authority under the Clean Water Act.

Our country is built upon tolerance for a diversity of faiths yet Mr. Pryor has also shown little respect for the important constitutional principle of separation of church and state.

As an appellate court judge, Mr. Pryor would be required to follow precedents established by the Supreme court. But Mr. Pryor has openly shown disdain and indeed personally attacked individual justices. For instance, he stated, "I will end my prayer for the next administration: Please God, no more Souters."

There are just too many indications that Mr. Pryor would be unable to separate his politics from the law. Just listen to what Former Republican Arizona Attorney General Grant Woods said about Mr. Pryor. Mr. Woods described Pryor as "probably the most doctrinaire and the most partisan of any attorney general [he had] dealt with in eight years, so people would be wise to question whether or not [Pryor is] the right person to be non-partisan on the bench."

The majority brought this nomination to the floor and immediately filed a cloture petition, not allowing for adequate debate on Mr. Pryor's controversial nomination. I think that is wrong Wrong for the Senate. Wrong for our Federal courts. And wrong for the country. For these reasons, I oppose cloture on Mr. Pryor's nomination.

Mr. KOHL. Mr. President, yesterday we voted on a motion to invoke cloture on the nomination of William Pryor to be a judge on the Eleventh Circuit Court of Appeals. After careful consideration of his candidacy, I had no choice but to oppose his confirmation in the Judiciary Committee last week and opposed cloture on his nomination as well.

When considering a nominee to a Federal court judgeship, we consider the nominee's legal skills, judgment, reputation, and acumen. The nominee should be learned in the law. And the nominee should be well regarded among his peers in his or her community. Perhaps most important of all is the nominee's judicial temperament.

An appeals court judge's solemn duty and paramount obligation is to do justice fairly, impartially, and without favor. An appeals court judge must be open minded, must be willing to set his or her personal preferences aside, and

must be able to judge without predisposition. And, of course, he or she must follow controlling precedent faithfully, and be able to disregard completely any views he or she holds to the contrary.

In the case of Attorney General Pryor, we are presented with a nominee whose views are so extreme that he fails this basic test. In case after case, and on issue after issue, Attorney General Pryor has a public record of taking the most extreme position, often at odds with controlling Supreme Court precedent, and in the most hard-line and inflexible manner.

Pryor's views are outside of the mainstream on issues affecting civil rights, women's rights, disability rights, religious freedom, and the right to privacy. He assures us that despite these views, he will follow settled law and Supreme Court precedent. After making extreme statements to the committee and in his hearing and refusing to disavow other zealous positions that he has taken throughout his career, he wants us to believe that he will blindly follow the law as a judge.

Let me make clear that the mere fact that Attorney General Pryor opposes abortion is not the reason I oppose him today. I have voted to confirm literally hundreds of judges, nominees who have both supported and opposed abortion. It is not Attorney General Pryor's views on whether or not he believes legal abortion is good public policy which concern me. Instead, the crucial issue is whether Attorney General Pryor can put his personal views aside and apply the law of the land as decided by the Supreme Court. It is my conclusion that he cannot.

His inability to set his personal views aside has been demonstrated most explicitly in his activist attempts to challenge numerous federal statutes. He has chosen to expand on his cramped view of federalism and challenge the ability of the Federal Government to remedy discriminatory practices. Many of the cases in which he took his most extreme legal positions were on behalf of the State of Alabama where he had the sole decision under state law as to what legal position to assert. These cases include his assertion of federalism claims to defeat provisions of the Age Discrimination in Employment Act and the Americans With Disabilities Act; his opposition to Congress's authority to provide victims of gender-motivated violence to sue their attackers in federal court; his argument that Congress exceeding its authority in passing the Family and Medical Leave Act; and many other cases. The extreme legal positions advanced in these cases were fully and entirely the responsibility of Attorney General Pryor.

Of course, Attorney General Pryor has every right to hold his views, whether we agree with him or not. He can run for office and serve in the legislative or executive branches should he convince a majority of his fellow

Alabamans that he is fit to represent them. But he has no right to be a Federal appeals court judge. Only those who we are convinced are impartial, unbiased, fair, and whose only guiding ideology is to follow the Constitution to apply equal justice to all are fit for this position. Unfortunately, we can have no confidence that he will set these views aside and faithfully follow the Constitution and binding precedent. For these reasons, I must oppose his confirmation.

