(ix) obstructs justice;

(x) has a significant prior criminal record; or

(xi) is an organizer or leader of drug trafficking activities involving five or more persons.

(2) RATIO.—The recommendations described in the preceding subsection shall propose revision of the drug quantity ratio of crack cocaine to powder cocaine under the relevant statutes and guidelines in a manner consistent with the ratios set for other drugs and consistent with the objectives set forth in section 3553(a) of title 28 United States Code.

(b) STUDY.—No later than May 1, 1996, the Department of Justice shall submit to the Judiciary Committees of the Senate and House of Representatives a report on the charging and plea practices of Federal prosecutors with respect to the offense of money laundering. Such study shall include an account of the steps taken or to be taken by the Justice Department to ensure consistency and appropriateness in the use of the money laundering statute. The Sentencing Commission shall submit to the Judiciary Committees comments on the study prepared by the Department of Justice.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WALKER). The gentleman from Florida [Mr. MCCOLLUM] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. McCOLLUM. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

This bill is the companion Senate bill that is referred to in the rule of the bill we just adopted. I ask for its adoption.

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the Senate bill.

The previous question was ordered.

The Senate bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A similar House bill (H.R. 2259) was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Ms. McKINNEY. Mr. Speaker, I was not recorded on rollcall vote No. 725. I would like the RECORD to show had I been recorded I would have voted ''no''.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. McCOLLUM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks on the bill just considered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

(Mr. ARMEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take a minute to inform the Members that there will be no more votes tonight. We will begin to proceed with special orders.

In a minute I will be asking unanimous consent to convene the House at 9 a.m. tomorrow. This is an agreement we have made with the minority so that the Members would expect then the House to convene at 9 a.m. We would then proceed to have fifteen 1–minutes on each side of the aisle and them begin consideration of the rule for the health care bill.

Mr. Speaker, we would expect the first vote to come sometime between 10:30 and 10:45 tomorrow morning.

HOUR OF MEETING TOMORROW

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 9 a.m. tomorrow, Thursday, October 19, 1995.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. (Mr. BUNN of Oregon). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was objection.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

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

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

MEDICARE BILL SACRIFICES SENIORS

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

Mr. BEVILL. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to the so-called Medicare Preservation Act, which this House will vote on tomorrow. This bill does not preserve Medicare. It preserves the high cost of health care and sacrifices our senior citizens.

Seniors will be asked to pay more out-of-pocket for their health care needs if this legislation is enacted. And, what is the justification for that? It's not so save Medicare from bankruptcy. Only $90 billion of the proposed $270 billion in Medicare cuts is needed to keep the program solvent for the next 10 years.

The seniors are being asked to pay more so that the wealthy in this country can get a tax break. That's what this legislation is all about. It's not about preserving Medicare. It's about giving the Nation's wealthiest people a tax break at the expense of 37 million American senior citizens and their families.

This legislation will impact more than one in every six people in my Fourth Congressional District in Alabama who depend on Medicare. This bill jeopardizes the quality of their health care, the affordability of their health care and their choice of doctors. That's the last thing they need or want.

Most people would agree that changes are needed to ensure the long-term survival of Medicare. In fact, Congress already has performed minor surgery on the Medicare program nine times when changes were needed.

But, this plan calls for major surgery on Medicare when there is no emergency. I think Congress needs to wait until after the Presidential election and then perform minor surgery to keep Medicare fiscally sound. We shouldn't do it when there is no immediate need and we certainly shouldn't do it in the middle of presidential politics.

We must continue to fight waste, fraud and abuse in the Medicare program. We must tighten enforcement of laws we already have on the books. And, any savings ought to go back into the program itself.

If there is so much concern about the viability of Medicare into the 21st century, let's use any savings to make the program better. Medicare savings certainly should not be used to further reduce taxes for the big corporations and the high income people.

This legislation represents an attempt to balance the budget on the backs of senior citizens. The cuts to Medicare account for 30 percent of all the proposed spending reductions for the next 7 years. Is this fair?

Is it fair to jeopardize the quality of care available to the elderly under Medicare, their choices of doctors and hospitals, and most importantly, their ability to pay for health care services? I submit that it is not fair.

We do not need to rush forward with an ill-conceived plan just so we can give wealthy people a tax break.

Any changes in Medicare need to be carefully crafted, well-thought-out and publicly debated. Congress should examine all the options for strengthening the Medicare program and devise a plan to achieve savings without penalizing senior citizens.

Instead, this House will vote tomorrow on a plan to unfairly cut $270 billion from Medicare to pay for a $245 billion tax cut for the wealthy. If this plan passes, seniors will pay more and get less.

I will vote against unfair cuts in Medicare. I will vote to ensure that the Nation's senior citizens have quality, choice and affordability when it comes to their medical care.

☐ 2115

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

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