''(A) the nutrient goals of the Chesapeake Bay Agreement for the quantity of nitrogen and phosphorus entering the main stem Chesapeake Bay;

''(B) the water quality requirements necessary to restore living resources in both the tributaries and the main stem of the Chesapeake Bay;

''(C) the Chesapeake Bay basinwide toxics reduction and prevention strategy goal of reducing or eliminating the input of chemical contaminants from all controllable sources to levels that result in no toxic or bioaccumulative impact on the living resources that inhabit the Bay or on human health; and

''(D) habitat restoration, protection, and enhancement goals established by Chesapeake Bay Agreement signatories for wetlands, forest riparian zones, and other types of habitat associated with the Chesapeake Bay and the tributaries of the Chesapeake Bay.

''(2) SMALL WATERSHED GRANTS PROGRAM.—The Administrator, in consultation with other members of the Chesapeake Executive Council, may offer the technical assistance and assistance grants authorized under subsection (d) to local governments and nonprofit private organizations and individuals in the Chesapeake Bay watershed to implement—

''(A) cooperative tributary basin strategies that address the Chesapeake Bay's water quality and living resource needs; or

''(B) locally based protection and restoration programs or projects within a watershed that complement the tributary basin strategies.

''(h) STUDY OF CHESAPEAKE BAY PROGRAM.—Not later than December 31, 2000, and every 3 years thereafter, the Administrator, in cooperation with other members of the Chesapeake Executive Council, shall complete a study and submit a comprehensive report to Congress on the results of the study. The study and report shall, at a minimum—

''(1) assess the commitments and goals of the management strategies established under the Chesapeake Bay Agreement and the extent to which the commitments and goals are being met;

''(2) assess the priority needs required by the management strategies and the extent to which the priority needs are being met;

''(3) assess the effects of air pollution deposition on water quality of the Chesapeake Bay;

''(4) assess the state of the Chesapeake Bay and its tributaries and related actions of the Chesapeake Bay Program;

''(5) make recommendations for the improved management of the Chesapeake Bay Program; and

''(6) provide the report in a format transferable to and usable by other watershed restoration programs.

''(i) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section $30,000,000 for each of fiscal years 1999 through 2003.''.

SEC. 503. CHESAPEAKE BAY GATEWAYS AND WATERTRAILS.

(a) CHESAPEAKE BAY GATEWAYS AND WATERTRAILS NETWORK.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of the Interior (referred to in this section as the ''Secretary''), in cooperation with the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency (referred to in this section as the ''Administrator''), shall provide technical and financial assistance, in cooperation with other Federal agencies, State and local governments, nonprofit organizations, and the private sector—

(A) to identify, conserve, restore, and interpret natural, recreational, historical, and cultural resources within the Chesapeake Bay Watershed;

(B) to identify and utilize the collective resources as Chesapeake Bay Gateways sites for enhancing public education of and access to the Chesapeake Bay;

(C) to link the Chesapeake Bay Gateways sites with trails, tour roads, scenic byways, and other connections as determined by the Secretary;

(D) to develop and establish Chesapeake Bay Watertrails comprising water routes and connections to Chesapeake Bay Gateways sites and other land resources within the Chesapeake Bay Watershed; and

(E) to create a network of Chesapeake Bay Gateways sites and Chesapeake Bay Watertrails.

(2) COMPONENTS.—Components of the Chesapeake Bay Gateways and Watertrails Network may include—

(A) State or Federal parks or refuges;

(B) historic seaports;

(C) archaeological, cultural, historical, or recreational sites; or

(D) other public access and interpretive sites as selected by the Secretary.

(b) CHESAPEAKE BAY GATEWAYS GRANTS ASSISTANCE PROGRAM.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary, in cooperation with the Administrator, shall establish a Chesapeake Bay Gateways Grants Assistance Program to aid State and local governments, local communities, nonprofit organizations, and the private sector in conserving, restoring, and interpreting important historic, cultural, recreational, and natural resources within the Chesapeake Bay Watershed.

(2) CRITERIA.—The Secretary, in cooperation with the Administrator, shall develop appropriate eligibility, prioritization, and review criteria for grants under this section.

(3) MATCHING FUNDS AND ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES.—A grant under this section—

(A) shall not exceed 50 percent of eligible project costs;

(B) shall be made on the condition that non-Federal sources, including in-kind contributions of services or materials, provide the remainder of eligible project costs; and

(C) shall be made on the condition that not more than 10 percent of all eligible project costs be used for administrative expenses.

(c) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section $3,000,000 for each of fiscal years 1999 through 2003.

