

unreasonable mandate of high costs on private business. There will be more tough votes ahead, but as I said, I am not afraid of making the difficult choices.

In conclusion, let me just note that I do not intend nor will I pretend to fill the tremendous void left by my predecessor, Senator Bob Dole. He stood as a giant in the Senate and his departure is a great loss to the Senate and to Kansas. But, I do pledge my very best, which I have always given to Kansas. And I am looking forward to working with Bob Dole in his new position of national leadership.

Mr. President, I thank my colleagues for the warm reception they have extended me. Their good wishes and assistance have been a great help during my first days in the Senate and I look forward to working with the leadership and my colleagues on both sides of the aisle as we work together to shape our Nation's future. Of course, we may not always agree, but I can assure you that my State of Kansas and the United States of America and the U.S. Senate will always receive my highest efforts and most careful judgment as we face the challenges ahead.

Thank you Mr. President.

CONGRATULATIONS TO SENATOR FRAHM

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I would like to take just a moment to congratulate the distinguished Senator from Kansas for her maiden speech.

Over the last few years, as I have gone back and read the history of the Senate, I have found that there have truly been many magic moments when maiden speeches are made in the Senate, and it is one you will always remember. I remember the first one I made—only I was on the back row over there. The Senator from Kansas is already right up on the front row.

But she has exhibited, Mr. President, all in her brief time in the Senate, that she is a legislator of courage and that she is an experienced legislator. The fact that she is here this afternoon making this maiden speech, saying what she has said and the way she has handled herself, reflects the fact that she has had tremendous experience as a leader in the Kansas State Legislature.

So I commend her for her experience in the past and for her work already in the Senate. She is going to make a great Senator for the State of Kansas like the two Senators we have been serving with earlier this year—Senator KASSEBAUM, of course, and, of course, our great majority leader, Bob Dole. It is a challenge to succeed such giants as those two.

I am convinced that our new Senator is up to the challenge. She has already been given very important committee assignments where I know she will have a chance to provide leadership. I know she is already enjoying the pleasures of being on the Armed Services Committee, having worked on this very bill in the Chamber.

I just wanted to say on behalf of the leadership and all Members of the Republican side of the aisle, in fact the entire Senate, that we are truly pleased and honored to have join us this great Senator from the State of Kansas.

Mr. THURMOND addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I wish to commend the junior Senator from Kansas on her maiden speech. It is a pleasure for us in the Senate to have such a delightful person join us in this body. She is a lady of integrity, ability and dedication, and will be a great asset to the Senate.

Mrs. KASSEBAUM addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kansas.

Mrs. KASSEBAUM. Mr. President, I am particularly proud to have heard the junior Senator from Kansas. I have known Senator FRAHM as a friend in Kansas. I have known her as a majority leader of the Kansas Senate, and I think she spoke in her speech to the qualities that have made her an exemplary leader and legislator in Kansas.

I have every confidence she is going to translate the very skills she spoke to in her maiden speech to the work she carries out in the future on the floor of the Senate, not only for the best interests of Kansas, as she said, but the best interests of the Nation. It is with real pride today that I, the senior Senator from Kansas, heard the maiden speech of the junior Senator from Kansas.

I yield the floor.

Mr. WARNER addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Virginia.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I also wish to join my colleagues in extending well-deserved praise to our new colleague, and particularly since she has joined the Senate Armed Services Committee on which I have been privileged to serve with the distinguished chairman for some many years.

It is interesting to note, Mr. President, I think a footnote in history; California was the first State in the history of the Senate to have two women and how quickly thereafter came a second State. Of course, it is of small distinction—two members of the Democratic Party from California and, proudly, two members of the Republican Party from Kansas. I have always been interested in the history of this institution. It goes way back. The Senator has made history today in two respects. Well done.

I yield the floor, Mr. President.

Mr. ROTH addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Delaware.

Mr. ROTH. I, too, join in congratulating our new Senator from Kansas. We are particularly proud to have two distinguished women Senators from Kansas. I only wish that we could look forward to both of them continuing to serve that State.

