work to support her family. The only job she could find was a minimum wage job at a lumber yard located miles away from her home. The work was hard, and after 9 months she broke her ankle on the job. Her family income last year was only $8,500. While on workers compensation, the section where she worked at the lumber yard closed and her job was eliminated. Now, both of her teenage sons are working to help support the family. Imagine trying to support a family of four on such a small income. But this woman just wants another job as soon as her physician allows her to go back to work.

This West Virginian deserves a raise—and if we raise the minimum wage to $5.15, and her family gets their full earned income tax credit, they will be lifted out of poverty.

It is a sad day in America when we do not help a West Virginia family that works hard to raise their children above the poverty line.

We in Congress have the ability to bring badly needed relief to this family and about 12 million workers in America. We should come together in a spirit of decency and common sense, restore some glimmer of hope for these families, and raise the Federal minimum wage.

The minimum wage has not been raised for 4 years, but the prices of everything else, from rent to food has gone up each and every year. Raising the minimum wage is essential to help families and reinforce the fundamental American values of hard work and self-sufficiency.

And we all know that solely raising the minimum wage is not the silver bullet that will erase the gross inequity between the haves and have nots. Nor, will this act alone restore the economic vitality of working Americans that deserve so much more from the society they contribute to. But it is a simple, important, obvious step in the right direction to reward and encourage work. It tells hard-working American families that we value their right to a decent life.

Mr. President, it is long past the time when the U.S. Senate should get the chance to vote for an increase that is shamefully overdue.

I conclude by reminding everyone listening how little time there is left to get anything done that is relevant, meaningful, and helpful to hard-working Americans. But there is still the time to take three basic, important steps that deal directly with what weighs on the minds and shoulders of families in West Virginia, in Mississippi, from California to North Carolina.

The bipartisan Kennedy-Kassebaum bill—a bill with the most basic health insurance reforms should get settled and enacted, now, this week, immediately.

Welfare reform, drawing on plans from both sides of the aisle, should get worked out, put into final legislative form, and sent to the President in a form that he can sign in good conscience—in a form that will make welfare dependency something to avoid and work something expected.

An increase in the minimum wage, the most basic and decent step we can take for millions of Americans who are doing everything possible to work, avoid welfare, and be productive citizens.

If my colleagues want to continue endless hearings on what fascinates them about 1600 Pennsylvania Avenue, so be it. But just a little time, some modest leadership, and some amount of attention to the calendar must go into producing something for the people who are waiting for action that makes a difference in their lives.

Mr. LEAHY addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont is recognized.

A TRIBUTE TO BOB DOLE

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, in my 22 years here in the Senate, I have had a chance to witness many historic events in this Chamber. When I leave the Senate, I hope to write a book about some of these.

One of the truly historic events was a speech given by our former majority leader, the senior Senator from Kansas, Senator Dole. I think, Mr. President, that there will be historians who read the RECORD of that event; but in reading the RECORD they will read only the words. They will not really see the event. I would like to add, for those historians who may read that, that at the time Senator Dole gave his speech, most of the Republicans and most of the Democrats were on the floor.

As the Presiding Officer knows, when Senators speak, even though we may all be on the floor, ofttimes we do not listen. This was an exception. Every single Senator on the floor listened, and listened carefully. They heard a speech that was vintage Bob Dole—plain, to the point, with flashes of the humor that we know so well. Even when he was corrected by the then distinguished Presiding Officer, the President pro tempore, when the President pro tempore spoke of his around-the-clock filibuster, Senator Dole ad libbed, ''And that is why you are not often invited to be an after dinner speaker.''

There is far more than just humor in that there is real affection from Senators of both parties—affection for a man who earned it. He earned it as one of the finest Senators I have had a chance to serve with. I have been here with great majority leaders, such as Senator Mansfield, Senator BYRD, Senator Baker, Senator Mitchell and, of course, Senator Dole. I was thinking how good it was to be in a Senate led by Senator Dole on the Republican side and Senator DASCHLE on the Democratic side. It is not just his leadership, but his role as a U.S. Senator that earned him respect and affection from both sides of the aisle.

