

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 bio-accumulative 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. 202. 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 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. 203. 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.

#### SEC. 204. LONG ISLAND SOUND.

Section 119(e) of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1269(e)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1), by striking “1991 through 2001” and inserting “1999 through 2003”; and

(2) in paragraph (2), by striking “not to exceed \$3,000,000 for each of the fiscal years 1991 through 2001” and inserting “\$10,000,000 for each of fiscal years 1999 through 2003”.

#### SEC. 205. NATIONAL ENVIRONMENTAL WASTE TECHNOLOGY TESTING AND EVALUATION CENTER.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency is authorized to provide financial assistance to the National Environmental Waste Technology Testing and Evaluation Center in Butte, Montana.

(b) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section \$10,000,000 for each of fiscal years 1998 through 2002.

#### TECHNICAL CORRECTIONS TO THE NATIONAL CAPITAL REVITALIZATION AND SELF-GOVERNMENT IMPROVEMENT ACT OF 1997

Mr. CRAIG. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of H.R. 4566, which was received from the House.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 4566) to make technical corrections to the National Capital Revitalization and Self-Government Improvement Act of 1997 with respect to the courts and court system of the District of Columbia.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the immediate consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. CRAIG. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered read the third time and passed, the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table, and that any statements relating to the bill be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The bill (H.R. 4566) was considered read the third time, and passed.

Mr. CRAIG. Mr. President, I will now speak as in morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Idaho is recognized.

#### THE WHITE HOUSE IS SPENDING THE SURPLUS

Mr. CRAIG. Mr. President, last night there was an interesting discussion on CNN. It went something like this:

The White House is now spending the surplus—the surplus that the President, a few months ago, said had to be guaranteed for only Social Security. I am told that the White House immediately responded by saying: Oh, no, no, no, the White House isn’t spending the surplus. Surpluses don’t exist until after you have had all of the emergency spending you need.

In other words, the White House has now come to the Hill to ask for upwards of \$20 billion worth of surplus

spending that is now emergency spending, that isn't called surplus and, therefore, doesn't count against application to the trust funds of Social Security.

Now, while the President's legions are up here in negotiations over in Speaker NEWT GINGRICH's office, the President is still out on the stump accusing Republicans of wanting to spend the surplus. The President has effectively, by Democrat action here on the floor, denied the taxpayers a reasonable tax cut this year. And while there are some necessary moneys to be spent in surplus spending for emergencies—such as disaster-related emergencies, the emergency of the commodity price crises in agriculture—nobody has denied that that wasn't surplus money and that in fact we are spending a little bit of that surplus, a very small amount of that surplus, to address some very real national needs. But no Republican has even tried to suggest that the surplus isn't the surplus until we have spent all of it, or a portion of it, and that what is left over becomes the surplus.

Mr. President, this is a doublespeak of yours that we are somehow, as a Nation, getting used to: Is "is"? No; the surplus is the surplus. That is the money that remains unappropriated at the end of a fiscal year. That is the money that, collectively, the budget process of Congress, the appropriating process of Congress, says is not needed; it is not necessary to spend that money.

So now we are attempting something uniquely different. Now we are attempting to once again redefine, at least in the eyes of the President and this administration, what a surplus is. I think we will let the American people decide what that is. You see, we know what "is" is. And "is," in this case, is the money that the budget process suggests is not appropriated beyond its normal channels, and that we have determined can be upward of \$60 billion worth of surplus this year, that the President in his budget message to Congress emphatically said had to be spent on Social Security, and that this Congress, in a very real and bipartisan way, said, yes, it is a good idea and should be done, because most of us agree that we are in a unique time—if not a historically opportune time—in our country, and that is to use our surplus, to use the surplus that was produced by a balanced budget that we worked so hard to accomplish—can be used to make major changes, not only in our tax law and tax policy, but now the unique opportunity to reform Social Security, not only to save it, secure it, and maintain it for those who become the immediate recipients of it, but so that our children and our grandchildren will be investing in a Social Security system that is worth investing in, so that they are not denied real return on their investment—25 cents on the dollar, as will be the case for our grandchildren today if we don't re-

form Social Security. We want them to get \$1.50 or \$2 back on their investment, as they should be allowed to do.

