

It is amazing to me to kind of watch and participate in this effort to communicate because the environmental community is spending a great deal of money portraying this area in 2½ to 3 months every summer. They are not portraying it in its 10-month winter period. They are not portraying it accurately relative to the people who live there.

They suggest it is going to take 10 years to develop the area. That is absolutely incorrect. They don't point out the reality that we have the infrastructure of an 800-mile pipeline already there, and that we have moved over towards the ANWR line to the Badami field, which is approximately 25 miles away from the edge of ANWR. If Congress were to authorize this area, it would take roughly 3½ years to have oil flowing.

Some people say it is only a 6-month supply. Tests estimate that there is a range of between 5.6 billion to 16 billion barrels. At an average of 10 billion barrels of production, it would be the largest field found in 40 years in the world.

That will give you some idea of the magnitude. It would be larger than Prudhoe Bay, which has been producing for the last 27 years 25 percent of the total crude oil produced in this country.

Let's keep the argument in perspective. It is a significant potential. It can reduce dramatically our dependence on imported oil from Saddam Hussein and others. It can have a very positive effect upon our economy.

Some Members have threatened to filibuster this. I am amazed that anyone would threaten a filibuster on an issue such as this. It is like fiddling while Rome burns.

Those who suggest that fail to recognize the reality that we have an energy problem in this country, and we have a broad energy bill that we think covers all aspects of energy development as well as new technology.

I urge my colleagues to go back and reexamine the potential.

First of all, let's recognize we have the problem. We are going to have to do something about it. We are not going to drill our way out of it. It is going to take a combination of a number of efforts to utilize existing energy sources. But opening ANWR is significantly a major role, if you will, in reducing our dependency on imported oil.

I remind my colleagues of one other point, and that is, a good deal of the west coast of the United States is dependent on Alaskan oil. That is where our oil goes. If oil does not come from Alaska, oil is going to come in to the west coast from some place else.

Oftentimes people say, developing Alaskan oil has nothing to do with the California energy crisis because they do not use oil to generate electricity. That certainly is true. I agree.

But what I would add is, California is dependent on Alaskan oil for its transportation, its ships, its airplanes. As a consequence, if the oil does not come

from Alaska, it is going to come from someplace else. It is going to come from a rain forest in Colombia where there is no environmental oversight. It is going to come in ships that are owned by foreign trading corporations that do not have Coast Guard inspections and the assurance of the highest quality of scientific applications to ensure the risk of transporting the oil is kept at a minimum.

I urge my colleagues to reflect a little bit on the reality that this is an energy crisis. We are not going to drill our way out of it. We are going to have to use all of our resources, all of our energy technology, and a balanced approach, which is what we have in our energy bill, to confront this energy crisis.

Mr. President, I thank you for your time and attention.

EXTENSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, on behalf of the leadership, I ask unanimous consent that this period of morning business be extended until 12:30 p.m. today, with the time equally divided in the usual form.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KYL). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

TRIP TO ANWR

Mr. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I rise to extend an invitation to all Members of the Senate to take advantage of an opportunity this weekend relative to a trip to my State of Alaska to visit the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge.

If Members are free, I would appreciate their contacting my office at 224-6665. We do have room to accommodate more Members. We anticipate leaving Thursday at the completion of business and flying up to Anchorage. We will be in the accompaniment of the new Secretary of the Interior, Gale Norton, and we will be having breakfast in Anchorage Friday morning, then flying on down to Valdez where we will see the terminus of the 800-mile pipeline. Valdez is the largest oil port in North America, one of the largest in the world. We will see the containment vessels, the technology that is used to ensure that if there is an accident of any kind, the capacity for cleanup is immediately there.

We will also have an opportunity to go across from the terminal to the community of Valdez. We will be able

to monitor the Coast Guard station that basically controls the flow of tanker traffic in and out of the port of Valdez. Then we will fly on to Fairbanks where we will overnight and have an opportunity to attend a dinner hosted by some of the people of Fairbanks, including Doyon, which is one of the Native regional corporations. At that time, we will have an opportunity to hear firsthand the attitudes of the people in interior Alaska.

