importance of a balanced budget amendment. Much to my chagrin, there was an announcement yesterday that probably certainly weakened the effort for a balanced budget amendment in the Senate.

In 1969, if you read the newspaper, you probably would have read about Charles Manson. The number one song was Simon and Garfunkle's ''Mrs. Robinson.'' The Mets won the World Series. I was an 8-year-old boy growing up in western South Dakota and had the opportunity to watch on a black and white television, Neal Armstrong take one giant step forward for mankind by walking on the Moon.

Little did I know at that time that that was the start of our taking one giant step backward fiscally, because 1969 was the last time that Congress and our country has been able to balance its budget.

It occurs to me, it has been my long-held belief that every generation of Americans has an appointment with destiny. For my grandfather who came to this country from Norway back in 1906, it was to help build America. He warked on and helped build the railroad that went across our State of South Dakota. Later he went on to be in the hardware business.

For my father, his appointment with destiny was to defend America. As a decorated World War II fighter pilot, when the call came for him to defend America in World War II, he was there.

I believe that for this generation of Americans, it is our responsibility to preserve America for the next generation. I think we are failing in our duty and the obligation we have to make this a better place for the next generation of Americans.

When it comes time to vote on a balanced budget amendment, the issue really is about our future and what will we do for our children. A lot has been made, there are a lot of distractions and diversions in this whole debate about reasons why we do not need a balanced budget amendment. But the fact remains that 1969 is the last time that Congress has had the political will to submit a balanced budget and to do what is right for the future of this country.

If we look at where we are today and the burden we are passing on, the legacy we are handing on to the next generation of Americans, in my view it is immoral, it is wrong. We have an opportunity this next week to vote to do something that will be meaningful. It is the most important vote I think that we will cast for the future of our country.

I am hopeful that we will see, when the Senate votes on this next Tuesday, that there will be some of the people, some of the Democrats who are currently opposed to it, perhaps one of the two from my State of South Dakota, who will come forward and recognize the importance of this important move to the future of this country.

We cannot afford to continue to mortgage the future for our kids and for our grandkids. So as we continue to engage the debate in this town and around this country, and as I traveled in my State of South Dakota for 9 days last week, I had the opportunity to raise this issue and to talk about it and its importance.

One of the questions that was repeatedly asked was what about Social Security, because they had heard a lot of radio ads that had been running in my State by opponents of a balanced budget amendment attacking me for my vote on it.

The point I come back to is if we do not do something to balance this country's budget, and if we do not impose the discipline necessary to do it, not only is Social Security jeopardized, but so is every other Government program. The only way we can protect Social Security for the long-term and make it a program that is there not only for today's seniors but for tomorrow's seniors is to pass a balanced budget amendment.

So, as I heard and listened to the discussion that was held last week in my State of South Dakota about this issue, I kept coming back to the same point. That is that as a young 8-year-old in western South Dakota in 1969, I had no idea of what was about to begin. But for the past 28 years, we have accumulated and amassed in this country $5.3 trillion in debt, or $20,000 for every man, women, and child in America.

I am calling on, today, hoping that our colleagues on the other side of the Capitol, when this vote comes up next week, will look into their hearts and see if this is not the right move. It is not only the right move, it is the only move if we are to preserve a future for our kids and for our grandkids.

I hope we will have the opportunity in this House, if the Senate goes first and votes and will approve a balanced budget amendment, that we can do it in the House and make this a better place for the next generation.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. COLLINS). The Chair reminds Members to refrain from references to Members of the other body urging action by the other body.

EDUCATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 1997, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOEKSTRA] is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Mr. Speaker, today I continue my series on talking about what works and what does not work in education and why it is such a needed focus. But before I do that, I just have a few miscellaneous comments on some issues that have been in the news over the last couple of days that I would like my colleagues to be aware of.

Mr. Speaker, in the last Congress I introduced a constitutional amendment. I introduced a constitutional amendment which would allow for a procedure where voters could recall their elected officials. So far in this Congress, I have not reintroduced that bill. But yesterday I decided that it was again time to perhaps make a few modifications to facilitate that process. But it is time to reintroduce the bill that allows public citizens, it allows the citizens of this country to hold their elected officials accountable for the promises and the commitments that they make during an election.

