

Mr. DODD. They get the benefits of the collective bargaining agreements even though they are not members per se. They all get the same benefits.

Mr. HATCH. That is another argument for another day. The fact is, I don't think anybody in their right mind is going to say that people are not compelled to pay union dues in nonright-to-work States, if they want the job and they want to work in a union business. It is that simple. Nobody doubts that. I don't have any problem with that. That is the way the law is. But to say they can spend 100 percent of the money for only one party and not disclose it seems to me to be a bad process, especially when Democrats have suggested: Well, if you don't make the corporations disclose, why should you make the unions? I am saying let's make both of them disclose. Let's be fair so there is no imbalance.

The imbalance is in the fact that the only two things the unions don't care about are TV advertisements and radio advertisements. They can do all these other things: Get out the vote, voter identification, voter registration, mass mailings, phone banks, TV advertisement, radio advertisements, magazine advertisements, newspaper advertisements, outdoor advertising, leafletting, polling, volunteer recruitment and training, and most of their employees are union salaried, full-time political operatives, all working for one party, and at the same time this McCain-Feingold bill limits the Republican Party, which has no outside organization doing this. It limits hard dollars to no more than \$1,000 per contributor. Talk about imbalance. In other words, the two groups that you would hope would be fully in the political process—the two political parties—are the ones that are left out, while we ignore all this other stuff.

Talk about imbalance. The McCain-Feingold bill is imbalanced. What is even worse, in my eyes, is that the one thing they impose on unions and others is TV advertisements and radio advertisements within 30 to 60 days of the primary and general elections. Think about that. That says they don't have the right to speak during that time which, under *Buckley v. Valeo*, shows that directly violative of the first amendment. Here we have the media and everybody else arguing for this.

My amendment does one thing. It doesn't stop the unions from doing this. It doesn't say you are bad people, you should not do this. It says you need to disclose what you are doing so that all members of the union know what political ideologies they are supporting with their dues. That includes 40 percent of them who are basically Republicans and whose moneys are all going to elect Democrats, people who are basically contrary to their philosophical and political viewpoints.

All I ask is that there be disclosure. But to even it up, since the Democrats have raised this time and again, I

would require disclosure in the corporate world, too—disclose what the money is used for regarding politics.

With that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there now be a period for the transaction of routine morning business with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

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

RETIREMENT OF COLONEL WILSON A. "BUD" SHATZER

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I rise today to pay tribute to Colonel Wilson A. "Bud" Shatzer, who after thirty-one years of dedicated service to the nation and the military, will retire from the United States Army on April 1, 2001.

Colonel Shatzer's career began following his graduation from Eastern Washington University in 1970 when he was commissioned a Second Lieutenant in the Armor Branch. Over the past three decades, his assignments have included a variety of both command and staff positions, and throughout his military career, Colonel Shatzer consistently distinguished himself in all his assignments. Furthermore, whether a newly commissioned Second Lieutenant or a seasoned Colonel, this officer always demonstrated one of the most important qualities an officer should possess, a deep-seated concern for his soldiers regardless of their rank. As a leader and teacher Colonel Shatzer proved himself to be a willing mentor of young officers and enlisted men, and in the process, he helped to shape the successful careers of soldiers throughout the Army.

Many of us came to know Colonel Shatzer during his five-year tour as Executive Officer, Army Legislative Liaison. His professionalism, mature judgment, and sound advice earned him the respect and confidence of members of the Army Secretariat and the Army Staff. While dealing with Members of Congress and Congressional staff, the Department of Defense, and the Joint Staff, Colonel Shatzer's abilities as an officer, analyst and advisor were of benefit to the Army and to those with whom he worked in the Legislative Branch.

For the past thirty-one years, Colonel Shatzer has selflessly served the

Army and our Nation professionally, capably and admirably. Through his personal style of leadership, he has had a positive impact on the lives of not only the soldiers who have served under him, but of the families of these soldiers, as well as the civilian employees of the Army who have worked with and under this officer. I am sure that all of those in the Senate who have worked with Colonel Shatzer join me today in wishing both he and his wife, Annie, health, happiness, and success in the years ahead.

