

Again, there were 796 criminal convictions over the last 6 years, with court-ordered restitution of \$101 million. Whose money is that? Whose money was being ordered to be paid back? It is union members' money—working Americans who have trusted their leaders. Maybe in the union hall there are 10 officers and leaders and only one of them found themselves in a position to steal. I am not saying we have this wholesale problem. What I am saying is there is a very real problem. There is no doubt about it. We are finding far too many criminal cases for each audit that is done.

As a result, it takes up time by the investigators. It takes up time by the auditors. It results oftentimes in a loss of money that no matter what the judge orders to be restored—no matter how much restitution they order—it may not actually ever be paid back if they do not have it. That is a true fact.

So I urge my colleagues to support this amendment. Once again, some of you may be concerned that the offset was to take money from the ILO, I believe it is, the U.N.-affiliated international labor group that is supposed to help labor conditions around the world. They certainly have high and good goals. I am not sure they have been very effective. But this money for my amendment is not coming from there anymore. I know a lot of people want to see that budget increased.

So this offset will be an offset from administrative expenses of Labor and HHS and Education. It will be a small impact on their overall budget.

I urge my colleagues to vote for this amendment.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa is recognized.

Mr. HARKIN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the pending amendment be set aside.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 3395 TO AMENDMENT NO. 3325

(Purpose: To clarify the application of current law)

Mr. HARKIN. Madam President, I have an amendment I offer on behalf of Senator REID. I send it to the desk and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. HARKIN], for Mr. REID, proposes an amendment numbered 3395 to amendment No. 3325:

At the appropriate place in title II, insert the following:

SEC. \_\_\_\_ Nothing in this Act shall be construed to effect or otherwise modify provisions of current Federal law with respect to the funding of abortion.

Mr. HARKIN. Madam President, I am going to propound a unanimous consent request. I ask the Senator's attention to this request so we get it right.

Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to set this pending amendment aside, then to turn to an amendment to be offered by the Senator from Lou-

isiana, at which time we will have a time agreement of 10 minutes for Senator VITTER and 10 minutes for Senator BOXER on the Vitter amendment, at the end of which time the Senate will proceed to a vote on or in relation to, first, the Reid amendment; upon disposal of the Reid amendment, the Senate will then proceed to vote on or in relation to the amendment offered by the Senator from Louisiana; at the conclusion of that vote, that the Senate then proceed to a vote on the amendment offered by the Senator from Alabama, Mr. SESSIONS; and that no other amendments or intervening matter occur prior to these votes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there any objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

There is 20 minutes equally divided.

The Senator from Louisiana is recognized.

Mr. VITTER. First of all, Madam President, I thank the chairman of the subcommittee for all his courtesies.

AMENDMENT NO. 3330 TO AMENDMENT NO. 3325

Under that unanimous consent request which has been granted, I now call up amendment No. 3330, the Vitter amendment at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Louisiana [Mr. VITTER] proposes an amendment numbered 3330 to amendment No. 3325.

Mr. VITTER. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

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

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To prohibit the provision of funds to grantees who perform abortions)

On page 79, between lines 4 and 5, insert the following:

SEC. \_\_\_\_ Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, none of the funds appropriated in this title shall be distributed to grantees who perform abortions or whose subgrantees perform abortions, except where a woman suffers from a physical disorder, physical injury, or physical illness that would, as certified by a physician, place the woman in danger of death unless an abortion is performed, including a life-endangering physical condition caused by or arising from the pregnancy itself. The preceding sentence shall not apply to a grantee or subgrantee that is a hospital, so long as such hospital does not subgrant to a non-hospital entity that performs abortions.

Mr. VITTER. Madam President, this is a very simple and straightforward but, I believe, important amendment. It says in clear terms that none of the funds in this appropriations bill will go to entities that provide abortions.

I think that is the right policy we should set in this body because whatever side of the abortion debate you are on, we can all agree on one thing: Abortion is a very divisive topic. Abortion divides our Nation—many folks would say down the middle—and it causes understandable passions and feelings on both sides. To a substantial number of Americans—myself in-

cluded—but millions upon millions of Americans, the procedure of abortion is deeply troubling and deeply offensive. In that context, I think it is the right policy and a very reasonable mainstream policy to say we are not going to send taxpayer dollars to support groups that perform abortions. It seems to me that is the right policy when you talk about taxpayer dollars.

Now, the other side will immediately jump up and say: Well, we have current Federal law that says we are not going to use taxpayer dollars to fund abortions. But, quite frankly, that is not good enough in my mind and in the minds of millions upon millions of other abortion opponents.

Because the way it works now, we send Federal dollars to abortion providers and money is fungible and it is a big shell game and it supports their overhead and it supports their organizations and, in many cases, that funding is a huge percentage of their overall revenue. So it does, in a very significant, meaningful way, support abortions. That is wrong in my mind.

Now, let me make clear what this amendment does and what it does not do.

It says we are not going to send taxpayer dollars to abortion providers under the title X program. The title X program is a family planning program, and many of those entities which get millions of dollars from the Federal Government perform abortions. This amendment says we are not going to send taxpayer dollars to those entities.

Now, what does the amendment not do? It does not affect hospitals. There is specific language, a specific exemption for hospitals. So hospitals are another category. It does not cut one penny from family planning. This amendment is not about family planning. It is clearly about abortion. We do not cut one penny of family planning funding.

This amendment does not deny one family, one individual, family planning services, because in every locality where a private abortion provider is receiving title X funds, there are alternative sources for family planning services—in every area, in every locality. So we are not taking family planning services away from any American, from any individual in any part of the country.

Finally, this amendment does not affect free speech. The amendment contains no language regarding counseling, advocacy, information or expression. It simply says: Let's be fair. Abortion is a very divisive topic. At least half the American people have deep concerns about it. In that context, we should not be sending those folks' money to abortion providers to take care of their overhead, to allow them to use it as a shell game and, essentially, indirectly fund abortions and support abortion services.

Now, there are a lot of examples of these sorts of entities that we could use. But, obviously, the biggest nationwide is Planned Parenthood. Planned