in the country. This area ranks third in the nation in the number of workers commuting more than 60 minutes to work, and has the highest per vehicle congestion cost and the second highest per capita congestion cost in the nation. It is clearly in our interest to support programs which encourage federal employees to make greater use of public transportation for their commuting needs.

The simple change made by the Commuter Benefits Equity Act would provide a significant benefit to those federal employees whose commute to work includes parking at a transit facility. For example, a commuter who rides the Metrorail System to work and parks at the Wheaton park-and-ride lot pays about $50 monthly for parking, on top of the cost of riding the train. A private-sector employee whose employer provides the parking benefit in addition to salary could receive $600 a year tax free to help pay these parking costs. Federal government employees should be allowed the same benefit.

I support the Commuter Benefits Equity Act because it creates parity—parity in the tax code between the parking and transit benefits, and parity for federal employees with their private-sector counterparts. Both of these improvements will aid our efforts to fight congestion and pollution by supporting public transportation. I encourage my colleagues to join me in supporting the Commuter Benefits Equity Act.

By Mr. MCCONNELL (for himself, Mr. TORRICELLI, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. ALLARD, Mr. SMITH of Oregon, Ms. LANDRIEU, Mr. BURNS, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. BREAUX, Mr. HUTCHINSON, Mr. SANTORUM, Mr. WARNER, Mr. REID, and Mr. ROBERTS).

S. 218. A bill to establish an Election Administration Commission to study Federal, State, and local voting procedures and election administration and provide grants to modernize voting procedures and election administration, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I rise today to re-introduce along with Senators TORRICELLI, FEINSTEIN, ALLARD, SMITH, BREAUX, BURNS, REID, BENNETT, LANDRIE, SANTORUM, ROBERTS, HUTCHINSON, and WARNER meaningful, bipartisan legislation to reform the administration of our nation's elections. I ask that the entire text of my statement and the text of the legislation appear in the record.

As we move into the twenty-first century it is inexcusable that the world's most advanced democracy relies on voting systems designed shortly after the Second World War. The goal of our legislation is rather simple: that no American ever again be forced to hear the phrases dimpled chad, hanging chad or pregnant chad. The Election Reform Act will ensure that our nation's electoral process is brought up to twenty-first century standards.

By combining the Federal Election Commission's Election Clearinghouse and the Department of Defenses' Office of Voting Assistance, which facilitates voting by American civilians and servicemen overseas, into the Election Administration Commission, the bill will create one agency that can bring focuses expertise to bear on the administration of elections. This Commission will consist of four Commissioners appointed by the President with the advice and consent of the Senate. It will continue to carry out the functions of the two entities that are being combined to create it.

In addition, the new Commission will engage in ongoing study and make periodic recommendations on the best practices relating to voting technology and ballot design as well as polling place accessibility for the disabled. The Commission will also study and recommend ways to improve voter registration, verification of registration, and the maintenance and accuracy of voter rolls. This is of special urgency in view of the allegations surfacing in this election of hundreds of felons being listed on voting rolls and illegally voting, as reported in the Miami Herald, while other law abiding citizens who allegedly registered were not included on the voting rolls and were unable to vote. Such revelations from this year's elections coupled with the well-knows report by ''60 Minutes'' of the prevalence of dead people and pets both registering and voting in past elections make clear the need for thoughtful study and recommendations to ensure that everyone who is legally entitled to vote is able to do so and that everyone who votes is legally entitled to do so—and does so only once.

In addition to its studies and recommendations, the Commission will provide matching grants to states working to improve election administration. During the first four years, low-income communities will get priority for these grants and low-income communities are permanently exempted from the requirement to provide matching funds. The legislation also ensure that states comply with the provisions in the Uniformed Overseas Voting Act designed to facilitate voting by members of the armed forces stationed overseas.

Finally, I am pleased also to announce that Representative TOM DAVIS, along with Representatives ROTHMAN, DREIER, and HASTINGS are re-introducing the House companion to our bill today.

Mr. DODD (for himself, Mr. MCCAIN, Mr. HOLLINGS, and Mr. HAGEL):

S. 219. A bill to suspend for two years the certification procedures under section 490(b) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 in order to foster greater multilateral cooperation in international counternarcotics programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, today I send to the desk legislation on behalf of myself, Senators MCCAIN, HOLLINGS and HAGEL. The purpose of the bill we are introducing today is to help the incoming Bush administration in its efforts to strengthen international cooperation in combating international drug trafficking and drug-related crimes.

