grim but to all of us, I believe, unacceptable and particularly painful to families who must bear this terrible loss.

This legislation is simple, straightforward, and effective. I must commend Senator KOHL for his authorship and for his persistence in pursuing this legislation. It mandates that a child safety lock device or trigger lock be sold with every handgun. Most locks resemble a padlock that locks around the gun trigger and immobilizes the trigger, preventing it from being used. These and other locks can be purchased for every gun for less than $10 and thus used by thousands of gun owners to protect their firearms from unauthorized use.

This approach is supported by a huge number of individuals. In fact, this Senate has gone on record previously overwhelmingly supporting this amendment. Polls have shown that 73 percent of the American public supports this amendment, including 6 out of 10 gun owners.

This legislation is not only well meaning and well intended, but it could be very effective if we adopt it. I am pleased to see we are now moving to consider this amendment. I am delighted that tomorrow morning we will get a chance for further debate and a vote on this amendment.

I yield my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Idaho is recognized.

Mr. CRAIG. Mr. President, let me thank Senator REED for his cooperation and effort today as we work our way through this legislation. Several amendments that had have been brought to the floor with an attempt to offer them we are looking to see if we can work with our colleagues in acceptance of them. We have a broad base of support for the underlying legislation, and we want to be able to sustain that support as we go into final passage.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I have now had the opportunity to review the Frist amendment, No. 1606. This amendment simply restates that the Attorney General of the United States can continue to enforce current Federal firearms laws against those who violate them, including dealers. In my view, nothing in S. 397 would prohibit the Attorney General from going forward in those matters. Nevertheless, at this time, I have no objection to restating that authority, as proposed in amendment No. 1606.

In my view, though, amendment No. 1606 does not address the circumstances that my amendment seeks to remedy. The Attorney General has always had the authority to enforce its gun laws yet some dealers continue to act irresponsibly. My concern is that the provisions of S. 397 would completely immunize from lawsuits those irresponsible gun dealers who have an established history of repeatedly losing guns or have an established history of firearms being stolen again and again from their inventory. If enacted without my amendment, S. 397 could cause the relatively small number of irresponsible gun deales to grow, not shrink.

My amendment is precisely aimed at these irresponsible and unscrupulous gun dealers who repeatedly lose firearms and have firearms stolen from their inventory. This is exactly what happened in the DC area sniper case. The snipers, both of whom were not allowed under the law to purchase a firearm, apparently stole their weapon from a gun store in Washington state that had previously lost or had stolen more than 200 weapons over a short period of time. When a gun dealer has an established history of lost or stolen guns and that lost or stolen gun is used in the commission of a serious crime that causes death or injury, it is a grave inequity to lock those victims out of the courthouse doors.

While I have no objection to amendment No. 1606, it clearly does not address the very real problem remedied by my amendment.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. CRAIG. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent there now be a period of morning business with Senators permitted to speak up to 10 minutes each.

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

Mr. CRAIG. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

PENSION REFORM

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, there has been a significant development in private pension law this week, and I have come to the floor to discuss it briefly because I think it is something that will be of enormous interest to working families across the country who, of course, have been reading for months now about their pension plans going belly up. These are workers who work hard, play by the rules, hope to have a dignified retirement and have understood that Social Security was never going to cover all of their retirement security needs. So they have sought to have a private pension, and companies across this country have given them the impression—falsely, in a number of instances—that their private pension would be secure and there for them when they retire.

One of the aspects of this whole challenge, with respect to pension security, has been to eliminate what I believe is a double standard today in private pension laws. There is in fact a double standard in private pension law because so often the executive retirement benefits get hidden in a lockbox while the worker ends up getting creamed in the process.

What we have done, on a bipartisan basis in the Senate Finance Committee, is to say that that double standard, the standard that protects the executives while it clobbers the workers, will no longer be tolerated under our private pension statutes.

As a result of a change that a number of our colleagues worked on, which was backed by Chairman GRASSLEY and Senator BAUCUS, if this provision that we have developed becomes law, if a company pension plan is funded at less than 80 percent, then the executive pensions cannot be hidden under the ruse of being ''deferred compensation.'' That is what we have seen come to light in the last few months, that somehow the executives walk away with millions of dollars worth of pension benefits under the guise of it somehow being something called deferred compensation while the workers end up seeing their pensions disappear by 40, 50, 60 percent.

This provision, in my view, is extremely important because it will prevent companies whose pension plans are at risk of going under from protecting the executive pension while allowing the employees' pensions to sink like a stone.

An example of this would be a flight attendant from Tigard, OR, who gave United Airlines 16 years of service, saw her pension fall recently to a net of $138 a month, while the CEO of United is going to continue to receive $4.5 million. Now, of course, the CEO claims it is not really a pension, that this was compensation worked out before the executive came to United. But I can tell you that elderly woman in Tigard, OR, would sure like to have what the United executive has, regardless of what it is technically referred to under pension law.

A lot more needs to be done to ensure that the executives are not going to reap these huge gains at the expense of their workers. Captain Duane Woerth of the Airline Pilots Association said it well, in my view, when he said, ''While thousands of pilots will retire with only a fraction of the pension benefits they earned and expected, airline executives can look forward to retirements knowing that their nest eggs are solid gold.'' This was reported in Fortune magazine. And there are numerous other examples where generous executive pensions have been protected at the expense of the workers' retirement.

In March of 2002, for example, US Air CEO Stephen Wolf took a lump-sum pension payout of $15 million, including benefits, for 24 years of service that he never actually performed. Six months later, the company filed for bankruptcy and terminated its pilot pension plan, leaving the Pension Benefit Guarantee Corporation with $2.2 billion in liabilities. Where is the fairness in all of that? The executive takes this huge golden parachute away while the workers try to figure out how to make ends meet when the company files for bankruptcy and terminates the pension plan.

Three months before United filed for bankruptcy in 2002, the company