Over the last few days, we have seen where individuals who campaigned and were elected during the campaign process made a series of promises and commitments to the voters that said, if I am elected, this is what I will stand for. This is what I will do. And these are the kinds of actions that you can expect me to take as your elected Representative.

It appears that too often that is all they are, is campaign promises. They are a great way to get a vote, but when they get to Washington, they all of a sudden decide that maybe it is a lousy way to govern. Well, it is about time that voters started to recognize and have the opportunity to tie candidates to their performance, that when they run a campaign, they see a direct link between what an individual promises in a campaign and what they do once they get here. And that when they fail to see that link between a campaign and a performance, rather than just having to stand back and say, there is nothing that I can do about this, there is nothing that I can do about somebody that I voted for, somebody that I supported because they said they were going to do these things and then they go to Washington and they do something else. They now will be empowered with a tool that says, you said you were going to do that and you got to Washington and you decided that something else was going to happen and that your behavior was going to move in a different direction.

Well, as a voter in your State, I now have the opportunity to say I voted for you because this is what you were going to do and, now that you have decided to do something else, I would like the opportunity to clarify and to hold you accountable for breaking the promises and breaking your commitment to me. It is time that the American people or at least the States in this country, it is time that the States had the opportunity to design a mechanism which will more effectively and more immediately allow the citizens to hold their elected officials accountable.

It is unconscionable that we keep finding individuals on key issues who say one thing and do another. We are going to have a voter empowerment. In the States it is commonly known as the ability to hold elected officials accountable through a recall mechanism. We will have a recall bill. I urge my

colleagues to take a look at it, to take a look at what is fueling voter cynicism and to say, yes, let us give the voters one more tool to hold their Representatives accountable.

On another topic that again fuels cynicism in Washington, last year we had a very critical debate on partial birth abortions. It would be nice to believe that what we debate here on the floor and the information that we receive is accurate. However, we now find that an abortion rights doctor admitted to lying about the frequency of partial birth abortions. He said, I lied through my teeth. It is a form of killing. You are ending a life. Went on to say that this was used not only in rare cases, it was used more frequently, that it was not only used on situations where the fetus was in distress but was used on healthy women with healthy children. Based on that kind of testimony, President Clinton vetoed our legislation to prohibit this gruesome act. So I am hopeful and anxious that we will revisit that issue based on this new information.

I also could not help but just find the irony that we as a society, as we focus on the right to kill unborn children, the headlines this week were, we are trying to find ways to clone sheep at the same time and on the same page, according to the headline, morning-after pill receives FDA approval. The FDA has also moved forward aggressively. Abortion bill accord clears way for sales, RU–486.

So as we are cloning sheep, we keep trying to come up with more innovative ways to take the lives of the most defenseless in our society, the unborn. We have gone so far that environmentalist groups in this Nation score votes against abortion. They score votes in favor of protecting the unborn as a vote against the environment because they identify the greatest danger to birds and their habitat is more people. So a vote for the unborn is now a vote against the environment. It is interesting to see how these debates and these issues are being structured in our society today.

But let us move on to education. Education is a critical issue in this Nation today. We have gone through a series of what we call lessons learned, what are we learning about education. We are going through a process which we call education at a crossroads. I do not think there is much doubt that there is a widespread belief that we have to take a look at what is going on in education in our country.

We have lots of statistics about what the results are in our Nation. One half of all adult Americans are functionally illiterate. This includes not being able to write a letter to explain a billing error or figure out a departure on a bus schedule. Sixty-four percent of 12th graders do not read at a proficient level.

In California, 2½ weeks ago, we had a hearing where the college presidents came in. They said, make sure that as you go forward and take a look at education funding, that you continue to fund remedial education. We need Federal remedial education dollars to be successful.