As you know, the issue of how best to construct and implement an effective international counter narcotics policy has been the subject of much debate in this Chamber over the years, and I would add much disagreement. Our intention in introducing this legislation is to try to see if there is some way to end what has become a stale annual debate that has not brought us any closer to mounting a credible effort to eliminate or even contain the international drug mafia. We all can agree that drugs are a problem—a big problem. We can agree as well that the international drug trade poses a direct threat to the United States and to international efforts to promote democracy, economic stability, human rights, and the rule of law throughout the world, but most especially in our own hemisphere.

While the international impact is serious and of great concern, of even greater concern to me personally are effects it is having here at home. Last year Americans spent more than $60 billion to purchase illegal drugs. Nearly 15 million Americans (twelve years of age and older) use illegal drugs, including 1.5 million cocaine users, 208,000 heroin addicts, and more than 11 million smokers of marijuana. This menace isn't just confined to inner cities or the poor. Illegal drug use occurs among members of every ethnic and socioeconomic group in the United States.

The human and economic costs of illegal drug consumption by Americans are enormous. More than 16,000 people die annual as a result of drug induced deaths. Drug related illness, death, and crime cost the United States approximately over $100 billion annually, including costs for lost productivity, premature death, and incarceration.

This is an enormously lucrative business—drug trafficking generates estimated revenues of $400 billion annually. The United States has spent more than $30 billion in foreign interdiction and source country counter narcotics programs since 1981, and despite impressive seizures at the border, on the high seas, and in other countries, foreign drugs are cheaper and more readily available in the United States today than two decades ago.

We think that for a variety of reasons, that the time is right to give the incoming Bush administration some flexibility with respect to the annual certification process, so that it can determine whether this is the best mechanism for producing the kind of international cooperation and partnership that is needed to contain this transnational menace. I believe that

government leaders, particularly in this hemisphere, have come to recognize that illegal drug production and consumption are increasingly threats to political stability within their national borders. Clearly President Pastrana of Colombia has acknowledged that fact and has sought to work very closely with the United States in implementing Plan Colombia. Similarly President Vincente Fox of Mexico has made international counter narcotics cooperation a high priority since assuming office last December. These leaders also feel strongly, however, that unilateral efforts by the United States to grade their governments' performance in this area is a major irritant in the bilateral relationship and counterproductive to their efforts to instill a cooperative spirit in their own bureaucracies.

The legislation we are introducing today recognizes that illicit drug production, distribution and consumption are national security threats to many governments around the globe, and especially many of those in our own hemisphere, including Mexico, Colombia, and other countries in the Andean region. It urges the Administration to develop an enhanced multilateral strategy for addressing these threats from both the supply and demand side of the equation. It calls upon the President to consider convening a conference of heads of state, at an early date, to review on a country-by-country basis, national strategies for drug reduction and prevention, and agree upon a time table for action. It also recommends that the President submit any legislative changes to existing law which he deems necessary in order to implement this international program within one year from the enactment of this legislation.

In order to create the kind of international cooperation and mutual respect that must be present if the Bush administration's effort is to produce results, the bill would also suspend the annual drug certification procedure for a period of 2 years, while efforts are ongoing to develop and implement this enhanced multilateral strategy. I believe it is fair to say that while the certification procedure may have had merit when it was enacted into law in 1986, it has now become a hurdle to furthering bilateral and multilateral cooperation with other governments, particularly those in our own hemisphere such as Mexico and Colombia—governments whose cooperation is critical if we are to succeed in stemming the flow of drugs across our borders.

Let me make clear however, that while we would not be ''grading'' other governments on whether they have ''cooperated fully'' during the two year ''suspension'' period, the detailed reporting requirements currently required by law concerning what each government has done to cooperate in the areas of eradication, extradition, asset seizure, money laundering and demand reduction during the previous calendar year will remain in force. We will be fully informed as to whether governments are following short of their national and international obligations. Moreover, if the President determines during the two year suspension period that the certification process may be useful in order to elicit more cooperation from a particular government he may go ahead and issue the annual certification decision with respect to that country. The annual determination as to which countries are major producers or transit sources of illegal drugs will also continue to be required by law.