I began serving on the same committee with Bob Dole when I came here as a junior member of the Agriculture Committee. I watched how he worked with Hubert Humphrey and George McGovern, as well as key members on the Republican side, on nutrition matters—school lunch, school breakfast, and food stamps. After Senator McGovern and Senator Humphrey were gone, it fell on me to pick up our side of the aisle on that.

Throughout the years, there were a number of Dole-Leahy and Leahy-Dole amendments on nutrition that passed. I have worked with him on major farm bills. This last one was the Dole-Leahy-Lugar farm bill in the Senate.

When Senator Dole was ready to leave the Senate, I went to see him, and I spoke to him and told him that it had been a privilege to work with him and that there were an awful lot of people who were fed—hungry Americans—because of legislation we were able to work on together.

It certainly was not just me, by any means. I think of another giant in the Senate, PAT MOYNIHAN, who stood in the well of the Senate, with Senators milling around, and had a conversation with Senator Dole. It was in the early 1980's when we thought the reform of Social Security was dead. Senator MOYNIHAN said to Senator Dole, ''Let us try one more time.'' And because the two of them worked first on what was best for the country—not necessarily what was best for each other's political future or the future of the parties—and they worked in a nonpartisan fashion, they saved Social Security. It required two Senators of that stature, with respect on both sides of the aisle, to do it, and Senators who were willing to put everything else aside.

So much will be written during this year, and each of our parties will support our nominee for President. No matter which way the Presidential election comes out, the country should understand that it benefited by Senator Dole being in the Senate. I say this as a Member of the other party. I hope that all Senators, Republicans and Democrats, will realize that the Senate itself is bigger than any one of us. We owe a duty not just to our political fortunes, but to the U.S. Senate and to help be the conscience of this great Nation. We have to work together, first and foremost, for what is best for the Nation, not each other.

I salute the good Senator, my good friend, Senator Bob Dole, and I will miss him here in the Senate.

I yield the floor.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, morning business is closed.

CAMPAIGN FINANCE REFORM

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will now resume consideration of S. 1219, which the clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 1219) to reform the financing of Federal elections, and for other purposes.

The Senate resumed consideration of the bill.

Mr. BENNETT addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, the subject of today's debate is ostensibly campaign finance reform. It is currently fashionable to say that all of our ills as a nation are caused by incompetent officeholders—or worse, politicians who have been bought by special interests through the process of campaign contributions. So we are gathering to debate a bill that is supposed to fix that.

Who can possibly be in favor of a system like that? To some, this should be an easy vote. Destroy the status quo. Anything would be better. So I am in favor of destroying the status quo, Mr. President, but I reject the idea that anything will be better, and particularly the bill that is before us.

I believe there is at stake here an issue that is far more fundamental than campaign finance reform. Perhaps without realizing it, we are dealing with the most crucial political questions that any society can confront, issues that were confronted and resolved by those that we now refer to as the Founding Fathers.

Accordingly, Mr. President, I wish to deviate from the direct bill in front of us long enough to move this debate into a context that goes back to the Founding Fathers.

I begin with the writings of James Madison, commonly called ''the father of the Constitution.'' His work, along with that of his fellow Virginian, Thomas Jefferson, is now on display in the National Archives, America's most hallowed document, our political scriptures, if you will: the Constitution, the Declaration of Independence, and the Bill of Rights.

However, today I am not going to be quoting either from the Constitution or the Bill of Rights, both of which were products of Madison's genius, but rather from what has come to be known as the Federalist Papers, a series of political tracts written during the time that the Nation was debating the ratification of the Constitution. At that time, there were many people who were afraid of the impact the Constitution would have on their existing Government, and to allay those fears, James Madison, along with John Jay and Alexander Hamilton, set forth the clear statement of the intellectual and philosophical underpinnings of American Government.