SEC. 504. PFIESTERIA AND OTHER AQUATIC TOXINS RESEARCH AND GRANT PROGRAM.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency, the Secretary of Commerce (acting through the Director of the National Marine Fisheries Service of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration), the Secretary of Health and Human Services (acting through the Director of the National Institute of Environmental Health Sciences and the Director of the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention), and the Secretary of Agriculture shall—

(1) establish a research program for the eradication or control of Pfiesteria piscicida and other aquatic toxins; and

(2) make grants to colleges, universities, and other entities in affected States for the eradication or control of Pfiesteria piscicida and other aquatic toxins.

(b) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section $5,000,000 for each of fiscal years 1999 and 2000.

Mr. DEWINE. I finally ask consent that H.R. 2863 be placed back on the calendar.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. DEWINE). Under the previous order, there will now be a period of morning business until 12 noon.

Mr. KENNEDY addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts is recognized.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, as I understand it, under the previous order I have 20 minutes. Is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. KENNEDY. Will the Chair be kind enough to let me know when I have 2 minutes remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will be notified.

Mr. KENNEDY. I thank the Chair.

TRIBUTE TO PATRICK MURPHY, FOUNDER OF THE ''FOR THE LOVE OF LIFE'' FOUNDATION

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I rise today to pay tribute to a wonderful friend who has left us all too soon, Patrick Murphy of Provincetown, Massachusetts, who died last Friday from complication of AIDS.

The poet Yeats wrote about another young man who died too young, in lines that apply to Patrick Murphy, too—he was ''all life's epitome. What made us dream that he could comb grey hair?''

Patrick was a very special friend, and we grieve all the more today because his life was so tragically cut short. But he lived that life with great energy, passion and commitment. And these priceless qualities won him countless friends and enormous success throughout his lifetime. But even more important, they won him the enduring respect and genuine affection of the people whose lives he touched and helped.

Patrick succeeded where others failed because he would never allow himself to be distracted by the mean-spirited. He had a determination that could overcome any obstacle or criticism. He was seldom burdened by a sense of reality, which made him all the more endearing and all the more successful.

In the Patrick Murphy handbook on life, ''No you can't'' became ''Yes you can.'' You can fight the bureaucracy. You can make a difference. You can live with AIDS—and never let anyone tell you you can't.

All of us who knew Patrick knew that he never gave up and never gave in. He was the ''ever-ready bunny'' in the television commercial—the one who just keeps going and going—ever-ready to fight for all the causes we share.

I remember my own campaign in Massachusetts in 1994. Patrick had just left the hospital. But that didn't stop him for a second. Before we knew it, he had list after list of events and phone-banks and campaign stops he was planning—working skillfully and tirelessly until every last vote was counted and victory was won.

He did the same for Senator JOHN KERRY in his reelection campaign in 1996—and for President Clinton and Vice President GORE in their campaign that year too.

And he did it all over again for the impressive ''For the Love of Life'' Foundation that he founded in 1992 and that will be his lasting memorial.

In the years to come, the Foundation will remind us again and again of Patrick and the power of individuals to make a difference. Ever since Patrick created ''For the Love of Life'' in 1992, the Foundation has brought greater hope and a higher quality of life to countless people living with AIDS—in Massachusetts and across the country.

The Foundation was inspired by Patrick's extraordinary belief that people's dreams can come true. And, the Foundation's great mission has been to grant the wishes of individuals and families living with HIV and AIDS.

''For the Love of Life'' works closely with other AIDS organizations. It provides a special extra dimension that others can't.

For an HIV positive father who could not afford a funeral for his infant son who died of AIDS—''For the Love of Life'' made the difference.

For a person living in a hospice in Boston—''For the Love of Life'' enabled him to visit his mother in Pittsburgh for one last time, to share a birthday.

The Foundation has helped many others as well—a mother with AIDS to attend her daughter's wedding—a teenage girl with AIDS to have a Sweet 16 party for her family and friends. Because of Patrick's vision and leadership, the dreams of countless others will come true.

As many have said, life is best measures not by its length but by its depth—by those magical moments that make life special. Patrick made life special for himself and everyone he touched. And in the years to come, ''For the Love of Life'' will continue Patrick's great work by helping people with AIDS to live life and love life. And for that great gift and lesson to all of us—we thank Patrick with all our heart.

Patrick, for the light you brought to dark hours and for the dignity you gave to the human spirit—God bless you and sustain you. Patrick said he was always happier and healthier when he had a project. So I say now, to Patrick in heaven, may you always have a project!