HEALTH INSURANCE REFORM

Mr. ROTH. Mr. President, we have been waiting for 2 months to move forward on critical health insurance reform legislation. During this time, Republicans have compromised again and again, each time in response to concerns raised by the White House and by some of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle about medical savings accounts.

Mr. President, we have been negotiating in good faith. We have addressed our colleagues' concerns about MSA on both the structure of the insurance plan and the structure of the savings account. We have limited the number of people eligible for the tax-free MSA. We have put forward proposals that are small enough to be considered demonstration projects. We have reduced the maximum contribution that can be made to an MSA. We have reduced the top range of the high deductible. In short, we have bent over backwards to accommodate the White House and some of our Democratic colleagues.

Millions of Americans are counting on us to reach an agreement, counting on us to work together to get the job done here in Washington. Americans with preexisting conditions, Americans who are unable to afford health insurance, small businesses that cannot afford to offer their employees health insurance, millions of Americans need this bill, and they do not have the luxury of time in waiting through more games and more rhetoric.

Legislating is about compromise. Americans want us to compromise and work together to get this legislation signed into law. We have compromised significantly. We do not have much time remaining for legislative business this year, and we have even less time for partisan games on this critical issue. So let us get together and work this out today or in the very immediate future.

I yield the floor.

Mr. WARNER addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Virginia.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, we are awaiting momentarily the distinguished majority leader and distinguished Democratic whip to address the Senate on a unanimous consent agreement.

Seeing no Senator seeking recognition, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BURNS). Without objection, it is so ordered.

NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 1997

The Senate continued with the consideration of the bill.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, again, I want to say I appreciate the cooperation of the members of the Armed Services Committee on both sides of the aisle. The distinguished chairman, the distinguished Senator from Virginia, the Senator from Georgia, Senator NUNN, and their staffs have all worked diligently.

I must confess that at 11 o'clock last night, I had my doubts we would be standing here this afternoon. But the tempo was very different this morning, and a lot of really good work has been done to clear amendments and to get amendments agreed to on both sides of the aisle. So I really express my sincere appreciation to the members of the Armed Services Committee and to the staff and to the Democratic leader, for his leadership team and our leadership time who was worked to bring this bill to a conclusion.

I think to complete action on this Department of Defense authorization bill is in the best interest of the country. It will allow us to move on in regular order to the appropriations bill. I hope by getting the authorization bill done first, we can avoid some of the conflicts we have run into in the past between the appropriations and authorization bills. I am pleased we have gotten it done.

AMENDMENT NO. 4433

(Purpose: To extend through fiscal year 1997 the prohibition on use of funds to implement an international agreement concerning theater missile defense systems)

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that sections 231 and 232 of the bill be stricken, and I now send to the desk an amendment inserting a new section, and ask the amendment be agreed to and the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table. This new section deals with demarcation of theater missile defense systems between antiballistic systems.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the amendment.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. LOTT], for Mr. THURMOND, proposes an amendment numbered 4433.

The amendment is as follows:

At the end of subtitle C of title II, add the following:

SEC. 237. EXTENSION OF PROHIBITION ON USE OF FUNDS TO IMPLEMENT AN INTERNATIONAL AGREEMENT CONCERNING THEATER MISSILE DEFENSE SYSTEMS.

Section 235(c) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1996 (Public Law 104-106; 110 Stat. 232) is amended in the matter preceding paragraph (1) by inserting "or 1997" after "fiscal year 1996".

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment is agreed to.

The amendment (No. 4433) was agreed to.

MODIFICATION OF SECTION 233

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that section 233, regard-

ing the ABM Treaty, be modified with the sense-of-the-Senate language I now send to the desk; and that the Foreign Relations Committee conduct hearings on the matter contained in section 233 before the end of the session.

While it is going to the desk, I want to say this is the proper thing to do. It is a serious matter as to how we deal with the question of multilateralization of treaties. I think the hearings are appropriate. I am glad to support this.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the section is so modified.