I believe that we need to reach out to other governments who share our concerns about the threat that drugs pose to the very fabric of their societies and our own. It is arrogant to assume we are the only Nation that cares about such matters. We need to sit down and figure out what each of us can do better to make it harder for drug traffickers to ply their trade. It is in that spirit that we urge our colleagues to give this proposal serious consideration. Together, working collectively we can defeat the traffickers. But if we expend our energies playing the blame game, we are certainly not going to effectively address this threat. We aren't going to stop one additional teenager from becoming hooked on drugs, or one more citizen from being mugged outside his home by some drug crazed thief.

During the Clinton Administration, Barry McCaffrey, the Director of the Office of National Drug Control Policy did a fine job in attempting to forge more cooperative relations with Colombia, Mexico and other countries in our own hemisphere. The OAS has also done some important work over the last several years in putting in place an institutional framework for dealing with the complexities of compiling national statistics so that we can better understand what needs to be done. The United Nations, through its Office for Drug Control and Crime Prevention has also made some important contributions in furthering international cooperation in this area. However, still more needs to be done. We believe that this legislation will build upon that progress. I would urge my colleagues to give some thought and attention to our legislative initiative. We believe that if they do, that they will come to the conclusion that it is worthy of their support.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of this legislation be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of these remarks.

There being no objection, the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 219

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. TWO-YEAR SUSPENSION OF DRUG CERTIFICATION PROCEDURES.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress makes the following findings:

(1) The international drug trade poses a direct threat to the United States and to international efforts to promote democracy, economic stability, human rights, and the rule of law.

(2) The United States has a vital national interest in combating the financial and other resources of the multinational drug cartels, which resources threaten the integrity of political and financial institutions both in the United States and abroad.

(3) Illegal drug use occurs among members of every ethnic and socioeconomic group in the United States.

(4) Worldwide drug trafficking generates revenues estimated at $400,000,000,000 annually.

(5) The 1961 Single Convention on Narcotic Drugs, the 1971 Convention on Psychotropic Substances, and the 1988 Convention Against Illicit Traffic in Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances form the legal framework for international dung control cooperation.

(6) The United Nations International Drug Control Program, the International Narcotics Control Board, and the Organization of American States can play important roles in facilitating the development and implementation of more effective multilateral programs to combat both domestic and international drug trafficking and consumption.

(7) The annual certification process required by section 490 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2291j), which has been in effect since 1986, does not currently foster effective and consistent bilateral or multilateral cooperation with United States counternarcotics programs because its provisions are vague and inconsistently applied and in many cases have been superseded by subsequent bilateral and multilateral agreements and because it alienates the very allies whose cooperation we seek.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) many governments are extremely concerned by the national security threat posed by illicit drug production, distribution, and consumption, and crimes related thereto, particularly those in the Western Hemisphere;

(2) an enhanced multilateral strategy should be developed among drug producing, transit, and consuming nations designed to improve cooperation with respect to the investigation and prosecution of drug related crimes, and to make available information on effective drug education and drug treatment;

(3) the President should at the earliest feasible date in 2001 convene a conference of heads of state of major illicit drug producing countries, major drug transit countries, and major money laundering countries to present and review country by country drug reduction and prevention strategies relevant to the specific circumstances of each country, and agree to a program and timetable for implementation of such strategies; and

(4) not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the President should transmit to Congress legislation to implement a proposed multilateral strategy to achieve the goals referred to in paragraph (2), including any amendments to existing law that may be required to implement that strategy.

(c) TWO-YEAR SUSPENSION OF DRUG CERTIFICATION PROCESS.—(1) Subsections (a) through (g) of section 490 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2291j), relating to annual certification procedures for assistance for certain drug-producing countries and drug-transit countries, shall not apply in the first 2 calendar years beginning after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(2) Notwithstanding any provision of paragraph (1), section 489 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2291h), relating to the international narcotics control strategy report, and section 490(h) of that Act (22 U.S.C. 2291j(h)), relating to determinations of major drug-transit countries and major illicit drug producing countries, shall continue to apply in the 2 calendar years referred to in that paragraph.

(3) The President may waive the applicability of paragraph (1) to one or more countries in one or both of the calendar years referred to in that paragraph if the President determines that bilateral counternarcotics cooperation would be enhanced by the applicability of subsections (a) through (g) of section 490 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 to such country or countries in such calendar year.

