The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senate is in morning business.

Mr. BINGAMAN. Madam President, I will speak on two subjects. First, the pension issue that I have talked about several times on the Senate floor in recent weeks. We have some information that I will share with Members about the extent of that problem. We hope before the end of this week we will have some legislation to propose to begin addressing that problem.

The other subject is the U.N. population fund. I ask that the Chair please advise me when 5 of my 10 minutes have been consumed.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair will do so.

PENSION REFORM

Mr. BINGAMAN. Madam President, the retirement system in this country leaves a great deal to be desired. We have many people who do not have adequate income when they reach the age of retirement. We have some charts that make that case. These charts are based on the 1999 U.S. census current population survey. They make the case fairly strongly.

This first chart is titled ''Private Workers Who Participate in an Employer Sponsored Plan,'' and breaks down the population by race and ethnicity. When we look at all workers as of 1999, there were 44 percent of the private workers who participated in the employer-sponsored plan, looking at the entire population. Among white, non-Hispanic workers, there were 47 percent or nearly half of the population that had some sort of employer-sponsored plan. That means a little over half did not. This chart does not include the public-sector employees or the self-employed workers.

For other minority groups the numbers are substantially less. For black, non-Hispanic, it is 41 percent; for Asian Pacific islanders and other non-Hispanic, 38 percent; for other minority non-Hispanic, 35 percent; and among Hispanic workers, it is 27 percent. Therefore, 27 percent, slightly more than one fourth of the private-sector Hispanic workers in the country, have an employer-sponsored plan.

That is important in my State because we have a large Hispanic population. When you look around the country and ask, where is the problem the worst as far as inadequate retirement coverage, my State is No. 1 in the Nation for the number of private-sector workers that do not have coverage.

The second chart demonstrates the percentage of private-sector workers who work at companies that provide after retirement or a pension plan. This chart talks of the companies employing these workers.

Madam President, 58 percent of all employees work for employers that provide some kind of plan. But then the numbers decline. Among white non-Hispanic, it is higher, and 62 percent of those employees work for companies that provide some kind of retirement plan; among Hispanic workers, only 40 percent of Hispanic workers nationwide work for companies that provide some kind of retirement plan. So this is a significant concern and a significant part of the problem as well.

The third chart illustrates the percentage of employees who participate in an employer-sponsored plan when the employer actually offers the plan. This is an assessment of how many people actually take advantage of this plan, in these different groups, once they have the opportunity. Among all workers, 75 percent nationwide will participate and have participated in an employer-sponsored plan if it is offered. Again, it is a little higher for white, non-Hispanic workers—up to 77 percent. Among Hispanics, it is 68 percent.

The interesting aspect about this is it is much less of a spread between the average, the ''all worker'' category, 75 percent, and the Hispanic, which is 68 percent, which makes the obvious case that Hispanic participation is not significantly different from that of the rest of the population when they are offered a plan.

The final chart pulls all this data together, puts it all in one place so we can understand it.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator has consumed 5 minutes.

Mr. BINGAMAN. I appreciate the Chair's information.

While it is not conclusive, it does indicate that if Hispanic workers do have jobs where the employers offer some type of plan, they tend to participate. Unfortunately, the data indicates that Hispanics tend to work for employers who do not offer retirement plans. What we need to do is get more employers to offer retirement plans, particularly small employers. That is what the legislation we are developing right now is intended to do. I will be proposing that later.

I urge my colleagues to look at this issue seriously. I hope we can introduce a bill before the week is out.

UNITED NATIONS POPULATION FUND

Mr. BINGAMAN. Madam President, now I will focus on the U.N. population fund. Last year I voted for the Foreign Operations conference report. I thought the funds provided there were inadequate to meet our pressing needs as we talked about them, but I recognized that the roughly $15 billion would provide help to millions of desperately poor people around the world and at the same time help improve the short-term and long-term security of our own country. I voted for that bill.

Here we are 7 months later and some of the most important funding provided in that bill, the $34 million provided for the U.N. population fund, is still sitting at the Department of Treasury. It is not helping poor people. It is not helping to make America more secure. It is just sitting at the Treasury Department.

The United Nations population fund works in over 150 countries, where it helps give women around the world access to reproductive health care and family planning services as well as services to ensure safe pregnancy and delivery. This population fund, the U.N. population fund, plays a critical role in helping prevent the further spread of AIDS. The withholding of U.S. funds, which is what we as a country are engaged in right now, only exacerbates the general inadequate health of poor women worldwide. It leads to more unwanted pregnancies and to deaths of more and more women during childbirth.