EDUCATION FUNDING

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I want to address the Senate for a few moments today to call attention to some progress that has been made, as I understand it, in budget negotiations in the areas of education, but also to indicate why I think the resolution of the President of the United States in identifying the importance of the help and assistance of the Federal Government for local communities and the States is extremely important, and why it has been very important in these last few days, that these negotiations reflect the President's strong commitment to education policy, and to put into some perspective why this battle has been necessary over the period of recent years and why it is necessary now. I will mention in just a few moments some of the areas where I understand progress has been made. Nothing will be achieved until everything is settled, but, nonetheless, the areas that I will mention here, I think, have been generally recognized as having been fairly well agreed to, and I think it is relevant to mention those because they are important and will be important when the final omnibus legislation has been achieved.

If you look over the recent years to see what has happened in terms of the education budget, you will see why this battle has been so important. If you look at the amount of the Federal budget that is devoted to education, it represents only 2 percent of the total budget. We are talking now of a budget of $1.7 billion. Only 2 percent of that budget is education. I think most Americans would believe that it should be a good deal higher.

What we are trying to do is to make sure that even this 2 percent is going to be preserved. If there is an opportunity, we are going to see some expansion of it. We understand that we have a tight fiscal situation. We are grateful for the economic policies that have brought us to some surplus, and we expect that to continue, although the surplus for the first 5 years is reflected really in the cumulative savings in our Social Security. And that is why the President is wise to say it is not appropriate now to have a tax cut because those funds which have been paid in and reflect themselves in the form of a surplus are really the hard-earned wages of workers and employers paying into the Social Security trust fund, and until we resolve the challenges of the Social Security trust fund, we should not, and we must not, see a tax cut.

But what we are trying to do is give education more of a priority within the total budget. That is certainly the desire of the American people. What we have been faced with over the period of recent years is the following: In 1996, the Republicans attempted to cut $3.7 billion below the previous year, 1995, in terms of what had actually been appropriated. Do we understand? In the education budget—that was in 1996, that was resisted by the President—all those budget cuts were not achieved but there were some budget cuts.

In 1997, the Republican proposal was to cut $1.5 billion below the previous year—not add on, Mr. President, not try to find out how we could possibly squeeze other aspects of our national budget in order to increase our commitment to education. No. We saw the request for $1.5 billion less in 1997 over the previous year; in 1998, a $2 billion cut below the President's request, and this year $2 billion below the President's request.

These are the facts. And so it is understandable that in the final wrap-up of these budget negotiations, the President of the United States is going to do everything he possibly can to resist that kind of cut in terms of education funding.

Now we know, as I have said before, the amounts of money do not necessarily indicate the solution to all of our problems. That is true in education as well. But what it does reflect is a nation's priorities—a nation's priorities. When you look over the record, for 1996, $3.7 billion; 1997, $1.5 billion; 1998, $2 billion; this year, 1999, $2 billion. That is reflected in the $420 million cut for title I, cutting back on the Eisenhower Teaching Program, cutting back on teacher technology, cutting back on the Afterschool Program, cutting back on the Year 2000 Program, zeroing out the Summer Jobs Program.

We can understand why the President and many of us—the Democratic leader, Senator DASCHLE, the Democratic leader in the House, DICK GEPHARDT—are saying we are not going to have an omnibus budget unless it protects education. In effect, that is what is happening in Washington. Surely, there are other priorities, but this is one identified by the President and the leaders, and the one which I believe is the overriding and overarching issue that those families across our country care most about.

Now, we have heard that in the past few days the Reading Excellence Act, which is basically the Literacy Program that passed in the Senate virtually unanimously, was tied up over in the House of Representatives, and when they effectively halted other kinds of action, that legislation was still hanging out there and would not have been approved unless put into this omnibus legislation.

When we understand that 40 percent of our children who are in the third and fourth grades cannot read properly, and when we understand that this is increasingly a problem, we are not going to be able to solve it all with our Reading Excellence Act, but we are going to be able to help and assist teachers who are attempting to set up literacy programs, who are tying into the Head Start Program, who are working with volunteers who reflect the interests of many of our young people who are working as volunteer teachers in the areas of literacy in our schools and colleges, with the Work-Study Program, which has been expanded significantly in the last couple of years.

I am proud that Massachusetts is ranked as the second State in the country in the number of volunteers in the Work-Study Program who are working with children in their communities on literacy. California is first; we are second. California better look out because we are increasing the number of our colleges that will be doing it. Close to 60 percent of all of our colleges scattered around our State of Massachusetts now are doing that. I believe every college ought to be involved. We ought to be challenging the young people in all of our colleges to give something back to the community. This program will provide that little seed