Fairbanks is my home. The 800-mile pipeline goes through Fairbanks. As a consequence, there will be an opportunity to visit the largest museum in our State which contains all the material from public lands that have been generated over an extended period of time. It is an extraordinary collection. It is regarded as one of the finest collections outside of the Smithsonian.

The next morning, we will fly up to Prudhoe Bay. We will visit Deadhorse. We will see the old technology. Then we will go over to the village of Kaktovik in ANWR. We will be in ANWR, and we will be able to meet with the Eskimo people and see physically what is there. We will be able to fly over ANWR, and then we will go back to a new field near what they call Alpine and be hosted by a group of Eskimos at Nuiqsut where they are going to have a little bit of a potlatch for us. Then that evening, we will be in Barrow overnight. Barrow is the northernmost point of the world.

Many of you, if you have any questions about a trip such as that, might contact Senator HELMS. Senator and Mrs. HELMS made this trip a couple years with us. They could be firsthand advocates. What it does is give every Member an opportunity to view objectively the issue of whether or not it is in the national interest to open ANWR, whether we can do it safely, whether indeed it makes, as it does in my opinion and those of many other Alaskans, a significant contribution to the national security interests of this Nation and makes a significant contribution to the economy. They will have an opportunity to hear from Alaskans themselves their attitude on whether or not this can be opened safely.

One of the things that bothers me about this issue is, I continually have to account for my knowledge of the issue as an Alaskan. Yet my opponents, who have never been there and don't have any intention of going, never seem to have to account for their ignorance or lack of knowledge—if I may put it a little more kindly—on the issue.

So this is a rare opportunity, Mr. President. I again encourage Members to think about it. Spouses are welcome to accompany Members. We in Alaska are certainly willing to do our part. This development would take place on land as opposed to offshore. It is much safer to do it on land. It seems to me that as we look at the high price of energy, there is a recognition that we can have some relief, at least from dependence on imported oil, which affects our

transportation costs; that it is significant.

Some Members obviously don't notice much of an increase in their bills because maybe somebody else pays the bills. A lot of people in my State of Alaska, including fishermen—and, for that matter, fishermen on the east coast, in Massachusetts and other States—are affected by the high price of fuel for their vessels. They are all affected by the high cost of energy. So I don't think we should rely on the NIMBY theory—not in my back yard.

I was doing some figuring the other day as a consequence of a little address we did on "Face The Nation" this weekend, where we had a debate with one of my friends from Massachusetts. I am told there is enough oil in ANWR to fuel the State of Massachusetts for 125 years. ANWR happens to be about four times the size of the State of Massachusetts.

In any event, I am not picking on Massachusetts this morning. I am extending an invitation to Members that this weekend would be an ideal opportunity for you to see and evaluate for yourselves, and not necessarily take the word of America's environmental community, which has seen fit to use this issue as a major factor in generating membership and dollars. I think they have not really related to the recognition of the technical advancements we have made in producing energy in this country, in recognition that we can do it safely.

Mr. President, I will be leaving this Thursday night and returning Sunday evening. I encourage all Members to consider this invitation. This is an invitation from Senator STEVENS and myself.

I yield the floor.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time for morning business has expired. Morning business is closed.

BIPARTISAN CAMPAIGN REFORM ACT OF 2001—Resumed

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the clerk will report the pending business.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 27) to amend the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 to provide bipartisan campaign reform.

Pending:

Specter amendment No. 140, to provide findings regarding the current state of campaign finance laws and to clarify the definition of electioneering communication.

Fitzgerald amendment No. 144, to provide that limits on contributions to candidates be applied on an election cycle rather than election basis.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senator from Minnesota, Mr. WELLSTONE, is recognized.

AMENDMENT NO. 145

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, I call up amendment No. 145 and ask that it be reported.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. WELLSTONE] proposes an amendment numbered 145.