Last fall, the Bush administration provided an extra $600,000 to the U.N. population fund to help women in Afghanistan, and these funds were very welcome and were certainly used, substantially to provide safe birthing kits, which are very important. They were also used to open and upgrade maternity hospitals, which is very important.

I want to make clear that the population fund does not perform abortions. It does not support the performing of abortions in any way. Anyone who suggests that they do has not studied the situation in depth.

The House of Representatives passed a conference report on the fiscal year Foreign Operations bill which included $34 million for this purpose. It was an overwhelming vote. The Senate approved $40 million for this purpose, also with a lopsided vote. But now, because of hearsay, because of unsubstantiated allegations that have been disproved many times, the administration is holding up this critically important funding.

It is the most desperate women in the world who are adversely affected by this action; it is not the United Nations itself. The women who would benefit from this funding are the most adversely affected.

I believe very strongly that the administration has been willing to follow the law and speed the appropriation of funds for these purposes in the past. I cannot understand why we are not moving ahead this year. The emergency supplemental appropriations bill that is presently being conferenced provides an excellent opportunity for us to resolve this issue.

I urge the Senate conferees to ensure that language included in the supplemental passed in the Senate be included in the conference report. That language requires that this money, the $34 million that was appropriated last December, be released unless the President certifies by July 10 that doing so would violate U.S. law.

This is fair. More important, it is the intent of Congress. It is the law of the land. I urge the administration to follow through in the conference.

I will be glad to yield to my colleague, but I believe my time has expired.

Mr. REID. I say to the Chair, this half hour is under the control of the Democrats. It is the minority's time this morning so we have whatever time we need, I say to my friend from New Mexico.

I ask my friend two questions. The first is on pension reform. The Senator is the leader of a task force appointed by the majority leader. I acknowledge the fine job he has done.

Would the Senator indicate if it is true that a lot of attention has been focused on pensions and how employees are treated as a result of the Enron debacle?

Mr. BINGAMAN. Madam President, in response to the question of my friend from Nevada, that is exactly right. I think the entire country was appalled to see what happened to the pension savings, the retirement savings of various Enron employees when that company collapsed. Accordingly, we have spent a lot of time discussing how to ensure that these funds that are in a pension fund for a worker can be safeguarded so we can avoid this situation in the future. That part of the problem has gotten a lot of rhetorical attention, at least. We have still not taken the necessary actions to solve it. I hope we are able to do that in the next few weeks as we consider the legislation that has come out of the Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions Committee, and also legislation that is, I understand, going to be marked up in the Finance Committee.

Mr. REID. Would the Senator also acknowledge what people are saying, that it seems so unfair that people who were working at Enron, who weren't so-called bosses, wound up with very little, whereas the bosses, the corporate leaders, ended up with millions and millions of dollars? Isn't that something they are talking about in New Mexico?

Mr. BINGAMAN. Madam President, in response to the question, it certainly is something that is a great concern in my State. I think people tend to lump all these issues together, understandably, because they are all part of a very much larger problem. One is the inadequate protection of the retirement savings of workers. Another issue is the inequity in compensation between the top officials of some of these corporations and the average worker. A third is the very unfair severance package arrangements that are made when some of these companies go bankrupt.

How does it happen that the top officials wind up getting severance packages, in spite of the financial difficulties of the company, while the people at the very bottom get virtually nothing?

Mr. REID. Madam President, let me ask the Senator from New Mexico, the chairman of the task force, it is true, is it not, that one of the things you are working on is legislation in conjunction with the committees of jurisdiction to make sure that in the future when this takes place there will be equity as far as employees are concerned?

Mr. BINGAMAN. Madam President, in response to that, we are trying to figure out what can be done in this regard. We essentially do not think Government should be dictating at what level companies compensate workers. But we do think the various laws we pass in Congress should be written in such a way that we don't provide additional benefits for extremely lavish compensation to high officials and inadequate compensation to people who are working every day in the bowels of these companies.

Mr. REID. I also say to the Senator, based on the second part of the statement he made, I congratulate, commend, and applaud the Senator from New Mexico for bringing to the Senate's attention something that has been going on now for several years; that is, the inability of the United Nations to help poor women around the world with just basic information and educational opportunities as to why they get pregnant, and as to why they are not taken care of when they are pregnant. But does the Senator acknowledge that this has turned into some abortion issue that has nothing to do with family planning on the international scene? Is that true?

