I am encouraged that the House leadership has not abandoned this worthy cause. We will have an opportunity in the opening days of this Congress to vote on a proposed amendment to the U.S. Constitution to limit our terms and send a message to the public that we are dedicated to building upon last Congress' reforms.

Mr. Speaker, support for term limits remains strong among voters. I encourage my colleagues to favorably respond to their call and vote to limit congressional terms.

INTRODUCTION OF LIVABLE WAGE ACT

HON. BRUCE F. VENTO

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 7, 1997

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing legislation intended to take a major step forward toward a livable wage for working men and women in our country. Too often American workers are forced to take jobs that pay substandard wages and have few or no health benefits. At a time when U.S. corporations are making record profits and the economy is strong and stable, it seems unreasonable that working families must struggle and cannot make ends meet. It is unconscionable for corporations to sacrifice fair wages for their workers in pursuit of inflated profit margins, and it is doubly so when these businesses are performing work on behalf of the Federal Government—when the workers' taxes which pay for Federal services and products perpetuate such depressed compensation.

My legislation is straightforward, simple and just; if you are a Federal contractor or subcontractor you will be required to pay wages to your employees that exceed the official poverty line for a family of four. This would be fair and equitable compensation achieved by law. When a business contracts for services or materials with the Federal Government and benefits from working families' taxpayer dollars, at the very least it should be required to pay its employees a livable wage.

As of March 4, 1996, the official poverty line for a family of four is $15,600. This is obviously not an exorbitant wage. Imagine a family of four trying to live on this amount or less. It may not seem possible, but it is done every day in this country. There are serious disparities in our society when hard-working men and women, holding down full-time jobs, cannot earn enough to bring their families out of the poverty cycle, while company executives earn an average of 70 times that of their average employee.

My bill does not attempt to alleviate this disparity throughout the business sector, but it does require those corporate entities receiving taxpayer dollars to be accountable to their workers. This is a reasonable and practical bill. It allows companies to count any benefits, such as health care, which they provide for employees as part of their wage determination, and it provides an exemption for small businesses and bona fide job training or apprenticeship programs.

I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this legislation to help ensure the American worker receives a fair day's pay for a fair day's work.

THE INSPECTOR GENERAL FOR MEDICARE AND MEDICAID ACT OF 1997

HON. JACK QUINN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 7, 1997

Mr. QUINN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to introduce the Inspector General For Medicare and Medicaid Act of 1997.

I was prompted to introduce this legislation when seniors in western New York continuously approached me at my town meetings last year with concerns about this issue. Many of us in Congress and throughout the country share their concerns that waste, fraud, and abuse within Medicare and Medicaid Programs have reached an excessive level which threatens the financial stability of our most vulnerable populations.

For instance, one of my constituents gave me copies of his personal medical statements which showed that he was billed three times for the same procedure, amounting to $2,367 in charges. Most people do not scrutinize their medical statements; which helps for fraud to be easily overlooked. in the end, seniors are forced to dip into their life savings.

My bill would establish an exclusive, full-time and independent Office of Inspector General [IG] for the Medicare and Medicaid Programs. This office would be charged with detecting, identifying and preventing waste, fraud and abuse within the Medicare and Medicaid Programs.

This IG office would be required to issue semiannual reports to Congress consisting of recommendations on preventing waste, fraud and abuse within the Medicare and Medicaid Programs.

The IG office would also be responsible for coordinating any audits, investigations, and other activities which promote efficiency in the administration of the Medicare and Medicaid Programs.

The need for this legislation comes down to dollars and cents. According to a 1995 GAO report, unchecked and improper billing alone would cost Medicare in excess of $3 billion over the next 5 years. Furthermore, health fraud has been estimated to cost between 3 and 10 percent of every $1 used to meet the health needs of America's seniors and indigent populations. I think you would agree that this funding would be better spent as a reinvestment in providing healthcare to our Nation's elderly, disabled, and poor citizens.

To further compound the problem, GAO also reported that physicians, suppliers, and medical laboratories have about 3 chances out of 1,000 of having Medicare audit their billing practices in any given year.

At the conclusion of the July 1995 GAO report to Congress, one of the main policy recommendations was to ''enhance Medicare's antifraud and abuse efforts.''

My bill simply responds to this need. I contend that with a separate IG office we can only expand on identifying and preventing fraud, waste, and abuse in healthcare. Based on HHS data, within a 4-year time frame, we have saved $115 for every $1 spent on inspector general operations.

In 1995, the Office of the IG saved $9.7 million per employee. This savings was accomplished with employees working on diversified case loads. It is my understanding that employees in the IG's office do not specialize in Medicare and Medicaid fraud, but must focus on several issues at one time. With a more specialized personnel, other HHS programs such as welfare and head start stand to benefit as well. By magnifying our focus to Medicare and Medicaid fraud, waste, and abuse, I am confident that we will see an increased return of our investment.

ROCKY MOUNTAIN NATIONAL PARK WILDERNESS

HON. DAVID E. SKAGGS

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 7, 1997

Mr. SKAGGS. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing the Rocky Mountain National Park Wilderness Act of 1997.

This bill, essentially identical to ones that I introduced in the 103d and 104th Congresses, is intended to provide important protection and management direction for some truly remarkable country, adding some 240,700 acres in the park to the National Wilderness Preservation System.

Covering 91 percent of the park, the wilderness will include Longs Peaks and other major mountains, glacial cirques and snow fields, broad expanses of alpine tundra and wet meadows, old-growth forests, and hundreds of lakes and streams. Indeed, the proposed wilderness will include examples of all the natural ecosystems present in the park.

The features of these lands and waters that make Rocky Mountain a true gem in our national parks system also make it an outstanding wilderness candidate.

The wilderness boundaries for these areas are carefully located to assure continued access for use of existing roadways, buildings and developed areas, privately owned land, and water supply facilities and conveyances—including the Grand River Ditch, Long Draw Reservoir, and the portals of the Adams Tunnel. All of these are left out of wilderness.

The bill is based on National Park Service recommendations. Since these recommendations were originally made in 1974, the north and south boundaries of Rocky Mountain National Park have been adjusted, bringing into the park additional land that qualifies as wilderness. My bill will include those areas as well. Also, some changes in ownership and management of several areas, including the removal of three high mountain reservoirs, make it possible to include designation of some areas that the Park Service had found inherently suitable for wilderness.

In 1993, we in the Colorado delegation finally were able to successfully complete over a decade's effort to designate additional wilderness in our State's national forests. I anticipate that in the near future, the potentially more complex question of wilderness designations on Federal Bureau of Land Management lands will capture our attention.

Meanwhile, I think we should not further postpone resolution of the status of the lands within Rocky Mountain National Park that have been recommended for wilderness designation. Also, because of the unique nature of its resources, its current restrictive management policies, and its water rights, Rocky Mountain