(d) APPLICABILITY.—(1) Except as provided in paragraph (2), the provisions of subsection (c) shall take effect on the date of the enactment of this Act and apply with respect to certifications otherwise required under section 490 of the Foreign Assistance of 1961 in the first two fiscal years beginning after that date.

(2) If this Act is enacted on or before February 28, 2001, the provisions of subsection (c) shall take effect on the date of the enactment of this Act and apply with respect to certifications otherwise required under section 490 of the Foreign Assistance of 1961 in fiscal years 2001 and 2002.

Mr. HOLLINGS. Mr. President, I rise today to join my good friend Senator DODD, and our distinguished colleagues Senator HAGEL and Chairman MCCAIN, in cosponsoring an important piece of legislation with far-reaching effects in our struggle to combat drug trafficking. Our bill calls for the development of a multilateral strategy among major illicit drug producing, transit, drug demand, and consuming countries to improve cooperation with respect to the investigation and prosecution of drug related crimes. Intelligence reports have shown that sophisticated cartels operate on a truly global scale. America's drug demand problems may feed Europe's money laundering problems which are related to Asia's organized crime problems or street-crime in Latin America. All the states of the world are under attack from a common, sophisticated enemy. Our bill encourages the President of the United States to bring the heads of state together to review individual country strategies and develop a new multilateral approach. This bill requires the President to submit to Congress legislation to implement a multilateral strategy devised through the consultation process described above.

Drug trafficking becomes harder to fight as the world becomes increasingly interconnected. I am united with my colleagues to remain vigilant in fighting the proliferation of drugs on the streets of the United States. The last time I checked, the United States does not produce one ounce of cocaine, or one ounce of heroin. This bill recognizes the essential truth of drug trafficking—it is a multinational, multifaceted criminal plague that respects no borders.

With this in mind, I rise to support a 2-year moratorium of the annual U.S. certification procedures which require the President to certify that other nations qualify as ''partners'' in combating drug trafficking. This certification is required for the release of certain U.S. bilateral assistance, as well as for the release of multilateral development aid from institutions where the United States is a voting member. This practice stymies multilateral cooperation in combating drug trafficking and has not yielded any measurable results—unless one counts the resentment of our neighbors. We need a new approach and new strategic partners. This legislation will direct President Bush to seek out new approaches and new partners rather than wasting time and energy on certification.

Officials from Mexico, our neighbor and close ally, have routinely appealed to the President of the United States and to Congress to suspend the drug certification process. They argue it is detrimental to bilateral cooperation in enforcement and interdiction, it is bad for the morale of law enforcement, and it serves to absolve the United States from its responsibility in the proliferation of drug trafficking. Americans spend an estimated $110 billion a year on illegal drugs—the equivalent of one-tenth the value of the country's entire industrial production. Unfortunately, the dedicated and hardworking efforts of our law enforcement and customs officials to gain control of drugs entering our country from Mexico are to date unsuccessful. The Mexican police have been overwhelmed by the sheer volume of drugs transhipped through their country (The DEA estimated that, in 1999, 55 percent of the cocaine and 14 percent of the heroin which enter the United States came from Mexico, as did 3,700 metric tons of marijuana). The situation is further complicated by the existing corruption in Mexican police ranks. By way of example, in December 1999 the Government of Mexico reported that between 1997 and 1999 more than 1,400 federal police officers had been fired for corruption and that 357 of the officers had been prosecuted. Given the pervasive scale of the problem, the Federal Preventive Police (FPP) was created to investigate and root out crooked officers in the federal police. By the winter of 2000, several agents of the FPP were under investigation themselves for corruption.

Despite these grim examples there are clear signs of hope. In July 2000 Mexico turned a corner in history and ended seven decades of one-party rule by sending opposition candidate Vincente Fox to Los Pinos. Fox cast a wide net in the Mexican mainstream with themes of inclusion and governmental responsiveness in a historic campaign. ''Democracy is a starting point—it is the process by which society becomes organized and gains its own voice'' said Fox. ''Democracy provides the legitimacy necessary for the country to meet the historic challenges in the areas of development, social justice, and the reduction of inequality.''