Mr. BINGAMAN. Madam President, my response to that question is the Senator from Nevada is exactly right. I think there is important assistance that the overwhelming majority of the House and Senate would like to see provided worldwide to these poor women who need assistance to deal with their very real issues of giving birth and planning their families for the future. We have appropriated money. That money has been appropriated now for 7 or 8 months, and it is sitting at the Department of the Treasury. I don't understand why they can't go ahead and spend that money as it was intended. I hope very much that happens in the very near future.

Mr. REID. I say to my friend from New Mexico, if someone is really concerned about abortion, it would seem to me they should consider ways to help women be educated so there are less unintended pregnancies. Isn't that one of the main goals of international family planning?

Mr. BINGAMAN. Madam President, in response to that question, that is clearly my understanding of the main goal of international family planning. It is a worthwhile goal. I think clearly we do not want desperately poor families and desperately poor women to find themselves with unwanted pregnancies because of lack of information. What we are trying to do is get assistance to this population fund so that we can provide good information and assistance to these desperately poor women.

Mr. REID. Will the Senator also acknowledge that where we have had international family planning in the past healthier babies are born and less babies are born? Is that a fair statement?

Mr. BINGAMAN. Madam President, again, in response to the question, I believe there is a record of success with many of these programs, and with many of the efforts that have been made to this population fund. I think it makes good sense for the United States as the largest, most prosperous country in the world to participate with other countries—with our friends and allies around the world—in supporting this effort. That is all we are trying to do. Our support is not overwhelming as compared to a lot of countries. But it is important, and we should provide it.

Mr. REID. I also ask my friend, is it not true that the Congress, in good faith, has appropriated these moneys, and now they are being held up by the administration?

Mr. BINGAMAN. Madam President, in response, that is certainly my information. My information is that the money was appropriated, and that it was appropriated last December when we passed the foreign operations appropriations bill. There is no reason that money should not be released for the intended use. That is what the law requires. I hope very much that the administration will move ahead. We are fast approaching the date when we are going to do another foreign operations appropriations bill. I don't think we serve the intended purpose by just delaying and delaying the use of these funds.

Mr. REID. It is fair to say, is it not, that each day that goes by there are more people around the world and more women around the world who have this lack of information and unintended pregnancies and complicated pregnancies that could be helped by virtue of these moneys if, in fact, they were coming forward.

Mr. BINGAMAN. Madam President, again, in response to the question, I think it is easy for us to believe, when we are sitting here in a nice air-conditioned Senate Chamber, that there is no urgency and think these are all sort of theoretical problems out there and there is no urgency in getting about trying to deal with them. I think the reality is very different for a lot of the women to whom my friend in Nevada is referring.

The reality is they have to either have assistance now or live with the consequences of not having the assistance. For that reason, I think it is very important we move ahead immediately.

Mr. REID. Madam President, I yield the remainder of our time to the Senator from Montana, Mr. BAUCUS.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator is recognized for 4 minutes.

Mrs. HUTCHISON. Madam President, parliamentary inquiry: I wanted to know how much time there is in morning business, and if there is any time

for the Republican side in morning business time.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. There are 4 minutes remaining. There is no time reserved for the minority side.

Mr. WARNER. Madam President, parliamentary inquiry: I would like to request of our leader—I am endeavoring to reach Senator LEVIN. I understand he will soon be available to give me some guidance as to what he desires as Chair. We are anxious to move ahead on this bill. I realize certain of our colleagues have extremely sensitive matters to speak to—the tragic wildfires experienced out West and the Amtrak situation. I am not sure what my good friend from Montana is going to address. But, at the same time, I am hopeful that with the support of our leadership, we can outline a course of action today so the Kennedy amendment—I spoke to Senator KENNEDY late last night—can be voted on at a time that is convenient, preceded by, say, maybe 30 minutes of final remarks by Senator KENNEDY and our side; that we are able to go to the missile defense amendment, which I shared with the chairman last night; and, that we have today at least, say, 4 hours of debate on that with the hope we will vote this afternoon somewhere around 5 o'clock.

Mr. REID. Madam President, I would say to my friend, the comanager of this bill, that Senator LEVIN isn't due here until 10:30. We are supposed to take up the Defense bill at 10:30.

Mr. WARNER. Madam President, I am not hearing the Senator.

Mr. REID. That is when we are supposed to take up the Defense bill. He will be here at or about 10:30. We, through staff, asked last night if the Republicans wanted any time for morning business. They said they didn't want any; they have a conference this morning. That is why the one-half hour was devoted to the Democrats. Had they wanted more time, we would have come in one-half hour earlier.

I ask unanimous consent that—we used all of Senator BAUCUS' time in this colloquy—Senator BAUCUS will be recognized for up to 5 minutes to speak as if in morning business.

