

Or listen to this man from Oak Lawn, IL:

I am a Republican and will continue to vote Republican. However * * * during some lean times I had to let my health insurance lapse. It was not, as some politicians and demagogos so smugly suggest, because I spent the money on recreation. I spent the money on food, rent, and bills. But I was forced to stay in the hospital a while. Now I am completely financially ruined. I'm 41 years old and I'm ruined.

Or the mother in Ottawa, IL, injured in an automobile accident, whose husband suffered injury in a work-related accident and must find different work. She writes

My husband and I and three children ages 18, 12, and 10 are now without health benefits. Due to our disabilities and unfair treatment by insurance companies our financial situation is dire.

The stories go on and on.

Those stories will multiply if we do not act. And other changes in health care delivery are emerging. Each week fewer and fewer Americans have an independent choice of physician. Each week, for-profit corporations are taking over not-for-profit hospitals, reducing the number of nurses on duty and requiring resident physicians to see more patients in less time, diminishing the quality of health delivery. At least one physician in Illinois has decided to give up the practice rather than provide care that uses mass production techniques.

And Medicaid patients—poor people—routinely are given the cold shoulder for nonemergency care by many hospitals who prefer patients with insurance coverage.

The United States is the wealthiest nation but not the healthiest nation. Twenty-one nations have lower infant mortality rates than we do, and 23 industrialized nations have fewer low-birthweights babies. Yet these countries spend far less on health care than we do, and many have a longer average lifespan. That is not because of an act of God but because of flawed policy. Our poor health record did not come as some divine edict from above but emerged from the indifference of men and women in this very room.

Why? Part of the reason was complexity and delay on the part of those of us who supported a health coverage program. But that is only a part of the picture. What primarily caused the confusion and opposition was the greed on the part of those who profit from their cut in this trillion-dollar business. Newsweek reported that opponents spend \$400 million, more than twice what the two major Presidential candidates spend in the last two elections combined. When CEO's who are engaged in the present system pocket as much as \$10 million in 1 year, do you think they will be anxious to alter the present procedures which help them and hurt millions of Americans? The Wall Street Journal recently stated that Health Systems International of Colorado has \$475 million in cash, and the amount is growing by \$500,000 a

day, and the Journal reports they are "hunting for new ways to park the money." Do they want to change the system? The same article quotes Margo Vignola of Salomon Brothers saying that the top nine HMO's have \$9.5 billion in cash, "way beyond what HMO's need." Do they want to change the system? Pfizer, the pharmaceutical company, gave \$221,235 to the Republican national committees in soft money before the election. Did they do that because they want to change the system?

The common assumption is that with a Democratic President and a Republican Congress, no significant progress in health care can be made. I challenge that assumption.

The greatest contribution of Harry Truman's Presidency—one of many significant contributions he made—was the creation of the Marshall plan. To many it seemed doomed when offered. The first Gallup Poll after its proposal showed only 14 percent of the American people supported it. On top of that, after the 1946 election, President Truman had to work with a Republican Congress. But one man, Senator Arthur Vandenberg of Michigan, a key Republican, stood up strongly and supported the Marshall plan and helped to save Western Europe. The Republicans in the Senate have designated as their new leader on health care Senator ROBERT BENNETT of Utah, one of the more thoughtful Members of this body. Is it possible that he, together with the new chair of the Finance Committee, BOB PACKWOOD, can be the Arthur Vandenberg of our generation?

It is politically understandable that Republican Senators might have been reluctant to work with Democrats on health care reform in the 103d Congress, for fear that they would hand Democrats a legislative victory. But now, that is behind us. With Republicans in control of both Chambers of Congress, there is no question that bipartisan agreement on health care will be of benefit to the broad public and not simply a political victory for one party at the expense of the other.

Could we, for example, at least provide coverage for all pregnant women and children age 6 and under? Do we have the courage to stand up to the profiteers to at least do that?

Let me add that it is not enough for Senators to stand up. They are not likely to do it in splendid isolation. Business and labor leaders, professional people and those who have been abused by this system must join in a chorus for action. Their voices will not be as strong as the decibel level of those who speak from greed, but Senators and House Members should know that there are at least some Americans who know and understand the dimensions and the importance of the issue.