President Fox represents a clean break with the institutionalized corruption and graft that carried Mexico to the brink of Chaos in 1994 when PRI presidential candidate Donaldo Colosio was assassinated. President Fox inherited a judicial system and a federal police force rocked by scandal and largely ineffectual in combating drug trafficking. Mexico ranked 4th in the World Bank's 2000 list of most corrupt governments. Backed with a popular mandate for change, Fox put fighting corruption as the overarching goal in all his policy initiatives. The task will not be easy. Last Friday, January 19th, for example, it was reported that convicted drug kingpin Joaquin Guzmán Loera escaped from a maximum security prison in Jalisco. Guzmán is a leader of the Félix Gallardo drug family, which authorities say is deeply involved in shipping illegal drugs to the United States.

While I am sobered by the accounts of the Guzmán escape, it is encouraging that the Mexican Supreme Court reversed its decision on extraditions for drug crimes and agreed to turn over drug kingpins wanted in the United States. We must further these confidence-building initiatives between the United States and Mexico. One way to do this is to grant Mexico a two-year moratorium from the drug certification process to allow President Fox to organize his Administration and to set his course. We should not evaluate President Fox for the corruption of his predecessors. We must allow him to address the endemic corruption that plaques the Mexican state.

This legislation does not cede Congress' role in the so-called drug war. It call for new energy and a new multilateral approach. It emphasizes Congress' interest in building real partnerships and looking for new answers in this difficult struggle. This legislation will give us a fresh start with our neighbor to the south and build confidence between our people. President Fox is committed to reforming Mexico and I intend to urge my colleagues to help this vibrant new leader to achieve his goal. He has brought the liberating force of democracy to his people, but his work is not done. President Fox has to use his power to transform the state. He has an old order to dismantle, a new one to build, and 6 years to do it. I have confidence in Mr. Fox and his able cabinet. My colleagues and I are reaching out to the Fox Administration and the Mexican people; we want to build a partnership and seek new ways to address common problems.

By Mrs. BOXER:

S. 221. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Energy to make loans through a revolving loan fund for States to construct electricity generation facilities for use in electricity supply emergencies.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, since last week, I have introduced several bills to help California deal with the

electricity crisis and to help prevent such emergencies from occurring in other States in the future. Today, I am introducing another such bill—the State Electricity Reserve Fund Act.

Current electricity generating capacity is tied to the expected need. Private generating companies have no incentive to build or maintain facilities that would generate capacity greater than what is needed to meet consumer demand. The plants would be idle most of the time. As a result, electricity shortages can occur.

A lack of rainfall, which means that hydroelectric facilities cannot be operated as often, as well as unseasonably hot or cold temperatures, or rapid population increases in a State can all result in a demand for electricity unexpectedly exceeding supply. But with supply tied to expected demand, this can result in devastatingly large price increases for consumers and/or electricity shortages, which in turn could cause brownouts or blackouts.

This is exactly what has happened in California. In the late 1980's, the California Public Utilities Commission required utilities to determine demand for new power generating capacity. At that time, the state recognized that generation needs could increase. However, the utilities argued that no new capacity would be needed in California until 2005. The utilities fought the attempt by the state to make them build more generating capacity. The utilities argued it was not needed.

It turned out that it was needed. And whether the utilities should have known is another argument for another day. But the point here is that we cannot rely on the private sector to create a ''rainy day fund'' of electricity in the event of emergencies.

So, the State Electricity Reserve Fund Act would create a revolving loan fund for states to use to help pay for the creation of an electricity reserve capacity. These loans could be used by states to build electricity generation facilities that would be controlled by the state and would be kept in reserve unless the Governor of the State declares an electricity emergency.

Mr. President, it is not an unusual thing for the federal government to prepare for energy emergencies. We have the Strategic Petroleum Reserve in the case of oil shortages, and last year we established the Home Heating Oil Reserve for the Northeastern States. My bill is based on the same premise.

True, we cannot store electricity like we can store petroleum and heating oil. But we can financially help States build a reserve facility, including a reserve of the fuel that is needed to generate electricity, to be used in the case of electricity emergencies. If such a reserve had existed in California, we would not have reached State III emergencies and rolling blackouts over the past couple of weeks.

Mr. President, I think being prepared for emergencies is always a good policy. Helping States be prepared for electricity emergencies is no different.

I ask unanimous consent that a copy of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 221

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''State Electricity Reserve Fund Act of 2001''.

SEC. 2. PURPOSE.

The purpose of this Act is to assist States in creating electric generating capacity to be used in the event of an electricity emergency.