The modification is as follows:

Section 233 is modified to read as follows:

SEC. 233. CONVERSION OF ABM TREATY TO MULTILATERAL TREATY.

(a) FISCAL YEAR 1997.—It is the sense of the Senate that during fiscal year 1997, the United States shall not be bound by any international agreement entered into by the President that would substantively modify the ABM Treaty, including any agreement that would add one or more countries as signatories to the treaty or would otherwise convert the treaty from a bilateral treaty to a multilateral treaty; unless the agreement is entered pursuant to the treaty making power of the President under the Constitution.

(b) RELATIONSHIP TO OTHER LAW.—This section shall not be construed as superseding section 232 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1995 (Public Law 103-337; 108 Stat. 2701) for any fiscal year other than fiscal year 1997, including any fiscal year after fiscal year 1997.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the majority leader, after notification of the Democratic leader, may proceed to the consideration of each of the following three bills; that they be considered in the following order, with no intervening business in order between the three bills; that no amendments or motions be in order to these bills:

Defend America, which is S. 1635;

A bill to be introduced by the Democratic leader, or his designee, on behalf of the President regarding national missile defense;

And a bill to be introduced by Senator NUNN regarding national missile defense.

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

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, for the information of all Senators, with respect to the Chemical Weapons Convention, the majority leader and the Democratic leader will make every effort to obtain from the administration such facts and documents as requested by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Foreign Relations Committee, in order to pursue its work and hearings needed to develop a complete record for the Senate regarding the Chemical Weapons Convention, Executive Calendar No. 12.

With that in mind, I ask unanimous consent that the majority leader, after consultation with the Democratic leader, will, prior to September 14, 1996, proceed to executive session to consider Calendar No. 12, the Chemical Weapons Convention, and the treaty be

advanced through its various parliamentary stages, up to and including the presentation of the resolution of ratification; that all reported conditions and declarations be deemed agreed to; that there be two additional amendments to the resolution of ratification, to be offered by the majority leader or his designee, dealing with the subject matter of the Chemical Weapons Convention to be limited to 1 hour each, to be equally divided in the usual form; that no further conditions, amendments, declarations or understandings be in order; and there be 10 hours additional time for debate, to be equally divided in the usual form; and following the conclusion or yielding back of time, the Senate proceed to the adoption of the resolution of ratification, all without further action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. LOTT. Finally, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be advanced to third reading and final passage occur at 9:30 a.m. Wednesday, July 10, 1996, and paragraph 4 of rule XII be waived.

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

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I further state that if the resolution of ratification, with respect to the Chemical Weapons Convention, is agreed to, then I will do my best to schedule the implementation legislation, if it is available, no later than early 1997.

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

Mr. LOTT. I wonder if the Democratic leader has any comments at this point.

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, let me just commend the distinguished majority leader. Like him, I was not very optimistic we would be able to get to this point. But I think it, again, demonstrates the interest on both sides in working together to accomplish a number of major legislative achievements this year, and this is a good one.

This is an important issue. It is a bill that we needed to get done. The administration is very much in keeping with our desire to see the completion of this legislation in the nearest possible time.

We have appropriations bills when we get back. I look forward to using the same approach as we try to address those as well. It will be my hope that during the month of July, we can do on appropriations what we have just done on this authorization bill.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I would like to confirm what, obviously, all Senators now know. There will be no further votes today. We will be back in session on Monday, July 8, during which time we will begin the debate that was outlined in the unanimous consent agreement with regard to minimum wage and small business tax provisions, to be followed on Tuesday by the TEAM Act. And then there will be a vote, as we just outlined, at 9:30 a.m.,

Wednesday of that week on the final passage of the DOD authorization bill.

Mr. DASCHLE addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The minority leader is recognized.