You sit back and say, now, what do you mean by remedial? Remedial education. Somebody that has been accepted into your institution of higher learning, what are you teaching these kids, what do they need remedial education in? Are you trying to teach them more complex writing skills, more complex math skills, what are you teaching them? They said, no, when these kids are graduating from high school and, of course, many go on to college, they cannot read or write at an eighth grade level. Excuse me. They cannot read or write at an eighth grade level?

They get into college and they want more remedial education dollars. As a college president, have you ever thought about going back to your high schools and trying to find out what is going on in the high schools that maybe we could teach them reading and writing and math and when they go through high school rather than trying to deal with it when they get to college.

In Washington, DC, we have decided that it is necessary to take the elected school board and replace them by an appointed administrator. Why? Because these kids are getting the lowest test scores in the country. We are failing the kids right outside of this building. It is not an issue of money, $8,300 per student, and they get the lowest test scores and some of the lowest test scores in the country.

In my own State of Michigan our Governor has proposed taking over a number of school districts because we are failing the kids. I asked the Governor, I said, what makes you think that as a Governor, removed from the local situation, you can do a better job of educating these kids than what the local school board can do? And the disappointing fact is, and he is probably right, he said, I cannot do any worse. When you have got 2 or 3 kids out of 250 kids who are passing a proficiency test, increasing that to 4 or 5 is a significant improvement but it is way below what is acceptable in this Nation.

We know that, as we take a look at education, as we have gone around the country, as we have been in east Harlem, New York, as we have been in Chicago and we have been in Los Angeles and Phoenix and Napa and towns in my own district, we know that, No. 1, the most successful schools and the most successful kids in our country, the ones that are learning are, where parents are involved and, No. 2, in very difficult areas, where school administrators and principals have developed a dynamic program and they have reached out into their community and they have involved their parents, the parents of the kids, then we have the most likely scenario for success. And we are going around the country and we are taking a look at what works and what is wasted.

Why do we have to take a look at what is working and what is wasted? We know there is a problem. Some people would say, well, why are you reviewing this at all; the Federal Government should not be involved in education. That may or may not be a correct argument. That is not the argument that we have in front of us today. The argument that we have in front of us today is that this town, Washington, DC, with this Department, the Department of Education, and 39 other agencies, has a tremendous impact on education at all levels in our Nation. This town, these bureaucrats, run 39 different agencies. This town—and these bureaucrats who are very good people, they are knowledgeable people, but they are asked to administer through 39 different agencies, we ask these people to administer 760 programs.

Remember what these people do and they are matched by their counterparts at the State level and at the local level. It is all good people with good intentions trying to do the right thing, and what they are doing is they have all got a stack of paper. They are all processing paper, which means that dollars go to processing paper and employing people. It keeps the dollars away from the classroom because remember, every time we create one of these 760 programs, we have to let people know that these programs exist. So we have got a bureaucrat who designs the brochure that says, here is the program and here is who might qualify.

At the other end of the communications pattern, we have got another bureaucrat that gets the brochure. They read the brochure and say, we might qualify for this program. Let us get some more information. Maybe let us even get an application. Let us fill out the application. It goes into the pile of paper. They fill out the application. They send it back to a bureaucrat in Washington who reads it and says, well, I have got a whole stack of applications. I am going to have to sort through who gets what and how much. Eventually they will decide. They send the money back.

□ 1430

The person says, ''Well, I am getting the money. Now what stack of paper says what can I do with it?'' Of course, they have to fill out papers sending back to Washington saying, ''Here is what we did with it.'' That gets back to Washington and somebody has to read it to determine whether they actually spent it the way it was intended to be spent.

So we are employing lots of bureaucrats in 39 different agencies, administering 760 programs, spending $120 billion a year; $120 billion per year in 760 programs going through 39 different agencies. Probably a little bit of concern as to whether we are actually getting our dollar's worth.

And that is why we are taking a look at what is going on in Washington.

What works and what is wasted? Spending time at the grassroots level and saying, we have 760 programs, we have 14 literacy programs, why can our kids not read when they are graduating from high school?

And what we are saying is, before we put on another overlay of more programs and more spending and more dollars, it is time to take a look at this conglomeration of programs, and look at it from a teacher's level and look at it from a kid's level and say, are these dollars getting to our children? Are these dollars getting into the classroom, or are the dollars being spent shuffling paper back and forth?