There are occasions when we, in the Senate, must ask ourselves: Why are we here? Let us look in the faces of 39 million Americans without health care coverage and ask ourselves that question. Let us look at the millions more who will lose their coverage if they

lose their jobs or change jobs. Let us not be silent and unresponsive to their pleas for help. Let us not be so eager to hold public office that we violate the public trust, not by disobeying the law, but by following the shifting winds of public opinion and the pressures of big campaign donors.

There are no Americans who today look to their forebears and say with pride, "He or she voted against creating Social Security." There are no Americans who look to their grandparents or great-grandparents and say with pride, "He or she voted against Medicare."

We are not here in the Senate simply to assume an exalted title and let the media message our egos. We are here to create a better future for our people and for generations to come. In the last session, the Senate did not even vote on health care. That will not happen again. But we should do more than give ourselves an opportunity to vote. We should, in a fiscally prudent, pay-as-you-go way, give all Americans what we as legislators and Federal employees have: health care protection. We should give future generations the ability to look back upon us with pride and say, "They were the first political leaders to guarantee health care coverage for all our citizens."

Mr. THOMAS addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming is recognized.

THE PASSING OF LORNA KOOI SIMPSON

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, I rise today for a short tribute to a lady from Wyoming who passed away last week, a lady who certainly was a rare and wonderful gem, not only for Wyoming but for this country as well. She was someone that I had the great privilege of knowing and admiring, Lorna Kooi Simpson.

My friend AL SIMPSON and the entire Simpson family lost a wonderful mother and caregiver last week. We all have lost one of the greatest ladies of Wyoming and the dearest of souls. Her devotion to her family, community, State and Nation are a legacy. Indeed she is part of the very fabric of Wyoming.

Lorna Simpson began her long distinguished life on August 19, 1900—the daughter of a Dutch immigrant. With her family Lorna Simpson moved West. In 1929 Lorna married an exceptional young man, a lawyer, from Cody, WY—Milward Simpson. He was a State legislator for Wyoming and a man destined to lead his State. Together they had two sons, Peter and ALAN. In Lorna, Milward found an equally dedicated soul and a partner to do the work few of us have the means to accomplish.

Lorna, like the rest of her family, went on to do great things. She was a stalwart of her community and State; active in community service, business, the war effort and of course politics.

She was a special young woman who, along with her husband, made up one of the most successful and respected teams Wyoming has ever known.

In 1954 Lorna became the First Lady of Wyoming after helping her husband become Wyoming's Governor. There in Cheyenne her reputation only grew as a caring compassionate person who put so much of her time and spirit into the youth of Wyoming.

Milward Simpson and his dear wife gave their unique talents and thoughtful style to Washington in 1962 when Milward served Wyoming until 1966 as a Member of this body. During her time here Lorna was named by the Senate to be the representative of the Women of the United States to the Organization of American States. In addition, she worked tirelessly to refurbish and extend the use of the Senate Chapel.

Their sons, Pete and AL, have gone on to great things. Pete Simpson as the University of Wyoming's vice president for development and alumni and university relations, AL SIMPSON, like his father, of course, as one of the most respected Members of this body.

As a wife, mother, First Lady, adviser, grandmother, and great-grandmother Lorna Simpson touched countless lives and helped so many people. Her accomplishments, the people she touched could never really be fully listed.

Susan and I join so many in grieving the passage of a lady who was truly the very best of Wyoming.

Thank you, Mr. President.

I yield back the remainder of my time.

SECOND READING OF A BILL—S. 290

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read the bill for the second time.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 290), relating to the treatment of Social Security under any constitutional amendment requiring a balanced budget.

Mr. COHEN. Mr. President, I object to further consideration of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The Senator from Maine is recognized.

Mr. COHEN. I thank the Chair.

(The remarks of Mr. COHEN pertaining to the introduction of S. 294 are located in today's RECORD under "Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.")

Mr. MURKOWSKI addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska.

Mr. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I thank the Chair. I ask how much time remains for morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Morning business continues until the hour of 2 o'clock. The Senator is being recognized for up to 10 minutes.

UNITED STATES-NORTH KOREA FRAMEWORK AGREEMENT

Mr. MURKOWSKI. I thank the Chair.