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, I ask the majority leader, subject to an earlier discussion we had, for the interest of Senators, if we might be able to announce that the minimum wage vote would occur after the caucuses on Tuesday, and that debate on minimum wage take place that morning to accommodate traveling Senators and the debate on the issue, and then if there are votes, for them to be stacked at that point, 2:15, we would be happy to do that.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I believe that we can work together on that, and agree now that we would not have a vote on the minimum wage issue until after the policy luncheons on Tuesday. However, my intent was to complete all of the debate on that on Monday, and then have the debate on the small business packages on Tuesday. You know, we can work that out as far as the debate time. And we may need to stack some votes, or we may need to go to other issues that morning. But at the very minimum, we can agree now there will not be a vote on that until after the luncheons. Then I would like to work with the minority leader on the time for the rest of the debate.

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, I am primarily interested in when the votes take place and also accommodating some Senators who want to be heard on minimum wage who will not be here on Monday. And if it were possible to accommodate them, to allow for additional comments on Tuesday morning, it would be very helpful.

Mr. LOTT. As is always the case, just like we entered into having an agreement we would have a vote on that Wednesday and final passage 30 minutes later so two Senators can be heard on issues they feel are important, I am sure we can work it out in a balanced way where there could be others that want to be heard on other subjects that morning. But we will work with the minority leader to make sure Senators have time to express their views.

I thought the main thing was just to understand we would not have a vote until after the luncheon. But I want to maintain the flexibility of what we do earlier in the day, and after the vote, so we can get as much done on Tuesday as is at all possible. We will continue to work together on that.

Mr. DASCHLE. I thank the majority leader.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I rise to address an issue of vital importance to the U.S. Senate: whether the Senate should provide its advice and consent on any succession agreement regarding the ABM Treaty, especially an agreement that would convert the treaty from a bilateral agreement to a multilateral agreement. I would remind my colleagues that existing law requires any substantive modification

of the ABM Treaty to be submitted to the Senate for advice and consent.

The administration has asserted that it would be inappropriate for the Senate to make a judgement about the substantive nature of any potential agreement at this point. But, if the Senate's treaty making role is to be protected, we must clearly establish our views now, especially since the implications of such an agreement are fairly clear already. To do otherwise would invite a major dispute with the executive branch in the near future and put the Senate in a position where its only recourse would be to attempt to prohibit the implementation of the agreement. In my view, multilateralization of the ABM Treaty clearly constitutes a substantive change. Let me briefly outline my reasons for coming to this conclusion.

First of all, the fundamental circumstances that produced the treaty in the first place have changed. The ABM Treaty, more than any other arms control agreement, was a product of the bipolar cold war confrontation between the United States and the Soviet Union. With the dissolution of the Soviet Union, we face strategic and political circumstances that are vastly different.

Second, by having the Soviet Union succeeded, for purposes of the ABM Treaty, by some but not all of the independent States of the former Soviet Union, each possessing full and sovereign rights under the treaty, we would be changing, limiting, and extending certain rights and obligations previously possessed by the parties. This is all but a text book definition of a treaty amendment. U.S. rights would clearly be changed given the fact that the Standing Consultative Commission, the ABM Treaty's implementing body, would now be comprised of several parties, all of whom would need to consent to changes, clarifications, or amendments to the treaty.

As the administration stated in a May 3, 1996, letter to Senator NUNN: "Each Party will participate in implementing the treaty as a sovereign entity. This includes a full and equal voice in the SCC." When asked if the consent of all parties would be needed before the treaty could be amended, clarified, or interpreted, the administration answered: "Yes. The U.S. has insisted on a decision-making mechanism in the SCC under which legally binding obligations would be adopted by consensus." In effect, the SCC would be transformed into a corporate body in which the United States would need to receive five, six, or more affirmative votes before the treaty could be amended. In addition, some of the new treaty partners would only have partial rights. Of the former Soviet States, presumably only Russia would be entitled to deploy an operational ABM system.

