

Today, I would like to make a special appeal to Congressman NORWOOD that we lower our voices and make a sincere effort to humanize our discussion. Instead of focusing on the overwhelming but abstract statistics such as the 56,000 hard-working Americans who die each year from job related causes, from now on let us emphasize instead the individual workers with names and faces.

There are workers in Mr. NORWOOD's district like William McDaniel, who without adequate restraining protection fell 80 feet off a television tower to his death in Pendergrass, GA. Like Paul Powell, who was crushed in the unguarded drive shaft of a machine at an Augusta, GA, plant. Like Earnest Gosnell of Homer, GA, who was operating a timber log skidder that had no safety belts when the machine overturned and crushed him. These fine Americans were all residents of Mr. NORWOOD's district in Georgia.

What's really alarming here is that Mr. NORWOOD and so many other Republicans show no concern whatsoever for these workers and the other 56,000 hard-working Americans who die each year from work-related causes. It is really disappointing and tragic that so many Members of Congress like Mr. NORWOOD, would rather launch a cold-hearted and sweeping attack on a Federal agency than do everything possible to protect their own constituents.

It is the duty of every Member of Congress to recognize and remember that OSHA protects the lives of workers in every district.

Mr. Speaker, one of the great things about the Vietnam War Memorial is that the Vietnam War Memorial names names of each individual soldier who gave his life for his country. I do not think we should ever again have monuments for unknown soldiers. Why have celebrations of unknown soldiers when you could name the names and have the faces? It will make it less likely than for those who make decisions about war in the future to be careless or casual when they are making those decisions.

In the same way we ought to try and humanize all the work we do here in Congress. In the budget that has been prepared by the Republicans, OSHA has been drastically reduced. OSHA next week will be under attack in the Economic and Educational Opportunities Committee. An omnibus bill which will deal with work-related protections will be on the floor of the committee, and OSHA will again be under attack.

OSHA saves lives. Stop and consider that OSHA saves lives. Fifty-six thousand people every year die of accidents on the job or work-related causes, diseases they contract on the job or accidents they have and later die in the hospital away from the job. Six thousand die immediately in accidents on the job, but 56,000 people a year is as many people as died, almost as many people that died, in the Vietnam war over the whole 7-year period of the Vietnam war.

□ 1345

It is a very serious matter. Accidents in the workplace, conditions in the workplace, are very serious. Let us not condemn our workers to unsafe conditions unnecessarily. OSHA protects lives.

Medicaid protects lives too. In the same budget that is going to reduce OSHA, we have tremendous reductions for Medicaid. I am not talking about Medicare, because we can talk about Medicare and the reductions there. That also needs to be debated. But Medicare will be protected. It will be discussed at length on this floor.

Greater cuts have been made in Medicaid than have been made in Medicare, and the Republican budget proposes to get rid of Medicaid as an entitlement. Medicaid is health care for poor people. We are going to have a second-class health care system sanctioned by the Federal Government. One system for those not in Medicaid, those who are in Medicare and can afford Medicare and can afford private insurance, and another system for the poor, that is financed by the Government, a second-class system that will be left to the States to run it. And there will be no Federal entitlements. When the States run out of money, if you are sick or ill, you will not get any help.

Those are human beings out there with faces. Those are people that we all know. Somebody will know the workers who are killed in accidents or the workers who die from job related causes. Somebody knows somebody who is going to die as a result of those cuts in Medicaid and Medicare. Let us not proceed with an across-the-board cut in Medicaid of 18 percent, higher than the cut in Medicare, across-the-board cut, and assume that human beings are not going to die as a result.

Second-class health care is dangerous health care. I once had a situation where a hospital about to go broke in my district told me that we are down to such a level that we cannot afford to really sterilize our towels properly. We do not have the equipment.

I said to the administrator of that hospital, if you cannot sterilize your towels properly, it is time to close the hospital. Let us not try to keep it open.

The provision of second-class health care is dangerous and deadly. If we treat people as numbers and do not treat them as human beings, we run the risk of destroying lives. Let us lower our voices and look at the faces again.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mrs. ROUKEMA] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mrs. ROUKEMA addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. DEFAZIO] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. DEFAZIO addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

#### MEDICARE: CUT OR LOSE?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. KINGSTON] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, the distinguished majority leader probably has a point when he was saying—excuse me, I mean the distinguished minority leader, force of habit—Mr. GEPHARDT, was giving a speech a few minutes ago saying that Medicare is going to be cut. And I think to some degree that you can argue that there is going to be certainly a modification of Medicare, and you may want to say that that is a cut. But I would say, what is better, modifying Medicare or losing Medicare? It will be broke under the current Medicare system in 6 years. It is not a matter of let us keep business as usual and avoid changing Medicare. We have got to do that.

You know, I wish that the critics, and most of the critics right now are coming from the minority side of the aisle, would enter into the solution as freely as they have entered into the criticism of the Republican plan. If they could enter the debate with facts and substance, instead of just with tactics and strategy, it would be so helpful. We need the help of the leadership and the wisdom of the Democrat Party.

We on the Republican side would be shortchanging ourselves if we said we had all the answers. And that is why our Founding Fathers had a two party system. We need the ideas from both sides of the aisle in order to come up with the solution.

The fact is, though, that the Clinton cabinet is the one who said Medicare is going to go broke in 6 years. The Clinton cabinet also has come out with statistics showing that baby boomers are going to be retiring in the year 2002, the Social Security trust fund runs out of money in the year 2030, and these are huge problems.

I yield to my friend from Michigan, Mr. SMITH.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. I thank the gentleman very much for yielding. You know, what is so very interesting is that it was 2 years ago that the trustees of the Medicare trust fund came to Congress and said, "This trust fund is going broke, and it will be out of money by the year 2000." This time they came back and said it might last until 2002.

But the fact is, it is a political hot potato. For the last 2 years, with the existing majority in Congress and the President, they did not want to deal with it because they knew it left a target. They were politically vulnerable.

Republicans met and said, do we want to save Medicare? If we do, are we