BUDGET COMMITTEE MARKUP

Mr. NELSON of Florida. Mr. President, it is a great privilege for me to be a new Member of the Senate, and it is a great privilege for me to be assigned to the Budget Committee. It is with a heavy heart that I have just learned that it is the intention of the chairman, the distinguished Senator from New Mexico, for whom I have the highest regard, not to have a markup in the Budget Committee and rather bring a chairman's mark under the lawful procedures of the Budget Act straight to the floor.

I am compelled to rise to express my objection, for that is what a legislative body is all about in the warp and woof and crosscurrents of ideas for Members to hammer out legislation, particularly on something as important as adopting a budget.

We first started adopting budgets pursuant to the Budget Act passed in the 1970s because Congress had difficulty containing its voracious appetite to continue to spend. Thus, the Budget Act was adopted in which Congress would adopt a blueprint, an overall skeletal structure, for expenditures and for revenues that would be the model after which all of the various committees, both appropriations and authorizing committees, would then come in and flesh out the skeletal structure of the budget adopted.

How important this budgetary debate is this year for the questions in front of the Congress. Such things as: How large is the tax cut going to be, particularly measured against, juxtaposed against, how large the surplus is that we are expecting over the next 10 years. That, of course, is a very iffy projection. We have seen, if history serves us well, that, in fact, we don't know beyond a year, 2 years at the most, with any kind of degree of accuracy, if we can forecast what the surpluses or the deficits are going to be in future years.

So the budget debate brings the central question of how large should the tax cut be counterbalanced against how much of the revenues and the surplus do we think will be there over the course of the next decade. That, then, leads us, once we know that, to be able to decide how much we will appropriate for other needed expenditures for the good of the United States.

Most everyone in this Chamber agrees there ought to be a modernization of Medicare with a prescription drug benefit. Most everyone in this Chamber agrees there should be additional investment in education, and there is a bipartisan bill that is beginning to work its way through the legislative process on increased investment in education and accountability. Most everyone in this Chamber agrees we have to pay our young men and women in the Armed Forces of this country more of a comparable wage in competition with the private sector in order to have the kind of skill and talent we need in today's all-volunteer Armed Forces.

Most people in this body would agree we have to have certain expenditures with regard to health care, planning for the end game, encouraging additional long-term insurance, equalizing the tax subsidies for health insurance now from a large employer to a small employer, or to an individual employer, or to an individual.

There are a number of items on which there is consensus that is built on this side of the Capitol where we should go with regard to expenditures in the future while controlling our fiscal appetite.

That brings me back to the budget resolution, for it is the very essence of adopting a budget resolution that we should have as our watchwords "fiscal discipline." That is why we need to have a full and fair discussion of all the issues in adopting a budget resolution. That is why we ought to mark it up and have that discussion first in the committee.

I wrap up by saying of all the debates that will take place this year, the debate on how we will allocate the resources with regard to the budget of the United States is one of the most important. It ought to have a full and fair and thorough discussion.

THE BIRTH OF WILLIAM BLUE HOLLIER

Mr. CRAPO. Mr. President, I rise today to announce the birth of a fine young man, William Blue Hollier. William was born on Monday, March 5th, making him a couple of weeks old today. He is the first child of Will and Alyssa Hollier. Will serves as my Administrative Assistant and has been an invaluable part of my staff for over 8 years. I'm happy to report that mother, father, and baby are doing well, although Will and Alyssa are probably getting used to fewer hours of sleep.

Young William is the grandson of Charles and Judy Hollier of Lafayette, LA; Judy Myers of New Orleans; and Bob and Cheri Knorr of Sawyer, ND. His great-grandparents, Henry and Mary Myers of Opelousas, LA; Art Odegard of Minot, ND; and Walt Knorr of Devil's Lake, ND, also join me in welcoming this baby.

It is always a joyous event to bring a new family member into the world.