I would be remiss if I did not address briefly—for a brief remark is all this point is worth—the destructive charges that those of us who oppose Mr. Pryor are anti-Catholic. The people who have put forward this charge engage in the worst form of personal destruction. These allegation are beneath the dignity of the process and beneath the dignity of the Senate and must be rejected by everyone involved.

One last point. The Judiciary Committee began an investigation into statements made by the nominee before this committee. Unfortunately, that investigation has not been completed, so I am not ready at this time to judge whether Mr. Pryor lied to the Judiciary committee at his hearing with regard to his involvement in fundraising activities. This investigation involves very serious matters and must be allowed to proceed.

I will vote no.

• Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, I took the floor last night to speak about the nomination of William Pryor and the unfortunate circumstances surrounding that nomination, and since that time certain of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle have chosen to mischaracterize my statements and perpetuate the unfair and baseless charges I was trying to debunk.

I want to briefly correct the record on two of these mischaracterizations, because I believe very strongly that these types of wrongful allegations should not be allowed to stand.

First, the junior Senator from Pennsylvania stated that anyone who questioned Mr. Pryor's "deeply held beliefs" would be questioning his religious beliefs. Specifically, he said: I just suggest that it is obvious to anyone that this code word is an antireligious bias.

Senator DURBIN attempted to correct the record immediately but was not allowed to do so until later. I appreciate his efforts in that regard, but I think I should also set the record straight myself.

First, what I said in my statement was clearly not a religious attack. I said, and I quote:

Many of us have concerns about nominees sent to the Senate who feel so very strongly, and sometimes stridently, and often intemperately about certain political beliefs and who make intemperate statements about those beliefs. So we raise questions about whether those nominees can be truly impartial, particularly when the law conflicts with those beliefs.

So Mr. President, I was very careful to raise this concern about deeply held

political beliefs, not religious beliefs. And my concern is not just the beliefs themselves but the manner in which they are expressed. I have found that intemperate statements often accompany intemperate people.

Indeed, I went on to say that, and again I quote:

It is true that abortion rights can often be at the center of these questions. As a result, accusations have been leveled that any time reproductive choice becomes an issue, it acts as a litmus test against those whose religion causes them to be anti-choice. But pro-choice Democrats on this committee have voted for many nominees who are anti-choice and who believe that abortion should be illegal, some of whom may even have been Catholic. I do not know because I have never inquired.

So this truly is not about religion. This is about confirming judges who can be impartial and fair in the administration of justice. I think when a nominee such as William Pryor makes inflammatory statements and evidences such strongly held beliefs on a whole variety of core issues, it is hard for many of us to accept that he can set aside those beliefs and act as an impartial judge—particularly because he is very young, 41; particularly because this is a lifetime appointment; and particularly because we have seen so many people who have received lifetime appointments then go on and do just what they want, regardless of what they said. So it is of some concern to us.

That is what I said. I did not attack Mr. Pryor's religion. Nobody in this debate has. I did not attack his religious beliefs. Nobody in this Senate has.

To accuse anyone in this body of using an anti-Catholic litmus test is inaccurate, and wrong. It is ill-advised, and it risks bringing us back to a day where religion and race and gender debates split this Nation apart at its seams.

The judicial nominations process is a serious one and filled with countless debates about very serious issues. We should focus on what is important and real, not on what can inflame political supporters.

The second mischaracterization of my statement was by the junior Senator from Alabama. I know he feels very strongly about this nominee, so I do not blame him for fighting hard for Mr. Pryor.

Nevertheless, the junior Senator from Alabama did not accurately portray what I said in my statement. Specifically, the Senator said that I claimed Mr. Pryor had "used his power as attorney general to obstruct the enforcement of the Violence Against Women Act in Alabama."

What I actually said was that Pryor "used his position as attorney general to limit the scope of crucial civil rights laws like the Violence Against Women's Act, VAWA, the Age Discrimination In Employment Act, the Americans with Disabilities Act, the Fair Labor Standards Act, and the Family Medical Leave Act. . . . For example, he was the only attorney general to argue against a key provision in the Violence Against Women Act on federalism grounds."

