I got a great hoot today out of one of my colleagues talking about the Contract With America. The first Contract With America was the Constitution. It guaranteed life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. Then in 1935 we made another contract with Americans. We said if Americans work hard and pay into Social Security, they will have a safety net. Then in 1965, when one-third of our seniors were living in poverty, we said we will make another contract with America, we will create Medicare and Medicaid.

Now, the Republicans, for the first time in 40 years, have control of the House, and they want to undo those safety nets. They want to say to these people we are going to save Medicare by bleeding $270 billion out of it. We are going to save Medicaid by bleeding $182 billion out of it. This is the same kind of medical care they used to give George Washington with leeches. I say this is the actually the biggest highway robbery since the James Gang rode the west. They should be ashamed.

SAVE MEDICARE FROM BANKRUPTCY

(Mrs. SEASTRAND asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. SEASTRAND. Madam Speaker, here is a picture of the new symbol of the liberal Democrat Party. Yes, it is an ostrich with its head in the sand.

This symbolizes the Democrats response to saving Medicare from bankruptcy. When told back in April by their own Medicare trustees in the Clinton administration that Medicare would go bottom up in 7 years, Democrats buried their heads in the sand.

Madam Speaker, it really is a shame that the party that devised Medicare in the 1960's would abandon it in the 1990's. Democrats have not put forward one idea on how to preserve Medicare, not one. Where is their plan? This is irresponsible and, in the words of the Washington Post, ''wrong.''

Yesterday, former Democrat Congressman Tim Penny wrote that Democrats should be in the forefront of saving Medicare from bankruptcy. Instead, like this ostrich, they have buried their heads in the sand.

DO NOT CUT MEDICARE

(Ms. DELAURO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. DELAURO. Madam Speaker, the Republican plan to cut $270 billion from Medicare in order to fund a tax cut for the wealthy is beginning to make members of their own party squeamish.

This week, three Republican members of the other body said they could not stand by a $245 billion tax cut while cutting $270 billion from Medicare. They think it is the wrong thing to do and they are right.

The Republican proposals to cut Medicare will mean that seniors will see their premiums double and their deductibles double. Senior citizens living on fixed incomes simply cannot afford to see their premiums go from $45 a month to $93 a month, or see their deductibles go from $100 to $200.

The three Republican Senators are right. It is wrong to ask 37 million American seniors to pay $1,000 more for Medicare, so that the wealthiest Americans can get a $20,000 tax cut.

SENIOR CITIZENS SHOULD HAVE RIGHT TO CHOOSE THEIR HEALTH PLAN

(Mr. HOKE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HOKE. Madam Speaker, did you see this? We just heard more of this.

Madam Speaker, one of the things that amazes me about this debate is that one of the options that individuals have, and the gentlewoman from Connecticut will be pleased to know this, is if a senior citizen chooses, chooses to stay in a 35-year-old plan, they may do that. If they choose to do that, they have that option. They have the option to do that if they want. They will have other choices that will give them far more flexibility, far more choice, et cetera, et cetera.

What is important about this is that in fact what we do know is that one of the choices that will exist is if a senior citizen wants to stay in the program exactly the way that it is today, they may do that. They may do that, but they will also be given other choices, better choices, newer choices.

DEMOCRATS SHOULD BE LEADERS, NOT OBSTRUCTIONISTS, DURING REFORM OF MEDICARE

(Mr. GUTKNECHT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GUTKNECHT. Madam Speaker, I do not expect the people on that side of the aisle necessarily to listen to us, but I would hope they would listen to one of their former colleagues and a Democrat who wrote the other day in the Washington Post. And, incidentally, he was my immediate predecessor, Tim Penny, who wrote a column entitled ''Medicare Mistake.''

In the column he says, ''By politicizing the issue, Democrats threaten the viability of the very program they created.'' He goes on to say, ''Democrats in Congress have not only opposed Republican reform initiatives, they have also refused to embrace the savings identified in President Clinton's plan. We cannot afford to ignore Medicare's shaky financial condition or put it off until after the next election. It is just too important. The Medicare trustees have given us a 7-year warning. These 7 years should not be squandered in indecision, stall tactics and politicking. We should view this time as an opportunity to devise and employ creative solutions. Democrats should be the leaders in this debate, not the obstructionists.''

□ 1030

APPOINT AN OUTSIDE COUNSEL AND BRING INVESTIGATION OF SPEAKER TO A CONCLUSION

(Mr. MILLER of California asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MILLER of California. Madam Speaker, the lyrics to an old song say, ''First you say you will, then you say you won't. You're undecided now, what are you going to do?''

This apparently has become the theme song for the chairman of the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct, the gentlewoman from Connecticut [Mrs. JOHNSON]. One minute she says she is going to have an outside counsel, then she is not going to have an outside counsel.

She said in 1988, the House should have an outside counsel when the committee investigated Speaker Wright, and now she is saying maybe she did not mean to sign that letter or agree with it at all. What is it?

The fact is that the only way this inquiry of Speaker GINGRICH can be brought to a conclusion is with an outside counsel. The press tells us, the Manchester Journal and Inquirer tells us, that when the chairman of the House Committee on Standards of Official Conduct visited with the Speaker to inform him that in all likelihood there would be an outside counsel, he hit the roof and said, ''You are going to wreck the GOP revolution and you are going to bring me down.''

Well, as he said to Speaker Wright, if you are innocent, you have nothing to fear from the outside counsel. Let us maintain the standard that the House has had since 1979 and appoint an outside counsel and let us get this investigation to a conclusion.

JUANITA MORGAN'S DEPARTURE FROM THE JOINT ECONOMIC COMMITTEE

(Mr. SAXTON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SAXTON. Madam Speaker, as vice chairman of the Joint Economic Committee, I rise today to thank and wish the best of luck to Juanita Morgan, or Nita, as all her friends call her.

I have had the great pleasure of working with Nita, who after 16 years of loyal and dedicated service, is leaving the Joint Economic Committee to join the private sector.

During her tenure with the committee, Nita has worked in a variety of