

increasing support to educational programs, such as Head Start, Title I, Pell Grants and other aid to college students, particularly students who are the first in their families to attend college. We know that disadvantaged students are more likely to drop out of high school and college without completing a degree. Yet, most jobs that pay a living wage now require knowledge of technology and training beyond high school. It is our responsibility as a wealthy nation to provide students with the support needed to graduate, join the economic mainstream and contribute to our national success story.

Moreover, in our current consideration of welfare reform, we have seen that targeted education and training can provide a leg up for working poor families to raise earnings and escape poverty. In the Eleventh Congressional District of Ohio, Cuyahoga Community College has done an excellent job of reaching out to adults in transition, and in preparing high school students for careers in technology. Around the country, community colleges enable disadvantaged people to realize their own potential and prepare to move into the economic mainstream.

The last seven years of prosperity we have enjoyed have not benefited everyone in our society. Education and training are the keys that will fling wide the portals of opportunity. America was founded on the principles of "Life, Liberty, and the Pursuit of Happiness." I salute our American history, and the key role of education to ensure opportunity for all.

Mr. PAUL. Madam Speaker, I rise to address two shortcomings of S. Con. Res. 129. I am certainly in agreement with the sentiments behind this resolution. The promotion of knowledge about, and understanding of, American history are among the most important activities those who wish to preserve American liberty can undertake. In fact, I would venture to say that with my work with various educational organizations, I have done as much, if not more, than any other member of Congress to promote the study of American history.

Unfortunately, while I strongly support efforts to increase the American public's knowledge of history, I cannot support a resolution claiming to encourage Americans to embrace their constitutional heritage, while its very language showcases a fundamental misunderstanding of the beliefs of America's founders and the drafters of the United States Constitution. Popular acceptance of this misunderstanding of the founders' thought is much more dangerous to American liberty than an inability to name the exact date of the Battle at Bunker Hill.

In particular, the resolution refers to American "democracy" and the "democratic" principles upon which this country was founded. However, this country was founded not as a democracy but as a constitutional republic. Madam Speaker, the distinction between a democracy and a republic is more than just a matter of semantics. The fundamental principle in a democracy is majority rule. Democracies, unlike republics, do not recognize fundamental rights of citizens (outside the right to vote) nor do they limit the power of the government. Indeed, such limitations are often scored as "intrusions on the will of the majority." Thus in a democracy, the majority, or their elected representatives, can limit an individual's right to free speech, defend oneself,

form contracts, or even raise ones' children. Democracies recognize only one fundamental right: the right to participate in the choosing of their rulers at a pre-determined time.

In contrast, in a republic, the role of government is strictly limited to a few well-defined functions and the fundamental rights of individuals are respected. A constitution limiting the authority of central government and a Bill of Rights expressly forbidding the federal government from abridging the fundamental rights of a people are features of a republican form of government. Even a cursory reading of the Federalist Papers and other works of the founders shows they understood that obtaining the consent of 51 percent of the people does not in any way legitimize government actions abridging individual liberty.

Madam Speaker, the confusion over whether America is a democracy, where citizens' rights may be violated if the consent of 51 percent of the people may be obtained, or a republic, where the federal government is forbidden to take any actions violating a people's fundamental rights, is behind many of the flawed debates in this Congress. A constitutionally literate Congress that understands the proper function of a legislature in a constitutional republic would never even debate whether or not to abridge the right of self-defense, instruct parents how to raise and educate their children, send troops to intervene in distant foreign quarrels that do not involve the security of the country, or even deny entire classes of citizens the fundamental right to life.

Secondly, it is not the proper role of the United States Congress to dictate educational tenets to states and local governments. After all, the United States Constitution does not give the federal government any power to dictate, or even suggest, curriculum. Instead the power to determine what is taught in schools is reserved to states, local communities, and, above all, parents.

In conclusion, by mistaking this country's founding as being based on mass democracy rather than on republican principles, and by ignoring the constitutionally limited role of the federal government, this resolution promotes misunderstanding about the type of government necessary to protect liberty. Such constitutional illiteracy may be more dangerous than historical ignorance, since the belief that America was founded to be a democracy legitimizes the idea that Congress may violate people's fundamental rights at will. I, therefore, encourage my colleagues to embrace America's true heritage: a constitutional republic with strict limitations on the power of the central government.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Madam Speaker, in 1988, National Endowment for the Humanities issued a report concluding that more than 80 percent of colleges and universities permitted students to graduate without taking a course in American history. Now, thirteen years later, standards have fallen even further with 78 percent of America's elite college and universities not requiring their student to take any history course at all. The results of this lackadaisical approach to learning and understanding our own country's history is devastating.

In a survey conducted by the American Council of Trustees and Alumni, only 23 percent of the students surveyed correctly identified James Madison as the "Father of the Constitution" while 54 percent incorrectly iden-

tified Thomas Jefferson. Unfortunately, the final results of the survey are equally embarrassing, with 65 percent of the students receiving a 59 percent or an "F" grade. This is unacceptable.

The poor performance of these students from America's top universities and colleges should serve as a wake-up call to Members of Congress that the academic quality of our history education programs is deteriorating to the point of no return.

But rather than take steps to improve these horrendous statistics with actual education reforms, the majority voted to slash teacher-training and student loan programs and recently rejected my amendment to moderately increase funding for the National Endowment for the Humanities, one of the only agencies that strives to preserve our nation's history through education.

