

a leader on the national and international level. For the past 12 years Dr. Richardson served as the general secretary of the National Baptist Convention, U.S.A. Inc. He was elected to this prestigious office in September 1982. The National Baptist Convention consists of more than 30,000 churches and 8 million Baptist members across the country. He is also a member of the general council of the Baptist World Alliance. In May 1983, he was elected to the governing board of the National Council of Churches representing more than 400 million Christians from 150 countries.

As a world-renowned minister, Dr. Richardson has preached and travelled extensively on six continents, including Africa, Asia, Australia, Europe, and North and South America. In February 1980, Dr. Richardson was selected as a member of the 1980 preaching team of the foreign mission board of countries on the continent of Africa. Since 1982, he has served as the L.G. Jordan lecturer in the laymen's department of the National Baptist Congress of Christian Education. In addition, he has crossed the nation and the world speaking at churches, conventions, colleges and universities.

I am personally honored to join with Reverend Richardson's parishioners, family, friends and neighbors in this 20th anniversary celebration.

FISCAL YEAR 1996 BUDGET

HON. MIKE WARD

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 30, 1995

Mr. WARD. Mr. Speaker, on Thursday, March 30, 1995, I had the opportunity to testify before the House Committee on the Budget. The following is the text of my testimony.

STATEMENT OF CONGRESSMAN MIKE WARD BEFORE THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET, MARCH 30, 1995

Mr. Chairman: Thank you for allowing me to share my views on the fiscal year 1996 budget submitted to Congress by President Clinton. My statement will reflect my firm belief that the well-being of our children should be a national priority.

Specifically, I call your attention to Head Start, child nutrition programs, the Consolidated Child Care block grant, and the Vaccines for Children Program. The fiscal year 1996 budget presented by President Clinton calls for moderate increases in these programs. Head Start funding will go from \$3.535 billion to \$3.935 billion. Funding for child nutrition programs would be \$8.06 billion in 1996, an increase from \$7.7 billion this year. The block grant would increase from \$949 million to \$1.094 billion and \$845 million is proposed for the vaccine program.

I believe these levels of funding are entirely appropriate because these programs work. Furthermore, educating and nurturing our children, preventing disease through immunization, and providing quality child care are critical to assuring the health and welfare of our young people. We must not let our commitment to our future be lost in the frenzy to cut the budget. Focusing our attention on these goals, in my view, will ensure the prosperity of America for years to come.

In closing, I am very proud to represent Louisville and Jefferson County, KY. Taking care of the needs of the children in our community has always been a serious concern of our elected leaders like Louisville Mayor

Jerry Abramson and Jefferson County Judge/Executive David Armstrong.

Also, many of our citizens like Libby Grever, executive director of Community Coordinated Child Care, and Dr. Rice Leach, commissioner of the Commonwealth of Kentucky Department for Health Services, have worked for years on behalf of our children. Dr. Leach, for example, is currently working to immunize all of Kentucky's children. I know that each of them joins me in urging your most thoughtful consideration of these concerns.

Chairman Kasich and Ranking Member Sabo, I appreciate your courtesy and time.

OUR VETERANS DESERVE NO LESS

HON. BOB FILNER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 30, 1995

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Speaker and colleagues, I rise today in support of the concept of Medicare subvention, found in H.R. 580 and H.R. 861. These two bills would let military retirees and veterans use their Medicare benefits at military or VA hospitals.

I take great interest in this legislation because the concepts contained in H.R. 861 originated in my hometown—with Col. Walter D. Mikulich, Maj. Edward H. Townsend, and Lt. Col. George R. Smith, in the San Diego military retiree and veteran health care study group.

Military health care facilities can actually treat older military retirees for less than Medicare pays civilian providers, but cannot afford to enroll Medicare-eligible retirees unless Congress changes the law to allow reimbursement from Medicare. So, older military retirees are now limited to using Medicare in the civilian community at a higher cost to everyone—Medicare, taxpayers, and beneficiaries. Those who do use military facilities lose the Medicare benefit they deserve.

The exclusion of retired personnel from the military health care system undermines the long-term interest of our country. A crucial aspect of personnel readiness is maintaining strong incentives for high-quality personnel to continue to serve full military careers. Offers of lifetime health care benefits are one of the primary incentives that induced many current retired members to serve military careers that often spanned two or three wars. Now, they are upset at the broken promise—and the prospect of no coverage but Medicare, at a time when reductions in Medicare benefits are on the congressional table.

Another consideration is the recruitment and retention of quality medical personnel at our military hospitals. Professional advancement means that medical personnel must see and treat a wide range of patients with a broad spectrum of medical problems. Medicare-eligible retirees would provide that clinical experience.

Medicare subvention is an idea that makes sense for everyone. Older retirees have earned military health care through decades of selfless service to this great country. It is time for us to keep our promise to our veterans and provide them access to the VA and military health care facilities of their choice.

“TO AMEND” MEANS “TO IMPROVE”

HON. PATSY T. MINK

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 30, 1995

Mrs. MINK of Hawaii. Mr. Speaker, my law school classmate, Prof. George Anastaplo, writes an interesting piece on the balanced budget amendment and on term limits, the latter of which comes to the floor this week. I submit his paper:

“TO AMEND” MEANS “TO IMPROVE”

(By George Anastaplo)

The considerable talk we hear these days of a balanced-budget amendment and of a legislative term-limitation amendment poses challenges to constitutional scholars respectful of the integrity of the Constitution. Both amendments would probably be troublesome if ratified: the first (an exercise in constitutional frivolity) because it is not likely to work; the second because it is likely to work, thereby crippling the Government of the United States. It does not help matters that the principal balanced-budget proposal currently before the Congress contains language that invites confusion and litigation, language that is singularly unfelicitous for permanent enshrinement in the Constitution.

Those who recognize how a balanced-budget amendment could readily be circumvented by both legislatures and executives suggest other ways of accomplishing such an amendment's purposes. One response is that a limitation be placed upon the amount of taxation that is permitted annually. But circumvention is likely there also, as may be seen in how State governments have had to work their way around such limitations. In fact, no mechanical rule or formula can take the place in such matters of political judgment on the part of both the people and their government, if there is to be sound guidance of the economy in varying circumstances. Such guidance depends upon sensible assessments not only of the causes and consequences of deficits but also of the costs, consequences, and desirability of balancing the national budget at any particular time. Here, as elsewhere, myths and misinformation have to be reckoned with. Many of these questions about economic and fiscal policies are better addressed directly and preferably by legislatures as circumstances change. A curious aspect of the balanced-budget situation today is that two-thirds of each House of Congress would vote for an amendment that might some day require a balanced budget, while at the same time one-half of each House could vote for a balanced budget during this session of Congress.

Those who recognize that term limitations for legislators can truly be crippling look to other remedies to deal with what they conceive to be the underlying problems. One set of remedies has to do with changes that could reduce the advantages of incumbency, including severe limitations upon political contributions and campaign expenditures. (A reconsideration by the United States Supreme Court of its unfortunate First Amendment rulings with respect to these matters should be encouraged.) Most of these remedies, too, are more appropriate for legislation than for constitutional amendments, especially since experiments and revisions are apt to be needed.

It is often said that those who hold legislative offices today are virtually impossible to defeat. But this is not, as many seem to believe, because incumbents are immune from