The Heritage Foundation has told us in their study that just in the Federal bureaucracy we lose 15 percent. And when we add in State and local bureaucracies, my estimate is that we lose about 35 to 40 cents of every education dollar to bureaucracy and bureaucrats who are doing what we ask them to do, but they are prohibiting the dollars from getting to our children and getting into the classroom.

And even then, as we have found out as we have made these field visits, the dollars get into the classroom and you ask somebody, do you appreciate the Federal programs? Yes, we appreciate getting the money, but when we get the rules and regulations of how we need to spend it, and then we take a look at our kids and we take a look at our school and we take a look at our classrooms and we take a look at our teachers and we take a look at our community and what we would really like to do in our classrooms for our kids, and then we take a look at what the rules and the guidelines from some bureaucracy in Washington are, that has never been in our town, that does not know the names of our kids, and what they tell us to do is not what we really want to do, it is not our No. 1 priority. It might be somewhere on our priority list, but it does not help us do what we think we need to do to help our kids today.

The lesson today is more does not always equal better. If we have a program, if we have 760 programs and we are spending $120 billion, there are those that are saying, and we are not getting results, we ought to be spending more. And if we had a couple more programs and a few more dollars, we would be able to solve the problem.

This was in the paper this week: ''Drug Education Shows Limited Success, Department Reports.'' Many children still turn to drugs between the 5th and 8th grades despite billions of Federal dollars that have been spent on drug education since 1987.

The Education Department reported that. A report commissioned by the Department said effects were small even in the programs that appeared to curb drug use.

Now, this is the interesting thing. One would think that after the Education Department completes its own study that says kids are still turning to drugs, which is a terrible problem, the effects were small, one would think that they would step back and say, why are we not getting the results? This is a terrible problem. We all want to curb drug use. We have spent billions of dollars. We are not having an impact.

One would think the Education Department would step back and say, let us rethink this. Let us come together and say this is not working, and let us think about bringing in parents, bringing in legislators, bringing in State people, bringing in teachers and saying, let us take another look at this problem; how are we going to solve this? We need to approach it in a different way.

So what is the Department's solution? The Department wants $620 million next year for drug education. They do not want us to rethink or come up with new programs or different programs to replace what they admit are the failed policies and a billion dollars of wasted money. They want $620 million next year for drug education, up from $558 million this year and $438 million in 1996.

This is the lesson we should be learning: More does not always equal better. More dollars going to Washington bureaucracies—dollars to bureaucracies, dollars to bureaucracies—does not necessarily mean we are going to be solving the problem.

It is amazing to me that as we prepared this lesson this week, I cut this out of the paper this week. It is a classic case of bureaucrats not worrying about whether we are solving the problem but saying we solve the problem purely by making more dollars available; not making them available in an attempt to build off an analysis that says these programs failed, and here is why they failed and here is a new approach.

They just say, here are the failed programs. Let us not rethink it. But if you just give me $62 million more into this same failed system, we will have protected a lot of bureaucrats and a lot of paperwork. We will not have helped any more kids, but we will be able to go back and say we gave $62 million more for drug education. Probably will not spend a lot of time talking about it does not really matter they will not work, but, hey, they are spending more.

So they can say we are spending more than a 10-percent increase in funding, more than a 10-percent increase in funding in failed programs. But the disappointing thing here is there is no thinking about what we need to do for our kids. It means pouring more money, hard-earned money into a broken system, a tragic system. And in too many places it is the argument that we hear over and over again.

And let me say this. We may raise an issue during the appropriations process about why are we going to increase spending by $62 million on drug education programs that, by the way, do not work, and it will be said, there they go again, those mean-spirited people cutting dollars for our kids. No, the Education Department said it. The drug education programs are not working. It is about time that that issue was raised.

It is the same question that we are trying to answer in Education at a Crossroads; that when the President proposes spending $50 billion more on education, before we go out and spend $50 billion more into what in some cases is a failed system, we should step back and say, 760 programs, 39 agencies, $120 billion per year: Is there maybe not a better way to do it?