I say to my friend from Virginia if Senator HUTCHISON and Senator CRAIG wish time, I am sure Senator LEVIN would have no problem giving them 5 minutes each. Is that fair enough?

Mr. WARNER. I think that is fair enough.

Mr. REID. Following the statement of the Senator from Montana, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Texas be recognized for 5 minutes, and following her the Senator from Idaho be recognized for 5 minutes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. WARNER. Reserving the right to object, I think that is a very good reconciliation in the interest of time. But let us say we would return to the bill at 10 minutes to——

Mr. REID. Why don't we return when we finish the morning business, which would be about a quarter till?

Mr. WARNER. That is fine.

Mr. BAUCUS. Madam President, reserving the right to object—I ask the indulgence of my friend—if I could have about 7½ minutes.

EXTENSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. REID. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent—we are extending the time anyway—Senator BAUCUS be recognized for 10 minutes—Senator HUTCHISON, is 5 still satisfactory?—and Senator CRAIG, 5?

Mr. CRAIG. Five plus two.

Mr. REID. Seven for the Senator from Idaho, and following that, we would resume the Defense authorization bill.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Montana shall proceed.

(The remarks of Mr. BAUCUS pertaining to the introduction of S. 2678 are printed in today's RECORD under ''Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.'')

Mr. BAUCUS. Madam President, I yield the floor and thank my friends from Texas and Idaho for their indulgence.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the Senator from Texas is recognized for 5 minutes.

AMTRAK

Mrs. HUTCHISON. Madam President, I rise today to talk about Amtrak. Our Amtrak national rail passenger system is teetering on the brink of bankruptcy. They have said they need $200 million in operating cash or the entire system will grind to a halt very soon. The effect of such a shutdown would be devastating.

With the Independence Day weekend approaching, and the number of airline flights slashed since September 11, families throughout the Nation are counting on Amtrak to get them to their destinations. If Amtrak is not running, those families will add to the millions of cars already expected to crowd our Nation's highways.

Amtrak has already received more than 100,000 reservations for the holiday weekend. Reservations account for about half of Amtrak's expected passenger load.

I have noticed from articles in the paper that people are already beginning to question whether Amtrak service is going to be there, so they are already suffering cancellations, which adds to the deficits we already have.

I have always been a supporter of Amtrak, but sometimes it has been hard because Amtrak has not really come to grips with the inefficiencies in the system. I hope Mr. Gunn, the new CEO of Amtrak—and I appreciate so much his willingness to come in and take over this railroad operation at this time—will make a difference. He has already fired mid-level managers. Certainly, I think anybody looking at the labor situation in Amtrak would realize that the rail unions really are out of line with other workers in our country. Amtrak has never engaged in tough negotiations with its unions, even 4 years ago, when we were trying to reauthorize Amtrak. As a result, labor costs are out of line with other workers in our country. A 5-year severance package for Amtrak employees, as in other rail unions, is way beyond the norm for most union workers or other workers in our country.

I do hope the unions will work with us to try to bring efficiency in both management, administration, contracting out, and overall severance packages that are in an alarming condition and have put us in such a precarious situation.

Amtrak has not come forward with its true financial condition in many instances. Mortgaging Penn Station last year was quite irresponsible. I didn't like it at all. I think we should have met this head on.

On the other hand, there are some Members of Congress who have been so recalcitrant about Amtrak; I can understand Amtrak's unwillingness to come and bare its financial soul to Members of Congress when they know they are going to get their heads chopped off.

We need to step back and take a responsible approach. We need a passenger rail system. It is part of a multimodal system that will serve the needs of all of the people. A skeleton that would go across the top of our country, down the west coast, across the bottom/southern part of the country, up to the east coast with one line right down the middle would give us a solid national rail system where States could then form compacts and feed into those systems. In my State of Texas, the DART, the Dallas Area Rapid Transit, is feeding its train into the Amtrak system.

Those are the possibilities we have if we know we have a dependable national rail passenger system. This means a whole system. It does not mean just the Northeast corridor.

One of the problems we have had is the rest of the system has been starved year after year while the Northeast corridor has gotten the lion's share of funding. We must acknowledge once and for all this is going be a national system. We are all going to be in this together.

All of us who believe in a national rail system should say: This is not going to be a piece of a system that is subsidized heavily and another piece that isn't. We need to consider it as a system. We need to fund it well.

Some people have said: We have to subsidize Amtrak too much. We have been subsidizing Amtrak to the tune of $520 million annually; whereas we have subsidized highways to the tune of $30 billion, and $10 billion per year on aviation.