SEC. 3. EMERGENCY ELECTRICITY GENERATION FACILITIES.

(a) REVOLVING LOAN FUND.—There is established in the Treasury of the United States a revolving loan fund to be known as the ''State Electricity Reserve Loan Fund'' consisting of such amounts as may be appropriated or credited to such Fund as provided in this section.

(b) EXPENDITURES FROM LOAN FUND.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Energy, under such rules and regulations as the Secretary may prescribe, may make loans from the State Electricity Reserve Loan Fund, without further appropriation, to a State.

(2) PURPOSE.—Loans provided under this section shall be used for the purpose of designing and constructing 1 or more facilities in a State with capacity to generate an amount of electricity sufficient to meet the amount of any intermittent deficiencies in electricity supply that the State may reasonably be expected to experience during any period over the next 10 years.

(3) USE OF FUNDS.—A facility designed or constructed with a loan provided under this section—

(A) shall be owned by the State and operated by the State directly or through a contract with an electric utility or a consortium of electric utilities; and

(B) shall be operated to supply electricity to the electricity transmission grid only during periods of electricity emergencies declared by the Governor of the State.

(4) DETERMINATIONS BY SECRETARY.—No loan shall be provided under this section unless the Secretary determines that—

(A) there is reasonable assurance of repayment of the loan; and

(B) the amount of the loan, together with other funds provided by or available to the State, is adequate to assure completion of the facility or facilities for which the loan is made.

(5) LOAN AMOUNT.—The amount of a loan provided under this section shall not exceed the lesser of—

(A) 40 percent of the costs to be incurred in designing and constructing the facility or facilities involved; or

(B) $1,000,000,000.

(c) LOAN REPAYMENT.—

(1) LENGTH OF REPAYMENT.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Before making a loan under this section, the Secretary shall determine the period of time within which a State must repay such loan.

(B) LIMITATION.—Except as provided in subparagraph (C), the Secretary shall in no case allow repayment of such loan—

(i) to begin later than the date that is 2 years after the date on which the loan is made; and

(ii) to be completed later than the date that is 10 years after the date on which the loan is made.

(C) MORATORIUM.—The Secretary may grant a temporary moratorium on the repayment of a loan provided under this section if, in the determination of the Secretary, continued repayment of such loan would cause a financial hardship on the State that received the loan.

(2) INTEREST.—The Secretary may not impose or collect interest or other charges on a loan provided under this section.

(3) CREDIT TO LOAN FUND.—Repayment of amounts loaned under this section shall be credited to the State Electricity Reserve Loan Fund and shall be available for the purposes for which the fund is established.

(d) ADMINISTRATION EXPENSES.—The Secretary may defray the expenses of administering the loans provided under this section.

(e) APPROPRIATIONS.—Out of any funds in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, there are appropriated to the State Electricity Reserve Loan Fund—

(1) $5,000,000,000 in fiscal year 2002;
(2) $4,000,000,000 in fiscal year 2003;
(3) $3,000,000,000 in fiscal year 2004;
(4) $2,000,000,000 in fiscal year 2005; and
(5) $1,000,000,000 in fiscal year 2006.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 6

At the request of Mr. DASCHLE, the name of the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 6, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act, the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974, and the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to protect consumers in managed care plans and other health coverage.

S. 27

At the request of Mr. FEINGOLD, the names of the Senator from Missouri (Mrs. CARNAHAN), the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. BINGAMAN), and the Senator from Indiana (Mr. BAYH) were added as cosponsors of S. 27, a bill to amend the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 to provide bipartisan campaign reform.

S. 28

At the request of Mr. GRAMM, the name of the Senator from Alabama (Mr. SESSIONS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 28, a bill to guarantee the right of all active duty military personnel, merchant mariners, and their dependents to vote in Federal, State, and local elections.

S. 29

At the request of Mr. BOND, the names of the Senator from Colorado (Mr. ALLARD) and the Senator from Kansas (Mr. BROWNBACK) were added as cosponsors of S. 29, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow a deduction for 100 percent of the health insurance costs of self-employed individuals.

S. 70

At the request of Mr. INOUYE, the name of the Senator from Maryland (Ms. MIKULSKI) was added as a cosponsor of S. 70, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for the establishment of a National Center for Social Work Research.

S. 88

At the request of Mr. ROCKEFELLER, the names of the Senator from Hawaii