Mr. President, I intend to make a brief statement on the status of the joint United States-North Korea agreed framework covering nuclear issues.

I had the pleasure of visiting North Korea, along with Senator SIMON, who is here on the floor today. As a consequence of that particular visit, the framework agreement has been an issue of great concern to me and an issue worthy of congressional scrutiny.

There have been a number of hearings on the agreed framework. The Intelligence Committee, the Energy Committee, the Foreign Relations Committee, and the Armed Services Committee have addressed this subject. I had an opportunity to speak before the Armed Services Committee just the other day. I want to commend that committee for its important role in reviewing the agreement, because there are some 37,000 American troops on the demilitarized zone in South Korea. They are certainly exposed to harm should any conflict arise on the Korean Peninsula.

It is interesting to note that under Armed Services Committee oversight, the Department of Defense has seen fit to fund the purchase of approximately 50,000 tons of oil. The first shipment called for under the agreed framework.

Now, Mr. President, I would like to briefly raise three specific areas of concern about the framework agreement. The first is the fate of 8,177 Americans still unaccounted for in North Korea following the Korean war north of the 38th parallel. I find it interesting to reflect on that staggering figure, when we recognize that currently today in Vietnam, we have somewhat less than 1,700 unaccounted for.

We have an obligation, Mr. President, to get the answers. How do we get the answers? Well, it is certainly a matter of access. The North Koreans must allow the United States access, including joint recovery teams that proved so successful in Vietnam. In fact, in North Korea, unlike Vietnam, we know the precise location of over 2,000 grave sites and prisoner-of-war camps. We simply cannot get in.

During our visit to Pyongyang, Senator SIMON and I delivered a letter to President Kim Jong Il. The letter was given to the Foreign Minister and he assured us it had been delivered to President Kim Jong Il.

At the conclusion of my remarks, I will ask unanimous consent that a copy of that letter be printed in the RECORD.

Mr. President, to my knowledge we have received no answer to the letter delivered to President Kim Jong Il.

I call on the North Korean leadership to respond favorably to our request for joint recovery teams and further cooperation. It is fair to say that the few remains repatriated thus far have not been well handled. Moreover, there appears to be a profit motive associated with those remains. We have had unof-

ficial indications that the DPRK wants up to \$30,000 U.S. per remain. This is an outrageous sum compared to the \$2,000 figure used for reimbursement in Vietnam.

It is inconceivable to me, Mr. President, that as to the lack of cooperation in fullest possible accounting for those Americans lost in the Korean conflict, there has not been a demand by the administration in the framework agreement that this matter be addressed. I think this is the highest requirement of Government—fullest possible accounting of those who gave so much for our freedoms. Why has it not been included if the framework agreement? Moreover, the administration has not yet seen fit to respond to the inquiries that this Senator has made in that regard.

I would also like to call this body's attention to the comparison between Vietnam and North Korea. The administration has moved faster in 3 months with North Korea than in the last 3 years with Vietnam toward diplomatic and trade relation, despite the fact that Vietnam has taken many good-faith steps by providing cooperation, including joint recovery teams.

One other interesting comparison, not related to the MIA issue, is the fact that we have agreed to provide the North Koreans with light-water. Yet, we are prohibited from selling that same technology to China.

The second issue I want to talk about is the lack of dialog between North and South Korea. One of the requirements of the framework agreement is that there be a dialog. Without a meaningful dialog between the North and South, it will be impossible to implement the agreed framework. Based on administration representations, we anticipate that South Korea and Japan will pick up substantial costs associated with the delivery of the light-water reactors—at least \$4 billion. We also anticipate other countries to cover the delivery of a significant amount of oil, approximately 500,000 tons per year over a period of years.

I do not believe that South Korea can make such a commitment to the North without a political dialog. But at this point, there is no such dialog. The North is still demanding an apology from President Kim Young-sam for the alleged insensitivity on the death of Kim Il-song, and yet the North continues with propaganda against the South.

Mr. President, section three of the framework agreement between the United States and North Korean requires that the North Koreans will engage in a North-South dialog and that the North Koreans will consistently take steps to implement the North-South declaration on the demilitarization of the Korean Peninsula.

I am gratified that references to North-South issues were included in the agreed framework, but I am concerned that the references do not have