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

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

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To apply the prohibition on electioneering communications to targeted communications of certain tax-exempt organizations)

On page 21, between lines 9 and 10, insert the following:

SEC. 204. RULES RELATING TO CERTAIN TARGETED ELECTIONEERING COMMUNICATIONS.

Section 316(c) of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 (2 U.S.C. 441b), as added by section 203, is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(6) SPECIAL RULES FOR TARGETED COMMUNICATIONS.—

“(A) EXCEPTION DOES NOT APPLY.—Paragraph (2) shall not apply in the case of a targeted communication that is made by an organization described in such paragraph.

“(B) TARGETED COMMUNICATION.—For purposes of subparagraph (A), the term 'targeted communication' means an electioneering communication (as defined in section 304(d)(3)) that is distributed from a television or radio broadcast station or provider of cable or satellite television service whose audience consists primarily of residents of the State for which the clearly identified candidate is seeking office.”

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota is recognized.

Mr. WELLSTONE. I thank the Chair.

Mr. President, first, I thank my colleague from Massachusetts for his remarks and in particular for his focus on the importance of what some call clean money, clean elections, others call public financing, partial or full public financing.

Before I talk about this amendment, I want to give it some context with the argument I made on the floor of the Senate last week.

I am bitterly disappointed my amendment was not adopted. That amendment was an effort to say that our States should have the option of applying a voluntary system of partial or full public financing to our races. A couple of Senators said to me during the vote that they did not want their State legislatures deciding "how to finance my campaigns." They are not our campaigns. These campaigns belong to the people of the country. I do believe, until we move to some system of public financing or move in that direction with some reforms, we are going to continue to have a system that is wired for incumbents. Sometimes I think the debate is as much between ins and outs as it is between Democrats and Republicans.

I want to put the defeat of that amendment in the context of some of the reform amendments being defeated and other amendments which I think significantly weaken this legislation, at least if one's interest is in reform and in trying to get some of the big money out of politics and bring some of the people back in.

The acceptance last week of the so-called millionaire's amendment, where we tried to fix the problem of people who have wealth and their own economic resources and spending it on their own campaigns with basically another abuse, which is to take the limits off how much money people can contribute—I fear this week we are going to take the lid off individual campaign contributions as some have suggested, going from \$1,000 to \$3,000 or \$2,000 to \$6,000 a year.

The point is, again, one-quarter of 1 percent of the people in the country contribute \$200 or more and one-ninth of the voting age population in the country contribute \$1,000 a year or more. How last week's support of the so-called millionaire's amendment can be considered a reform—it probably will be challenged constitutionally as well.

The point is, I do not know how bringing more money into politics, and more big money in politics, and having Senators—Democrats and Republicans—running for office more dependent on the top 1 percent of the population represents a reform.

If the Hagel proposal passes, I think that is a huge step backward. If part of the Hagel proposal passes and we raise the limits on individual contributions, then we have created a situation where I have no doubt incumbents will have a better chance of going after those big bucks.

Frankly, I think some of us probably will not be too successful, and, in any case, why in the world would you want a system more dependent upon the top 1 percent of the population who can make those contributions?

I worry about a piece of legislation that has moved in this direction. There were some good victories. I always will give credit to colleagues for their good work, and I certainly give full credit to Senator McCAIN and Senator FEINGOLD for their good work. But I am in profound disagreement, first of all, with defeat of the amendment last week which would have allowed people at the State level to organize—grass roots politics at the State level. I am especially worried about creating loopholes in this bill or moving toward taking off the cap when it comes to the raising of hard money. Again, I do not believe it is much of a reform.

I have heard some argue it is a fact that since 1974 there has been inflation and \$1,000 is not worth \$1,000. It is also a fact that one-quarter of 1 percent of the people in the country contribute over \$200. It is a fact that one-ninth of the people contribute over \$1,000. It is a fact that most people do not have that