Now in retrospect, I should have been more careful in the wording of my

statement, and for that I am sorry. I said that Mr. Pryor "used his position as attorney general to limit the scope of crucial civil rights laws . . ." rather than saying what I meant to say, which was that he argued for limiting the scope of those laws—sometimes successfully—in briefs before the Federal courts.

But I certainly never said that he used his power to "obstruct" the law in Alabama.

Some other comments have been made throughout this debate that mischaracterize the Democratic opposition to this nominee and in many instances state, or at least imply, that our opposition is based on religion.

I will say once again, this is simply not true.

I hope, as I said yesterday, that this debate can focus on what it should focus on, the qualifications of this nominee. That focus should not have been lost through a violation of the committee rules, the thwarting of an ongoing investigation into the nominee, or these false charges of religious bias.●

TRIBUTE TO DR. THOMAS D. CLARK

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I rise today to pay tribute to a legend, Kentucky's Historian Laureate Dr. Thomas D. Clark. On July 14, 2003, Dr. Clark turned 100 years old.

Dr. Clark has been described as a "State treasure." A native of Mississippi, Dr. Clark stumbled upon Kentucky as he sought to further his education. He earned a scholarship to the University of Kentucky where he received a master's in history in 1929. From there, he went on to Duke University, where he obtained a Ph.D. In true Kentucky style, Dr. Clark returned to the Commonwealth and began researching its rich past. He has written more than 32 books including, "A History in Kentucky," and served in the University of Kentucky's Department of History for nearly a quarter of a century. One of the State's leading scholars, he proudly calls Kentucky home.

Dr. Clark's service to my great State has not gone unnoticed or unappreciated. In 1969, the University of Kentucky presented Dr. Clark with an honorary doctorate for the way he touched so many Kentuckians during his teaching career. Over his 100 years, he has received many awards and honors, including the University of Kentucky Library Medallion for Intellectual Achievement and the Commonwealth Historian Laureate for life. Dr. Clark also has a building and a foundation named in his honor by the University Press of Kentucky.

Kentuckians admire Dr. Clark for his patriotism to the State, his adept knowledge of our history, and most importantly, his zest for life. I ask my colleagues to join me in honoring Dr. Clark and congratulating him on his Centenarian status.

HONORING THE LIFE OF SENATOR VANCE HARTKE

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, I rise today to honor the life of my fellow Hoosier, Senator Vance Hartke, who passed away on July 27. Senator Harke dedicated his life to serving his country and our home State of Indiana, setting an example of personal conviction and political courage throughout his 18 years as senator.

Born on May 31, 1919, Vance Hartke grew up in Stendal, IN. He attended the University of Evansville and then earned his law degree from Indiana University. Senator Hartke served 4 years as a member of the Coast Guard and as a U.S. Navy officer during World War II. Upon his return to Indiana, Hartke began practicing law in Evansville, where he was elected mayor in 1955. From there, he was elected Senator in 1958, demonstrating a work ethic on the campaign trail that is remembered by Hoosiers still today. Senator Hartke served three continuous terms as senator, the first Indiana Democrat ever to do so.

While serving as Senator, Hartke played a crucial role in requiring auto manufacturers to install seatbelts in their cars, and supported legislation that created the Head Start Program, which continues to provide early education opportunities for tens of millions of children from lower-income families. He led Senate support for Medicare, work that earned him the nickname "Father of Medicare." Senator Hartke also was instrumental in creating the International Executive Service Corps, an organization modeled on the Peace Corps that sent retired U.S. business executives to developing countries to help expand their local businesses.

During a particularly trying time in our nation's history, Senator Hartke remained unafraid to take a bold stance in support of his convictions, sometimes in the face of strong opposition. He chose to speak out against the Vietnam war, knowing that doing so would cost him his friendship with President Lyndon Johnson, because Senator Hartke felt it was his moral responsibility to defend his beliefs.

However, of the many issues Senator Hartke supported during his 18 years as Senator, family members recall that one of his proudest accomplishments was his work on legislation that provided affordable treatment for kidney diseases. It was work that was largely overshadowed by his personal stances on other issues, but it led to the creation of a bill now credited with saving more than 500,000 lives.

The sense of loss to all those who knew Senator Hartke is tremendous. He is survived by his wife of 60 years, Martha, four sons, three daughters, and 16 grandchildren.

HONORING OUR ARMED FORCES

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, I rise today to honor the accomplishments of