Is there not maybe an issue that we should be raising, before we try to mobilize 100,000 tutors, that we take a look and say why do our 14 literacy programs not work today? And if tutors are better than our current literacy programs, if tutors are the right answer, let us go for tutors. Maybe we can pay for the tutors by saying the literacy programs we had in place were not working and so we will be able to fund not 100,000 tutors but 200,000 tutors because we are going to get rid of the failed literacy programs.

Let us step back and see what is working and what does not work before we just put a patchwork of more programs on a failed system. The issue here is not money. There is plenty of money in the system. The issue is making sure that we spend the dollars on the right kinds of things.

We have gone to schools in, like I said, in New York, Chicago, Milwaukee, L.A., Napa, Phoenix. We are going to Cincinnati, we are going to Delaware next week, we are going to have hearings on the D.C. schools, schools in Detroit. We have gone and we are going all around the country, and we have seen schools that spend $2,200 per child, we have seen schools that spend $8,300 per child.

What does the research of our committee show? Our committee's research shows that more does not always equal better. Pouring more dollars into a bad system does not fix the system.

If we put in place the right system, we can educate the kids. It is the fun thing about this project. The great thing about this project is going into some of what we in Washington define as some of the greatest areas of at-risk kids, kids who supposedly are at a disadvantage for learning, and seeing schools and seeing children that are getting a great education. It is because parents are involved, the schools are focusing on the basics, and the dollars go into the classroom and not into a bureaucracy.

The issue is not how much money is spent but it is how we spend it. Are we spending it on kids? Are we spending it on the basics? Are we spending it on teachers? Are we spending it at places closest to the kids, or are we pouring it into bureaucracies and bureaucrats who are greatly removed from the system?

The dollars: The District of Columbia, as I mentioned, spends over $8,000

per child yet their children are not graduating, they are not reading and they are not succeeding. Schools in New York: Some of the schools that I visited, $2,200 to $2,500 per child, and they are very, very successful. More spending does not always equal better.

We need to focus on how we spend it, not how much money is being spent. That is what Education at a Crossroads is doing: Visiting communities, talking to people, finding out what is working, finding out how effective the Federal programs are, and then going back and identifying what we need to do in Washington to straighten out our bureaucratic mess so that we can help our kids.

The focus of this whole issue cannot be the Department of Education or the other 38 agencies that are trying to educate kids. It cannot be a bureaucratic focus. It cannot be on this town. The focus has to be on kids around the country.

□ 1445

The problem that we have in Washington today and the problem that we maybe have in our country today is if we go back and take a look at this graphic: Where education in this country is supposed to be, parental involvement and local control, independent of Washington interference, so that programs in classrooms, in instructional materials, in instructional lessons can be tailored to the needs of every individual child in every individual community.

What we have found is that rather than local control, these 39 agencies in Washington that are trying to educate our kids have made the street that some of you may walk down to get to work every day, which we fondly call Independence Avenue, when you take a look at who is lining the sides of that street, it is all the bureaucracies here in Washington, and the end result is one of these days we may have to rename it, not Independence Avenue but Dependence Avenue because all of these agencies are fostering local dependence on Washington bureaucracies before they can do anything. That is why parents are frustrated.

This is ironic. Why are parents frustrated? Kids cannot do math so we are going to have 100,000 new tutors. They are going to be administered by an agency that cannot even keep its own books. All parents are frustrated because they want to give their children a chance to receive a quality education and we stand in the way.

We are investing a tremendous amount of money in education. But too often it seems like that money is wasted. It is not getting to our kids and it is going to inefficient systems, so it is wasted. Think of how much money is spent on administrators and education bureaucrats. Think of how little money actually reaches the kids. Like I told you earlier, 60 cents of every dollar gets to our children.

I yield to my colleague from Florida.

Mr. SCARBOROUGH. I do not want to take up too much of the gentleman's time, but I will just briefly say, he talked about Dependence Avenue and the bureaucracy, the Federal bureaucracy on Dependence Avenue, the Department of Education bureaucracy.

