

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, leafleting, 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.