

have the teacher just take the children into the library and say: Pick a book. That overlooks the huge contribution a well-trained librarian can make to the education of young children. A well trained librarian is essential to helping students read. It is also important to have librarians with particular skills to be able to show children different means of research, different techniques, to be able to answer their questions, to find material for them, and to show them how to find material. That is not done simply by walking the children into the library, and saying: Pick a book. You need to try to get a sense of their interests and you need to try to lead them from one interest to another interest.

This might be the most fundamental aspect of education, and yet if you do not have the trained professionals to do it, you will not get the kind of high-level achievement we seek in this legislation.

The amendment would also allow establishing resource sharing initiatives. In my home State of Rhode Island, and in Ohio, the school librarians have set up a wonderful network with other school libraries, with public libraries, with academic libraries, so they can multiply the resources at their disposal. That would provide the kind of support that I believe is not only necessary but long overdue with respect to school libraries.

This amendment allocates funding on a formula basis to school districts, so that all needy districts and schools get the assistance they need to improve school libraries, rather than authorizing a very limited, competitive grant program which would only help certain districts that have a knack for grant writing.

This amendment is built upon the initial legislation I introduced along with Senators COCHRAN, KENNEDY, SNOWE, CHAFEE, DASCHLE, and others. The amendment, as I indicated, has broad support.

This bipartisan amendment I offer today, along with Senators SNOWE, KENNEDY, CHAFEE, BINGAMAN, WELLSTONE, MURRAY, CLINTON, SARBANES, JOHNSON, BAUCUS, LEVIN, REID, ROCKEFELLER, DURBIN, and DAYTON, is a modified version of that legislation because, rather than being a separate, stand-alone portion of the ESEA, this amendment includes support for books as part of the Reading First initiative.

In conclusion, since I have talked about what the amendment does, I would like to briefly talk about some of things the amendment does not do.

First of all, this is not a new program. This amendment would incorporate school library funding into the Reading First Initiative, the President's reading initiative. Unanimously, last week, we embraced Senator COLLINS' amendment, so I assume, without contradiction, we are all for Reading First, we are all for literacy. This would be incorporated into that. This is not a new program.

The second point I make is that this is not, as I said before, a novel Federal intervention into school policy. In 1965, we authorized funds to buy library materials. It worked. Those materials are still on the shelves. It is something that has been long associated with our Federal effort to help local schools.

Now we all want to consolidate programs. I think that makes a great deal of sense. As you look across the board, some programs could be more efficient. But here is an effort to present, within the context of the Reading First Initiative, a comprehensive reading program: training teachers to teach reading based on scientific principles, classroom materials, and then, if you will, the laboratory for reading, which is the school library and the books to read.

If we are serious—and I know we are—that we want to see every child succeed, if we want to see every child meet challenging standards, and in a very real sense pass the test, then we have to invest more in our school libraries. It is not simply enough to just prescribe the test and hope for the best. We have to give children books to read, the tools to master these techniques and, hopefully, I think in a broader sense, to acquire a passion for reading that will carry them far beyond their schooldays into their adult days. That truly, in my view, is the sign of an educated person.

Let me conclude my initial remarks by citing the Department of Education's guide for parents entitled "A Guide For Parents: How Do I Know a Good Early Reading Program When I See One?" In that guide they say that a good early reading program has: "a school library [which] is used often and has many books."

We must take this opportunity to dispense with inaccurate, out-of-date books that line the shelves of our school libraries. We have an opportunity to complement the President's proposal and provide the funding that is critical to making the program work so it can actually improve the reading and literacy skills of our nation's students. I hope we will seize this opportunity and urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Missouri.

Mr. BOND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to proceed as in morning business.

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

(The remarks of Mr. BOND pertaining to the introduction of S. 849 are located in today's RECORD under "Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.")

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. CLINTON). The Senator from Wisconsin.

ANOTHER LANDMARK TORN DOWN

Mr. FEINGOLD. Madam President, I rise to voice my objection to another blow committed by this majority

against the Senate. I wish to express my dismay with the majority leader's decision, of which I first learned in Monday's Roll Call, summarily to fire the Senate Parliamentarian because of his advice on a number of budget-related issues.