I think one of the finest examples of how Americans' dollars, tax dollars, come up to Washington, DC to these huge Federal bureaucracies and do not get back home is the example of the Department of Education who 2 years ago said that they had to cut their budget by $100 billion to keep schools across the country safe from caving in and collapsing. But in that same budget where they cut $100 million from the safe schools part of the program, they added $20 million just to improve their single bureaucracy building on Independence Avenue.

So here we have an example not of robbing Peter to pay Paul, but an example of the Federal bureaucratic machine robbing our children to feed bureaucracy instead of doing what needs to be done in education. I applaud the gentleman for actually having the courage to stand up and say enough is enough to this nonsense, and I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. I thank my colleague from Florida for those comments. That is why parents are frustrated. They want to give their kids a quality education, and at the end of the day they see us taking care of bureaucrats and bureaucrats not taking care of their kids, taking care of Washington but not taking care of Holland, MI. And it is kind of like, well, we never really wanted you to take care of Holland, MI, in the first place, but you took all of our money and you sent it to Washington and now to get it back we need to do what you want us to do and then think of the results.

What is happening? How much money is spent on education? Consider the results. Half of American children cannot read, cannot meet the minimum expectations for math and reading. We spend more money per child than nearly every other industrial country, yet our children simply are not learning the way we would like them to.

Think about this. Why are parents frustrated? Why are parents frustrated? They want to give their kids a quality education. Fewer than half of all dollars spent on public education are spent in the classroom. Fewer than half. Low test scores, frustrated parents, kids who are not learning, plenty of money, fewer than half the dollars are spent in the classroom. They are spent on bureaucrats, on support personnel, on administration buildings, but less than half are spent on children in the classroom.

Parents, local control, that is most important about getting our kids to learn. We must restore the crucial parental role in education. Parents have the right to choose the school that is best for their child. Parents have the right to choose the best school for their child. Parents have the right, not bureaucrats assigning kids. Parents pay for it, it is their tax dollars, it is your tax dollars. Tax dollars should go to the schools of the taxpayers' choice.

Remember, at the end of the day, more does not always equal better. Only in Washington is that accepted, that more equals better. In the rest of America, it is fairly common knowledge that more does not always equal better. It is not how much money is spent, it is how we spend it. When we spend a dollar and only 50 cents goes into the classroom, the answer may not be spending $1.20 to get 60 cents in the classroom. It may be taking a look at the dollar and saying 50 cents of overhead, that may just be too much. Maybe we can take that dollar and maybe we can find another dime for our kids if we take it out of the bureaucracy, maybe if we take it out of the paperwork shuffle between local school districts, State bureaucrats and Washington bureaucrats. Maybe if we take it out of that system, maybe if we simplify it and we make it 200 programs instead of 760 programs, maybe if we make it 2 agencies instead of 39 agencies, maybe we could just find that extra nickel or that extra dime for our kids. It is not how much is spent, it is how we spend it. Today we are spending way too much on the wrong kinds of things. We need to get the money into the classroom.

THE LONG-TERM CAPITAL GAINS SAVINGS ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. COLLINS). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BENTSEN] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BENTSEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to introduce legislation, the Long-Term Capital Gains Savings Act, that takes an innovative and I believe economically correct approach to capital gains tax policy. This legislation seeks to reward long-term economically productive investment and encourage Americans to save for the future.

I might also add that I have been one who has voted consistently for a balanced budget and said we should put off tax cuts until we balance the budget. I still think that is a prudent policy, but as we see both the administration and the leadership of the Congress moving in the other direction, I think it is also prudent that we lay out markers of what would be good tax policy.

This legislation is identical to S. 306 introduced by Senator WENDELL FORD in the other body and would provide for the maximum capital gains tax rate to be adjusted downward the longer an investment is held by the taxpayer. For every year an asset is held, the tax rate would be reduced by 2 percentage points down to a rate of 14 percent after 8 years or more. The top rate would remain at 28 percent for investments held less than 2 years. I am attaching a chart outlining this sliding