

nation. Her political savvy and integrity brought professional respect, as well as outstanding accomplishment. The great courage of her final year has been cited as she fought and at last accepted death with confidence, peace and encouragement for others. Not only at death's door was courage so evident. Her professional standards and personal values demanded courage and confidence and determination in reaching the goals she set for herself.

Mollie recognized the importance of maintaining a strong, healthy persona—physically, mentally and spiritually—not a selfish concern for her ego, but the pragmatic acceptance that thus only could she give the most of her life. Carlyle wrote that "Life is a little gleam of time between two eternities." Mollie's life was a great burst of light in that time allotted to her. We have been blessed by it.

She had one unusual and wonderful attribute—that of an unconscious but strong sense of personal presence, not one of power or command, but a presence that, of itself, demanded attention and got it. Hard to describe, but easy to recognize when you were exposed to it. Yet there were occasions when, while looking directly at you, she would leave you dreaming or thinking of some secret, transmundane reality, some mystic other world that only she could know and could not share. Then with a glance and a grin she would return her attention to you.

At the end Mollie could have assured us, "I own only my name. I've only borrowed this dust." Mollie's dust has returned to the earth from which it evolved. But her name will live long in our memories. May those memories serve to guide, strengthen and encourage us in our lives of service.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska.

Mr. MURKOWSKI. I thank the Chair.

BLANKET HOLDS ON ENERGY COMMITTEE BILLS

Mr. MURKOWSKI. I rise today to inform my colleagues of my degree of frustration with the gridlock that has occurred this entire Congress preventing passage of virtually every bill reported by my committee, the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources. As chairman of that committee, I obviously have the obligation of moving the bills out. I have attempted to do that.

I think it was the night before last, Mr. President, that the minority leader, Senator DASCHLE, expressed similar frustration over an objection from this side of the aisle to a judicial nominee. You can imagine my frustration when a few Senators from the Democratic side have prevented passage of all 72 bills from my committee currently pending on the calendar. Those objections, Mr. President, were not based on the merits of the bills being held; they were based on a problem with some other bill. So we have this chain of "you are not going to support my bill unless your bill passes."

I think it is fair to note that during part of the last year and a half, all of my committee bills were being held not because of any inaction by the Senate or my committee, but the excuse was the House was not acting quickly enough on some matter of interest.

There are many, many items that are very important to Senators. I want to get them cleared and get them out.

For example, Sterling Forest, my good friend Senator D'AMATO has been urging me, clear Sterling Forest. The New York Times has taken up the charge. I certainly want to see Sterling Forest cleared. I want to support the position of my friend, Senator D'AMATO from New York, who responded to the editorial of the New York Times as it affects New Jersey, as it affects New York. We attempted to clear that, along with the Utah ski bill, and a couple of small native items for Alaska.

I cannot recall how many holds—it was like a rabbit trail. You could not keep up with it fast enough. Once we attempted to clear them, one hold would go on, someone would attempt to remove the hold, and, bingo, it is back on. My good friend from Utah, Senator BENNETT, spent endless hours trying to clear that. This is a blatant abuse of the whole process. It has to stop. I know the leadership feels that way. The Members are going to have to recognize a few realities.

Over the past several months, I have been working with my House counterparts to put together a package in conference on the Presidio bill. It has virtually everything in it. Everybody is not going to like everything in it, but there is virtually something in it for every Member. If you want to get behind this bill and get these land issues passed, you are simply going to have to recognize that we will have to keep the bill together.

Due to the holds and the situation of the Senate, the process has become cumbersome, to say the least. Virtually everyone who has a parks or public lands bill introduced in the House or Senate wants to be included in any package that is moving.

On the other hand, if I try to move an individual bill separately, Members think the Presidio package is dying and want to be included in the measure, as well. So what we have, Mr. President, is gridlock. I am not going to point fingers. It is just the reality.

Mr. President, frankly, I have had it. Unless those Members who have blanket holds on Energy Committee bills, unless they lift those holds and allow me, as chairman, to work the system, to start moving individual bills and packages where appropriate, no bills are going to move. That would be a shame, Mr. President, because these bills affect our Nation's parks, public lands, our forests. They are good public policy, and they are good for the environment.