Third, the actual functional mechanics of the ABM Treaty will be changed through multilateralization. The ABM

Treaty is based largely on a geographical description of the United States and the Soviet Union. It states specifically that certain large phased array radars may only be located along the periphery of the territory of the parties. In the case of the former Soviet Union, however, some such radars are now located outside Russia. The so-called Scrunda radar in Latvia, for example, is on the territory of an independent country that has categorically rejected membership in the ABM Treaty. Clearly, any agreement that addresses the successorship issue will also have to redefine these geographic aspects of the treaty, which in and of themselves will constitute substantive amendments to the treaty. In this regard, the Senate will be as interested to see which States do not accede to the ABM Treaty as it will be to see which countries do accede.

Mr. President, as we consider this important matter, which dramatically affects the Senate's constitutional prerogatives, let me also remind my colleagues of an important debate that took place in this Chamber several years ago regarding the so-called broad versus narrow interpretation of the ABM Treaty. On March 11, 12, and 13, 1987, the chairman of the Armed Services Committee, Senator NUNN, took to the floor to deliver a series of speeches criticizing the Reagan administration for having announced a new interpretation of the ABM Treaty. I do not wish to revisit the specific issues in that debate, only to remind my colleagues, especially on the other side of the aisle, how outraged they were at what appeared to be a challenge to the Senate's constitutional treaty-making role.

On March 11, 1987, Senator NUNN stated that the State Department was directly challenging the Senate's constitutional role. "This effect," he said, "could carry over and may well produce a congressional backlash through its exercise of the power of the purse and the power to raise and support armies in a manner that would give the effect to the original meaning of the treaty as presented to the Senate." It is precisely such a backlash that we are seeking to avoid by including section 233 in the Defense authorization bill. The administration is proceeding down a very dangerous course and we are simply trying to ensure that the Senate plays a role before we arrive at a point of crisis.

Why do I use such strong terms in describing the administration's present course? Let me be clear, Mr. President. The administration is not intending to submit any agreement to the Senate regarding ABM Treaty succession, even though such an agreement would constitute a fundamental departure from substance of the treaty presented to the Senate for advice and consent in 1972. In the same letter than I quoted from earlier, the administration makes clear that they are working on a memorandum of understanding on succession. What, I would ask, is the legal

standing of an MOU? How is it possible, given the major implications of such a change, that the administration is trying to modify a major arms control treaty with an MOU, as if this were some minor agreement with a close and reliable ally?

Mr. President, I do not believe that one can avoid the conclusion that the administration is negotiating major changes to the ABM Treaty, that these changes constitute substantive modifications to the treaty and the rights and obligations of the parties, and that the Senate must be directly involved. In my view, this involvement must include advice and consent to any such agreement. The executive branch cannot simply change the entire context of a major arms control treaty and expect the Senate to stand idly by.

The administration has sought to use various analogies to other cases in which the executive branch has not sought, and the Senate has not insisted upon, advice and consent on succession. The examples of the Conventional Forces in Europe and Intermediate-range Nuclear Forces Treaties are frequently used.

In the case of CFE, the Senate specifically recognized the impending breakup of the Soviet Union and adopted provisions taking this into account during the ratification debate. In fact, the Senate was so concerned about this issue with regard to CFE that it took great care to develop a condition to the resolution of ratification specifying procedures for adding new states parties and for evaluating the implications of the withdrawal of key newly independent states from the treaty. In the case of the ABM Treaty, no such provision has ever been made, since the ABM Treaty has always been viewed in a bipolar context. If anything, the case of the CFE Treaty argues for Senate advice and consent on any ABM Treaty succession agreement.

In the case of the INF Treaty, in my view, the executive branch still should seek a formal protocol on succession. The only reason that this has not become a major issue is due to the fact that INF has already been fully implemented and there are no significant areas of contention. Unlike the ABM Treaty, there is little likelihood that the United States may require major amendments or clarifications to the INF Treaty.

In the case of the START I Treaty, the succession agreement, known as the Lisbon Protocol, was in fact approved by the Senate as part of the overall ratification process. As in the case of CFE, START I was surrounded by major succession issues that the Senate had to address in a formal manner. I think it is fair to say that neither CFE or START I would have been approved by the Senate if not for the fact that the succession issues were thoroughly addressed as part of the ratification debate. In both cases the Bush administration correctly saw that a vote of the Senate was necessary.