I am a proud co-sponsor of S. Con. Res. 129 and I wholeheartedly agree that Congress needs to eradicate the profound historical illiteracy that currently plagues our nation's young people, but we can do better than to pass a "feel-good, do-nothing" resolution.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. PETRI. Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. BIGGERT). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. PETRI) that the House suspend the rules and concur in the Senate concurrent resolution, S. Con. Res. 129.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the Senate concurrent resolution was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DESCHUTES RESOURCES CONSERVANCY REAUTHORIZATION ACT OF 1999

Mr. WALDEN of Oregon. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1787) to reauthorize the participation of the Bureau of Reclamation in the Deschutes Resources Conservancy, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 1787

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Deschutes Resources Conservancy Reauthorization Act of 1999".

SEC. 2. EXTENSION OF PARTICIPATION OF BUREAU OF RECLAMATION IN DESCHUTES RESOURCES CONSERVANCY.

Section 301 of the Oregon Resource Conservation Act of 1996 (division B of Public Law 104-208; 110 Stat. 3009-534) is amended—

(1) in subsection (b)(3), by inserting before the period at the end the following: "; and up to a total amount of \$2,000,000 during each of fiscal years 2002 through 2006"; and

(2) in subsection (h), by inserting before the period at the end the following: "and \$2,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2002 through 2006".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. WALDEN) and the gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. WALDEN).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. WALDEN of Oregon. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and insert extraneous material on H.R. 1787.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. WALDEN of Oregon. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I appreciate the efforts of the gentleman from California (Mr. DOOLITTLE) and his staff in helping me to bring forward H.R. 1787, the Deschutes Resources Conservancy Reauthorization bill. I also appreciate the support of the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO) and the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER) for this important bill.

The DRC is one of the best examples of a win-win program that I have ever seen. Because it is a consensus-based mission, it brings together central Oregonians from diverse backgrounds and should be the model for other resource management programs across our great country.

The DRC has brought together interests who have historically, at times, been at odds in competing for the limited supply of our resources. Board members include ranchers, the Bureau of Reclamation, the Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife, the Warm Springs Tribes, the Forest Service, timber companies, developers and environmentalists, all working together and doing exceptional projects on the ground in central Oregon to improve water quality and water quantity.

The beauty of the DRC model is that they are taking scarce Federal dollars and then leveraging them with other grants to obtain the greatest impact. In 1999, the DRC leveraged its \$450,000 appropriation to complete more than \$2.1 million in on-the-ground restoration projects, more than a 4 to 1 ratio. These projects include piping irrigation district delivery systems to prevent water losses; securing in-stream water rights to restore flows to Squaw Creek; providing riparian fences to protect water banks; working with private timber landowners to restore riparian and wetland areas; and seeking donated water rights to enhance in-stream flows in the Deschutes River Basin.

Madam Speaker, I wholeheartedly support the reauthorization of this sound conservation program for another 5 years and support the increase of its reauthorization level. If the authorization level is increased as requested in this legislation, I do not have any objections to including the

Department of Agriculture as an additional funding source.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this sound environmental legislation.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I want to thank the gentleman from Oregon for explaining this legislation. He has done more than an adequate job explaining the values of the Deschutes Resources Conservancy and I urge Members to support this legislation.

Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. WALDEN of Oregon. Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. WALDEN) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1787.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

WATER RESOURCES RESEARCH ACT REAUTHORIZATION

Mr. WALDEN of Oregon. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 4132) to reauthorize grants for water resources research and technology institutes established under the Water Resources Research Act of 1984.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 4132

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. REAUTHORIZATION OF WATER RESOURCES RESEARCH ACT OF 1984.

(a) WATER RESOURCES RESEARCH PROGRAM GRANTS.—Section 104(f)(1) of the Water Resources Research Act of 1984 (42 U.S.C. 10303(f)(1)) is amended by striking “\$5,000,000 for fiscal year 1996, \$7,000,000 for each of fiscal years 1997 and 1998, and \$9,000,000 for each of fiscal years 1999 and 2000” and inserting “\$9,000,000 for fiscal year 2001, \$10,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2002 and 2003, and \$12,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2004 and 2005”.

(b) GRANTS FOR RESEARCH FOCUSED ON WATER PROBLEMS OF INTERSTATE NATURE.—The first sentence of section 104(g)(1) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 10303(g)(1)) is amended by striking “\$3,000,000 for each of fiscal years 1996 through 2000” and inserting “\$3,000,000 for fiscal year 2001, \$4,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2002 and 2003, and \$6,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2004 and 2005”.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. WALDEN) and the gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. WALDEN).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. WALDEN of Oregon. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that

all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 4132.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. WALDEN of Oregon. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, in partnership with the U.S. Geological Survey, the Water Resources Research Institutes have the capability to provide important support to the States in their long-term water planning, policy development and resources management efforts. The state water resources research institutes, under the authority of the Water Resources Research Act, have established an effective Federal-State partnership in water resources, education, and information transfer. These institutes are located in each of the 50 States, the District of Columbia, the Virgin Islands, Puerto Rico, and Guam/Federated States of Micronesia. They have worked with State and Federal agencies and water resources stakeholders in their home States for more than 3 decades while acting as a network for the exchange of water resources research and information transfer among States.

This legislation will reauthorize the Water Resources Research Act of 1984 for the fiscal years 2001 through 2005. It will provide increased funding for the water resources research program grants and provide an increase in the authorization for grants for research focused on water problems of an interstate nature.

We recognize the important role of these institutes and the role they play in our understanding of water policy and planning throughout the United States, and I urge passage of this legislation.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise in support of H.R. 4132, a bill to amend the Water Resources Research Act of 1984. This legislation extends the authorization's important program for 5 years and provides a modest increase in the authorization of appropriations. The water research program has provided us with extraordinary benefits for many years, and I would ask that all Members support the legislation.

Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. WALDEN of Oregon. Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. WALDEN) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 4132.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.