It has added relevance to the debate on campaign finance reform because in the 10th of this series of publications, that which has come to be known as the 10th Federalist, Madison addressed the fundamental question of what to do about what we now call special interests.

The 18th century word for ''special interest'' was ''faction,'' so I will use the terms ''faction'' and ''special interest'' interchangeably.

Quoting now from the 10th Federalist, I give you Madison's definition of what a faction is. Faction:

. . . a number of citizens . . . who are united and actuated by . . . common impulse of passion or . . . interest, adverse to the rights of other citizens.

I can think of no better description of a special interest than that one.

Madison then tells us, ''There are two methods of curing the mischiefs of faction: * * * removing its causes'' or ''removing its effects.''

He then tells us, ''There are again two methods of removing the causes of faction: * * * by destroying * * * liberty'' or ''by giving to every citizen the same opinions, the same passions and the same interests.''

Appropriately, Madison then describes the first remedy, that is, the destruction of liberty, as ''* * * worse than the disease.'' I think all Americans would agree with this. Controlling the mischiefs that come from special interests by destroying the basic liberty that guarantees each American his or her own right of opinion would destroy the very basis of the Nation in which we live.

Now, referring to the second way of dealing with factions, that is, ''* * * giving to every citizen the same opinions * * * passions * * * and interests,'' Madison says, ''The second * * * is as impractical as the first would be unwise. As long as the reason of man continues fallible * * * different opinions will be formed.'' He summarizes, ''The latent causes of faction are thus sown in the nature of man.''

Again, Mr. President, no contemporary writer could place the situation more precisely than Madison has. Special interests arise among us because we are free, and, as long as we are free we will disagree to one extent or another.

Madison continues. He says, ''The inference to which we are brought is, that the causes of faction cannot be removed * * * and that relief is only to be sought in the means of controlling its effects.'' He then tells us, ''* * * relief is supplied by the republican principle.''

Now, by using the word ''republican,'' Madison is clearly not referring to the modern Republican Party. He is differentiating between a democracy and a republic as a governmental form. He says, ''The two great points of difference between a democracy and a republic are, first, the delegation of the government in the latter, to a small group of citizens elected by the rest. Secondly, the greater number of citizens * * * over which the latter may be extended.''

Referring to the greater number of citizens that are governed by a republic, he tells us why this will defeat the pressures of special interests. Quoting, ''The influence of factious leaders may kindle a flame within their particular States, but will be unable to spread a general conflagration throughout the other States.''

I will say more about this in a moment, but for now it is his point of the difference between the democracy and a republic which I wish to stress. In a pure democracy, every decision is made by the vote of every citizen; in a republic, as Madison says, ''The delegation (goes) to a small number of citizens elected by the rest.'' It is this republican form of government that the Constitution gives us and under which we have lived for well over two centuries.

Now, since the representatives in our Republic are freely elected, as contrasted to those who were chosen by the Communists to serve in the Republics of the old Soviet Union of Republics, modern commentators use the term ''democracy'' to describe us, and if we interpret the word ''democracy'' to mean a system where everybody gets to vote, I have no objection to that term. However, as a description of governmental structure, applying the term ''democracy'' to the United States is a misstatement.

What does all this have to do with campaign finance reform? In my view, it has a great deal to do with it. Campaign finance reform is about the power of special interest groups—factions—and how to control that power, the very subject of the 10th Federalist paper.

Let us take modern tools of communication and insert them into the model that Madison gave us. For instance, is it now possible for a modern special interest or faction to create a conflagration simultaneously in several States? Given the wide reach of television, national publications, the Internet, the answer is clearly yes. A special interest group, be it a labor union, an environmentalist group, a business alliance or a religious association, now possesses the means, if it can raise the money, to reach every citizen in the country virtually simultaneously without regard to any political boundaries or geographical boundaries that might exist. Examples of this are all around us.

First, various religious organizations calling themselves the Christian Coalition have banded together, and by using the outlets of communication available to them in both churches and the media, in 1994 put out a common message to all of those who are adherents to those particular denominations. They greatly influenced the outcome of the election that year, and