William has been much-anticipated and has held a place in the hearts of his parents and family for many months now as they have awaited his arrival. As the father of five myself, I know that Will and Alyssa are in for a most remarkable, frustrating, rewarding, and exciting experience of their lives. William Blue will make certain of that. Our best wishes go out to the Hollier family on this most auspicious occasion.

CHILDREN AND HEALTHCARE WEEK

Mr. HOLLINGS. Mr. President, each day, many of our Nation's children face illnesses that require a doctor's office or hospital visit. This can be frightening for both the child and his or her family, and underscores the need to continue providing quality, caring pediatric health services. This week in Greenville, SC, The Children's Hospital of The Greenville Hospital System is celebrating Children and Healthcare Week with a number of valuable activities for health care professionals, parents and community partners. Among the events are continuing education classes for medical residents and support staff as well as an awards ceremony to honor local individuals who have dedicated their lives to pediatric care.

Children and Healthcare Week highlights educational programming to increase public, parental and professional knowledge of the improvements that can be made in pediatric health care. In particular, it stresses new ways to meet the emotional and developmental needs of children in health care settings. Lack of quality health care should never be an impediment to the long-term success of our nation's children and I commend Greenville's dedication to Children and Healthcare Week.

45th ANNIVERSARY OF TUNISIA'S INDEPENDENCE

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. President, I congratulate Tunisia on the occasion of her 45th year of independence.

Tunisia is a constitutional democracy striving to create a more open political society, diversify its economy, attract foreign investment, and improve its diplomatic ties with both the European Union and United States.

I am pleased to be a member of the Hannibal Club USA whose mission is to improve the political and economic ties between the United States and Tunisia. I am hopeful that a mutually beneficial relationship between our two countries will continue to grow in the years ahead.

ELECTIONS IN UGANDA

Mr. FEINGOLD. Mr. President, I rise today to express my serious concern about the recent presidential elections

in Uganda. Uganda is a country of great promise; in the past year I and many of my colleagues have come to this floor to praise the Ugandan Government and the Ugandan people for their energetic and effective fight against the AIDS pandemic. In recent years, the economy has enjoyed moderate economic growth. Most strikingly, even given the persistence of brutality like that embodied by the Lord's Resistance Army, there can be no mistaking that Uganda has come a long way from the dark days when Idi Amin and Milton Obote terrorized their citizens. This progress toward stability and an improvement in the quality of life enjoyed by Ugandans has been cause for celebration, and legitimately so.

But the latest trends from Uganda are alarming. In particular, the days leading up to the March 12 presidential elections revealed a disturbing willingness on the part of the ruling party to retain power through intimidation. According to observers, the opposition was threatened with violence and arrests from state security forces throughout the campaign. Reports indicate that, in some cases, opposition supporters also resorted to violent tactics. While most observers agree that outcome of the vote would probably not have been different had the election not been marred in this manner, there can be no question that Uganda has been proven to be less democratic and less stable by these recent events, and the security of individual Ugandans wishing to exercise basic civil and political rights is not assured.

It is unquestionably true that many positive developments have unfolded in Uganda over the years that President Museveni has been in office. But Uganda's success is not about Mr. Museveni. Institutions, not individuals, are the backbone of lasting political stability and development. And the movement system currently in effect in Uganda, always dubious, increasingly looks like a single-party system by another name. Its defenders will point to last year's referendum on this so-called "no-party" system and claim that it is the will of the people. But the deck was clearly stacked against multipartyism in last year's referendum on the movement system—state-sponsored political education courses were used to mobilize support for the Movement, and the opposition boycotted the vote.

Today, in the wake of the presidential election and after long months of Uganda's involvement in the Democratic Republic of the Congo—an adventure that, while perhaps profitable for the few, is clearly unpopular with the Ugandan people—today, those of us who genuinely wish to see Uganda consolidate the successes of the past and make even more progress in the years ahead are profoundly troubled.

Some in Central Africa believe that the U.S. turns a blind eye to the shortcomings of the government in Kampala. I certainly hope that is not the