I want to also add one more thing, because there is some confusion about the interests of the Senator from the State of Alaska. The Tongass is not part of this package. There is a proposal to allow an extension, for 15 years, of a competitive timber contract with the Forest Service for Louisiana Pulp Co., Louisiana Pacific Co. The ra-

tionale behind that, or the necessity, is that they are prepared and required, under the new laws governing effluent and air quality, to invest roughly \$200 million in converting this plant—which, I might add, is our only year-round manufacturing plant—in southeastern Alaska, upon which 2,000 jobs are dependent. They simply must have a contractual commitment from the Forest Service for supply of raw material.

Now, why is that different in Alaska? It is different in Alaska, Mr. President, because we have no other source of timber. There is no private timber. There is no State timber. It is all owned by the Federal Government, and their current contract is about to expire.

I ask unanimous consent to have 1½ more minutes.

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

Mr. MURKOWSKI. If the 15-year contract is not extended, this plant—the only manufacturing plant, with 2,000 jobs—will be lost, and the pulp timber will be exported out of the State, which is really a travesty.

Now, that is the interest of the Senator from Alaska in this package. So, Mr. President, I hope that clears up any doubts in the minds of anybody relative to the environmental aspects of the merits of this contract. This is to provide a chlorine-free new mill to replace the old one. But it can only happen if there is a contractual commitment for timber, because nobody is going to spend \$200 million without an assured supply and a contract with the Federal Government.

So I am committed to moving these bills. My committee has held hearings on these bills and held the markups. I have supported and voted for each of these bills. I am not the problem, Mr. President. But unless these holds are lifted, I don't see how I can be part of the solution. So I urge my colleagues—particularly the leadership—to do what they can to end this gridlock. It just has to be stopped.

I yield the floor.

Mr. WELLSTONE addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota.

EXTENSION OF PATENT FOR LODINE

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, I will be very brief.

Mr. President, I have sent a letter to my colleagues about the inclusion of the extension for the patent of the drug Lodine in the health insurance conference report and announced my intention to raise a point of order about this, since a similar provision was not included in either the House or the Senate bill. Whatever the intentions of whoever inserted this into conference committee report in the dark of night—and I don't know what their intentions were—certainly the impact of

this provision on consumers will be disastrous. Moreover, granting such an extension in the dark of night is not the way to legislate.

So all of my colleagues have a letter announcing my intent to challenge this provision on a point of order. I am also considering offering a concurrent resolution to delete this provision from the conference report. My hope is that we can get bipartisan support for this effort, in which case, one way or the other, we can knock this special interest giveaway out of conference committee report.

I want to state to my colleagues that this patent extension that we see before us for the manufacturer of Lodine essentially means that for a period of 2 years, and in effect over a period of 5 years because of the way the provision is written, cheaper versions of the prescription drug will not be made available to consumers. People who are suffering from arthritis and are not able to buy a cheaper drug will pay millions of dollars that they should not have to. This is really outrageous.

When I was a college professor, I talked about conference committees, and I knew they were kind of the third House of the Congress, but I had no idea that this type of thing happened all the time, or some of the time. But it should not happen any of the time.

What we have here is a company that sells over a quarter of a billion dollars worth of a drug, willing to pay the Government \$10 billion a year for the additional costs that the patent extension will cost the Government in increased Medicaid and health care costs, but not willing to do anything for consumers and seniors. And quite frankly, the payments to the Government are nothing compared to the ripoff of seniors and consumers.

I hope that we may be able to do something about this situation together, in a bipartisan way. I believe that Senator KENNEDY, Senator KASSEBAUM, and many other Senators will be interested in doing that one way or the other. I started talking about this yesterday when I realized that, in the dark of night, this provision had been inserted, and one way or the other I am going to take action as a Senator from Minnesota to do everything I can to knock this provision out.

This provision represents a giveaway to a special interest at the expense of patients and senior citizens, and, quite frankly, the mysterious manner in which it was added to the conference report late at night is not the way we ought to be conducting our affairs here. This is a perfect example of the kind of practice that makes people lose confidence in our political process. Therefore, I hope all Senators, Republicans and Democrats alike, will join me in my effort to knock this provision out.