Mr. President, in summary, let me simply say that section 233 of the bill stands up for the prerogatives of the Senate. The fact that the administration is so opposed to it is very bothersome. This provision was approved by the committee on a bipartisan basis and I believe that the Senate should overwhelmingly endorse it.

Mr. WARNER addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Virginia.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I want to thank the leadership on both sides of the aisle on behalf of all members of the Armed Services Committee on both sides of the aisle. We simply would not have been able to achieve what we have just announced without strong, firm commitments by both leaders. Indeed, I commend the distinguished Democratic whip who, likewise, helped in the clearance of amendments.

It is remarkable. I have served with many leaders. I will tell you, each time they arise to the challenge. And this time, indeed, both leaders did arise to the challenge. So I thank the leaders on both sides.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for third reading and was read the third time.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, having worked with our distinguished chairman on the committee, I wish to compliment again his leadership in enabling this bill to come through and be acted upon by the Senate in a timely manner thereby putting us in the logical sequential order with the appropriations measure.

I wish to congratulate the distinguished ranking member, Mr. NUNN. We have worked on bills for many years together. This will be the last that we have worked on together. I shall speak about his departure at a later time.

I also wish to thank the staff on both sides who have diligently pursued efforts dramatically in the last 24 hours. I assure you we were here until after midnight last night.

Also, I wish to thank the many colleagues on our committee who took an active role in this, and certainly Senator MCCAIN with his usual help in trying to get this series of amendments through and also working with the group of us who dealt with the time agreement which I hope will soon be adopted by the Senate.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, after we call the roll next week, I will make some expressions of appreciation to those who were so helpful on this matter.

One of them is the able Senator from Virginia who has done a magnificent service in the passage of this bill. I want to thank him.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CHAFEE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

Mr. CHAFEE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent I may proceed as in morning business for 5 minutes.

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

TRIBUTE TO MOLLIE BEATTIE

Mr. CHAFEE. Mr. President, I rise today to express my sorrow over the death last night of Mollie Beattie who was, up until just a few weeks ago, the Director of the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. Mollie Beattie was a courageous and determined woman for whom all of us who knew her had the most tremendous respect.

As I mentioned, just up until a few weeks ago, she was Director of the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and resigned from that because of the battle she was undergoing with brain cancer. Her death, Mr. President, is a great loss to this country. We have lost a committed, dynamic professional whose devotion to the conservation of our Nation's natural resources has benefited us all and will continue to improve the lives of our children and our grandchildren.

Mr. President, as a way of commemorating Mollie's contribution and her spirit, I am honored to cosponsor S. 1899, a bill to designate 8 million acres of wilderness within the 19-million acre Arctic National Wildlife Refuge as the Mollie Beattie Alaska Wilderness Area. It seems to me this is a wonderful tribute to a person whose appreciation of wild places has been a lodestar for her career. I am grateful to Senator STEVENS for sponsoring this resolution along with Senator LEAHY and Senator MURKOWSKI.

Many of you knew Mollie and recognized that she had incredible energy and vitality, and she brought all that to the Fish and Wildlife Service during her 3-year tenure there. She was the first woman to lead the Service, and she did an extraordinary job during a period when her agency was faced with increased budget cuts, public scrutiny and criticism. Her commitment to conservation of natural resources and to the people that work for the Fish and Wildlife Service made her an effective and well-respected advocate.

Throughout her serious illness, Mollie continued to lead the Service, demonstrating the strength of courage that made her unquestionably an extraordinary leader. She refused to let the serious operations and treatments for her cancer keep her from the job she loved. Mr. President, I have had the privilege of working with Mollie Beattie on a number of issues important to the Fish and Wildlife Service. Just last month, on May 16, despite her poor health, she came to my office to urge me to help in