This action appears to be yet another unfortunate turn in the majority's heavy-handed efforts to transform the Senate into another House of Representatives. And I fear that the real victim of this latest purge will be the rules and traditions of this great body. Bob Dove has borne the brunt of the majority's latest outburst, but I fear that the Senate, too, will suffer.

Let me begin by noting that I, as others, have had my share of disagreements with Bob Dove during his time as Parliamentarian. I suspect that most Senators who have devoted any time to learning the Senate's rules will find points on which they differ with the Parliamentarian. But in the practice of law that is Senate procedure, the Parliamentarian plays the role of the judge. It is before the Parliamentarian that staff and even Senators make their arguments and state their cases, much as advocates before a court.

It is in the nature of judging that a judge cannot please all litigants, and it is in the nature of having a Parliamentarian that the Parliamentarian's advice to the Presiding Officer cannot always please all Senators.

Were it not so, we would not have a Parliamentarian. If the Parliamentarian cannot advise the Chair what the Parliamentarian truly believes that the law and precedents of the Senate require, then the office of the Parliamentarian ceases to exist.

If the Parliamentarian merely says what the majority leader wishes, then the majority leader has taken over the job. And in that case, the Senate has become less a body governed by rules and precedent and more a body that proceeds according to rule and precedent only when it pleases, in effect at the whim of the majority leader.

That the Senate rules constrain the majority has been one of its strengths. It is oft-recounted lore that when Jefferson returned from France, he asked Washington why he had agreed that the Congress should have two chambers. "Why," replied Washington to Jefferson, "did you pour that coffee into your saucer?" "To cool it," said Jefferson. "Even so," said Washington, "we pour legislation into the senatorial saucer to cool it."

It is the Senate's rules that allow legislation to cool. It is the Senate's adherence to its precedents and not to a rule adopted for this day and this day only that distinguishes the Senate from the House of Representatives. The Parliamentarian is a vital link in that chain of precedents. It is the Parliamentarian's advice to the Chair that makes this a body governed by rules.

The Senate has had an officer with the title of Parliamentarian since July

1, 1935, when the Senate changed the title of the journal clerk, Charles Watkins, to Parliamentarian and journal clerk. Since then, only four other men have occupied the office: Floyd Riddick, Murray Zweben, Bob Dove, and Alan Frumin. These five Parliamentarians held that office for an average of more than 12 years each. By comparison, during the same time, the Senate has had 14 different majority leaders.

As Justices sit on the Supreme Court, though Presidents will come and go, so Parliamentarians have maintained the rule of precedent, through changes in political majority. Removing a Parliamentarian because a majority leader disagrees with a decision is akin to a President's attack on the Supreme Court. History has roundly decried President Franklin Roosevelt for seeking to pack the Court. I predict that history will also roundly decry the majority leader's man-handling of the Senate's rules.

This majority has torn down another ancient landmark that our predecessors had set up. Once again, this majority has removed another boundary stone that once marked how far we could go. We are left today more bereft of rules, a body less governed by law, and unfortunately more governed by the wishes and ambitions of men and women.

The new Parliamentarian, Alan Frumin, has, as I have said, served as Parliamentarian before. I hope this time he can serve for a good long time.

I have always known Alan to be a man who calls them as he sees them. I hope that the majority leader will allow Alan to continue to do so. For only by allowing the Parliamentarian to follow his or her best judgment will the office of the Parliamentarian continue to be able to play its important role in preserving the Senate rules, and, thus, in preserving the Senate itself.

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 2002—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. LOTT. Madam President, I submit a report of the committee of conference on the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 83) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Committee of Conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 83), establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2002, revising the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2001, and setting forth appropriate budgetary levels for each of fiscal years 2003 through 2011, having met, have agreed that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate, and agree to the same with an amendment, and the Senate agree to the same, signed by a majority of the conferees on the part of both Houses.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will proceed to the consideration of the conference report.

(The report was printed in the House proceedings of the RECORD of May 8, 2001.)