Mr. DEWINE addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio is recognized.

FAMILY HOUR PROGRAMMING

Mr. DEWINE. Mr. President, earlier this week, the President of the United States gathered the TV networks together to work out a much-trumpeted agreement on quality TV programming for children. I certainly applaud the President's efforts, and I am pleased that the meeting has served to at least spotlight this important issue. But the sad fact remains that this new and improved agreement to bring quality programming to our children is really nothing more than a ratification of the status quo. In fact, two of the major networks announced they already met this agreement. Another said that it is just barely short of compliance now.

So, essentially, the President has come out and said he approves of what the networks are already doing about quality programming; the status quo is OK.

Mr. President, as the father of eight children, and now the grandfather of three, let me just say that I do not approve of what the networks are doing. In fact, I find that some of what you see on television during the so-called family hour, from 8 to 9 o'clock at night, is absolutely outrageous today. I do not approve of it. I can say with assurance that parents I have talked to are clearly frustrated with television programming today. The last thing we want to say to the networks is, "Just keep on doing what you are doing."

Parents do not want a measure that has a lot of fanfare and no substance. They want to do something real. Personally, I would like to be able to sit down after dinner with my 13-year-old daughter, Alice, or my 9-year-old son, Mark, or my 4-year-old daughter, Anna, and watch a half an hour or an hour of TV without having to always be in some sort of high state of alert for things that might not be appropriate for any one of them to see.

You know, Mr. President, it was not that many years ago that we did not have this problem. We could all watch TV with our children between 8 and 9 o'clock at night without having to worry about them. While every show between 8 and 9 wasn't a great show, at least you could find one show between 8 and 9 o'clock at night that was appropriate for a child to watch with a parent.

Mr. President, I think we should take advantage of the attention that the White House has focused on this issue, and I think we should use it to call for some measures that really would make a difference.

Our distinguished colleague from Connecticut, Senator LIEBERMAN, has recently proposed a resolution that I think would do a great deal to accomplish this goal. His resolution would call upon the networks, on a strictly voluntary basis, to restore the idea of family hour programming.

That, Mr. President, would make a real difference in the lives of America's families. I would guess that, on this issue, my experience is not unique or

unusual. Who among us—among all the parents in this country—has not been very worried about what their children might suddenly be exposed to on TV?

Just a few years ago, during the family hour, you did not have to do that. I am not talking about just the 1950's or the 1960's; I am talking about as recently as less than a decade ago. I think many of us in politics do not fully realize how much and how fast TV has changed just in the last few years. That is why I think my colleagues will be interested in seeing a comparison of the TV Guide listings for the hour between 8 and 9 o'clock as they have changed over the years.

I ask unanimous consent that this very interesting document be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks, and I recommend it to the attention of my colleagues.

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

(See Exhibit 1.)

Mr. DEWINE. This was put together by Dan Wewers, a young man who interned in my office. He researched the TV Guides going back to 1954 and looked at a typical week. We take it every so many years, in 1954, in 1960, all the way up through July 14 through the 20th of 1996. People are not going to approve or like every program on here. They weren't all great shows. But the point is, I think there were very few times where you could not at least find one program between 8 and 9 o'clock that was suitable to watch with your children.

Mr. President, the networks recognize, at least in principle, that they have a responsibility to the public. As parents and citizens, we have both the right and the duty to tell the networks what we think they should do—the little changes they can make that we believe will make a positive difference in the lives of our children and our families.

Scheduling 1 hour of programming in the early evening that is appropriate for parents to watch with their children would be a very big positive step, and it would be a great change from the status quo. That is why I support the Lieberman initiative, and I think my colleagues, if they look at the document I am submitting today, which I asked be printed in the RECORD, they will come to the same conclusion.

I think the President should talk to Senator LIEBERMAN about this idea. It is a good idea, and it would make a real difference.

I yield the floor.

EXHIBIT 1

FAMILY HOUR PROGRAMMING

(8:00–9:00 p.m.)

TV GUIDE LISTINGS

*New York Metropolitan Area*¹

Major Network Stations

(CBS, NBC, ABC, and FOX)

For the dates of:
APRIL 2–8, 1994

¹ Washington, D.C. Metropolitan Area