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