Mr. LOTT. There are 10 hours for debate provided under statute. I expect all debate to be used or yielded back by the close of business today with the exception of an hour or so. We will then obtain a consent for closing remarks tomorrow morning to be followed by a vote on the conference report. I will not propound that request now but will consult with the Democratic leader and will propound the unanimous consent at a later time. I do think it best to get started.

The distinguished chairman of the Budget Committee has arrived. We will begin debate and go as long as Senators desire today and reserve about an hour tomorrow so there will be time equally divided to wrap up and then get a recorded vote.

Madam President, I thank the distinguished chairman of the Budget Committee for the job he has done again this year. A lot of people are appointed different jobs in the Senate in terms of leadership or offices of the Senate and have difficulties in doing our jobs. But few have a job any tougher than being chairman of the Budget Committee because it lays out the plan for the year. It does have to take a look at the whole budget.

The Presiding Officer, the Senator from New York, is on the Budget Committee. I know she found the process interesting, including the hearings. It is the committee that has to decide what is set aside for Medicare, for instance; if we have reform and need additional funds, how much will be available for tax relief and how much will be available for the nondefense and, in fact, defense discretionary accounts.

It is very hard to accommodate all the different parties. We have to work it through the Budget Committee, Democrats and Republicans, and on the floor of the Senate, with many amendments, and quite often vote-aramas at the end of the process where we vote, many times, on 20, 30, 40 amendments, in sequence. It is not a pretty process, but it is one that has to be done.

The chairman of the committee and the ranking member of the committee go to conference and see if they can find ways to work together and deal with the House, too.

So it is a long process. Senator DOMENICI has been involved in that process, either as ranking member or chairman, I believe, almost since we began. I remember I voted for the original Budget and Impoundment Act way back in 1973 or 1974. This time was probably even more difficult than usual, trying to thread the eye of the needle, trying to get something that can pass.

I believe they have done a good job. It surprises me when I hear some of the condemnation that I just heard from

the Senator from Wisconsin and in press conferences. I think this is a good budget resolution.

Some people seem to think that people who work and make money should not be able to keep a little bit more of their money. Anybody who wants to defend this Tax Code can go right at it, but I don't believe it is going to work with the American people because the people I talk to, blue-collar working neighbors in my hometown—shipyard workers, paper mill workers, refinery workers, small business men and women—don't think it is fair; they think they are overtaxed by the Federal Government, and by the State and local government, for that matter. They think they pay too much for gasoline taxes, which contributes to the price with which they are having to deal.

They think the Tax Code is too long, too complicated, and unfair. When I say: Does anybody in this room want to defend the marriage penalty tax, any Democrat, any Republican, anybody, old or young, married or single? I see not one hand.

Yet we have been yapping around here for 10 years about how we are going to get rid of the marriage penalty tax. It has gotten so serious, my daughter who got married 2 years ago, has threatened to run against me if I don't finally do something about this. This is an unfair, ridiculous tax.

Does it cost some money? Yes. Whose money is it, for Heaven's sake? It is my daughter's and her husband's, a young couple trying to make ends meet. Nobody wants to defend that.

The very concept of the Federal Government coming in when you die and reaching into the fruits of your labor in your lifetime is so alien to what America should be about, I just cannot believe people will say estate taxes are a good idea.

Oh, it will not affect me. I have asked for and been given a life in this institution in the Congress. I came here young and don't have any money and don't really ever expect to have very much. But the idea that my son, who has chosen a different route, would have the Federal Government show up and say: Give me 40 percent or 50 percent of your life's earnings—I am not going to give him an estate; he is not going to inherit it; whatever he has, he is going to earn it—I think that is wrong, fundamentally unfair and basically wrong. Rates are too high; taxes are too high.

Oh, there will be weeping and gnashing of teeth—the very idea that you would lower the top rate from 39.6 to 33 percent. You go out and ask the average man or woman on the street, do they think one-third of what they earn is enough to pay for Federal taxes—anybody—anybody should pay more than a third, 33 percent?

Then you have to add on to that State taxes, local taxes, sales taxes. On everything you do from the moment