So what is "is," Mr. President, and what is surplus doesn't allow your definition. It isn't what is left over when you get through spending on all of the additional social programs that you want to spend it on.

Just a few moments ago, our colleagues on the other side of the aisle held a very interesting press conference. They called it a "do-nothing Congress." They denied that we had spent the money necessary to fund all of the social programs. Mr. President, in 1994 the American people spoke most profoundly when they changed Congress and said they wanted a new agenda, they wanted a balanced budget, they wanted us to reform Social Security, and they wanted the influence and the impact of the Federal Government on our lives and on our pocketbooks lessened. That is exactly what this Congress has been doing. Yet, of course, now that we have accomplished those goals, now that our economy and our lessened Government spent less of the money and our economy generates more money and we have a unique opportunity of surplus, the President now sees that opportunity—sees it or seizes it, I am not sure at this moment.

Let me suggest, Mr. President, that what is is. Surplus is surplus. It isn't what is left over after you get through spending. That is exactly what the President and the White House tried to engage in last night, a whole new definition. We have watched this President try to redefine a lot of things over the last good number of months—from the word "is," now to the word "surplus." Mr. President, surplus is surplus. It is when the Congress works the budget process, and that is concluded in a bipartisan fashion, that we determine what surplus is. So I think it is terribly important that we finalize our work here. Those negotiations are now underway. Yes, some surplus money will be spent in emergency. What is left over at the end will be surplus. But you don't start the game by redefining the fact. That is how we deal with it. That is how we must deal with it. And it is very important that we stay with that.

I am proud of the record of the Republican Congress—a balanced budget, welfare reform—major changes—and new dollars into education, education controlled at the local and State level and not new, grand programs here at the national level. Those are the issues about which we are talking. Those are the issues with which we must deal.

I hope we can conclude those quickly, adjourn this Congress, and be able to announce to the American taxpayer that they can rest assured that our effort is to control Government spending, the size of Government, and the impact it has on their pocketbook.

With those comments, I yield the floor.

#### MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, there will now be a period for the transaction of morning business not to extend beyond the hour of 1 p.m. with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 5 minutes each.

Mr. ROTH addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Delaware is recognized.

#### EDUCATION

Mr. ROTH. Mr. President, I rise today to make some comments with respect to the question of the allocation of resources to assist our State and local governments in meeting their challenge in the provision of education for grades K through 12.

First, in this war of words it should not be overlooked that there was no disagreement last year in establishing education as a priority when we enacted the Balanced Budget Act. We entered into an agreement only one year ago with this administration where we indicated that yes, we agree that education is a priority for all. We have honored that commitment.

Under the balanced budget agreement from last year, we agreed to increase spending on education by 15 percent, or \$3 billion. We did that.

This year in the budget resolution adopted by the Senate we agreed to increase education spending over the next 5 years by an amount equal to inflation which would result in spending increases of \$6.6 billion in budget authority and \$4.1 billion in outlays over the next 5 years. Almost all other discretionary programs were frozen.

In addition, earlier this year we passed a bill—with bipartisan support—the Parent and Student Savings Account Plus Act to expand the education IRA which we enacted last year as part of the Taxpayer Relief Act of 1997.

Under this provision the annual contribution limit for education IRAs would be increased from \$500 under current law to \$2,000 and expand the use of the proceeds from these accounts for elementary and secondary education expenses.

Education expenses, it is important to note, under the provisions of the bill were broadly defined to include after school programs, expenses for special needs children, computers, tutoring, uniforms—in sum, virtually any expense associated with improving the totality of a child's education.

The benefits of this provision were large for a very small cost, and I would note most importantly, with no Federal interference. Mr. President, this one provision was anticipated to generate \$5 billion for education over a 5-year period and \$10 billion over a 10-year period.

It was thought that 14 million families would utilize the savings benefit and 20 million school children would benefit. All at minimal cost and interference. The administration vetoed this good and important bill.