

and a great Georgia visionary. 50 years ago, Benjamin H. Hardy, Jr., was one of the primary architects of a new foreign policy initiative that became known as President Truman's "Point Four," a program of technical assistance to help the people of developing nations. This bold and revolutionary program became an important tenant of American foreign policy, helping people around the world improve their lives.

Mr. Hardy was a distinguished student at the University of Georgia, graduating with a BA in journalism in 1928. After graduation, he worked as a journalist and later as a public affairs officer for the Departments of Defense and State. His service at the Department of State required him to draft the foreign policy portion of President Truman's 1949 inaugural address. The address cited four basic points of American foreign policy: (1) Support for the United Nations; (2) continuation of the Marshall Plan; (3) military cooperation with Western allies; and (4) a "bold new program" of technical assistance to people in developing nations. This last point was based on what Mr. Hardy had seen of the economic needs in South America during World War II. According to some accounts, he included it in the draft of President Truman's speech at considerable risk to his own career.

But it was the last concept, point four, which received widespread acclaim and that, in time, became a major component of American foreign policy. In 1950, this "Point Four" policy was approved by Congress in the form of a mandate to create the Technical Cooperation Administration (TCA) within the State Department. It was this "bold new program" drafted by Mr. Hardy that later developed into the Agency for International Development and which, perhaps, was the seed for the establishment of the Peace Corps. These were truly forward-looking concepts.

During this period, Mr. Hardy served as the chief of public affairs for the TCA and the chairman of its policy planning council. Tragically, on December 23, 1951, Mr. Hardy, along with the Director of the TCA, was killed in a plane crash on a flight from Cairo to Teheran. It is a shame that Benjamin Hardy did not have the opportunity to see his concept take root and grow as he would have had it.

Fifty years after Mr. Hardy drafted the Point Four speech, it is fitting that we in Congress pay tribute to the vision and courage of this man, his contribution to American foreign policy, and his commitment to improving the lives of people around the world. Ideas like Benjamin Hardy's have helped demonstrate the generosity of the American people around the world. And it is such ideas that have helped America remain engaged as the world's leader, helping to build a better future for all people. Mr. President, it is my

honor to recognize this distinguished American from Georgia and to inform my colleagues of his proud heritage. Thank you.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. CONRAD. Mr. President, on Friday, March 5, I was necessarily absent in order to join Secretary of Energy Richardson in Bismarck for meetings with representatives of North Dakota energy industries and to meet with the Governor and other State officials about water resources. Had I been present for rollcall vote No. 33 on S. 280, to table the Graham amendment which would have prohibited the implementation of the "Know Your Customer" regulation by Federal banking agencies, I would have voted "nay."

Mr. President, I yield the floor, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. JEFFORDS. Mr. President, what is the pending business?

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Morning business is closed.

EDUCATIONAL FLEXIBILITY PARTNERSHIP ACT OF 1999

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will now resume consideration of S. 280, which the clerk will report.

The bill clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 280) to provide for education flexibility partnerships.

The Senate resumed consideration of the bill.

Pending:

Jeffords amendment No. 31, in the nature of a substitute.

Bingaman amendment No. 35 (to amendment No. 31), to provide for a national school dropout prevention program.

Lott amendment No. 37 (to amendment No. 35), to authorize additional appropriations to carry out part B of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act.

Gramm (for Allard) amendment No. 40 (to amendment No. 31), to prohibit implementation of "Know Your Customer" regulations by the Federal banking agencies.

Mr. JEFFORDS addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont is recognized.

Mr. JEFFORDS. Mr. President, I say to the Senator from Massachusetts that I desire to make a statement for a while, if that is all right with him.

Mr. KENNEDY. Absolutely.

Mr. JEFFORDS. Mr. President, we are again back with the Ed-Flex bill, which is a bill, as everybody knows, that would merely attempt to make it easier for States to be able to utilize regulations to their advantage by being able to waive them for communities or school systems within their jurisdiction. This has been used successfully by 12 States now—6 originally, and then another 6. It has demonstrated that there are problems in the present system which make it impossible to take care of very, very minute differences in schools in order to get them to be able to have the flexibility for the utilization of the title I funds.

We are also facing, apparently, a filibuster. Therefore, we will have a cloture vote at 5 o'clock this afternoon. It is my hope that we can proceed perhaps on to another amendment, and then we will be able to make some progress on this bill.

This is our fourth day on the Ed-Flex bill. This bill, which is supported by the administration and all 50 Governors, has broad bipartisan support in both the Senate and in the House. I urged my colleagues last week to limit their amendments to the bill before us. As we have shown, we are perfectly willing to work with the limited issues raised by the Ed-Flex bill.

As my colleagues know, later this year we will be considering the statute that governs the K-through-12 educational programs, the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, and that is where the debate on these larger questions should take place. I say this not because I am a stickler for procedure, but because the whole point behind the committee system is so that complicated issues can be debated and examined in detail. That is not possible on the floor of the Senate. This doesn't happen in every instance, and I have been on both sides of the question, but I cannot recall when we have been in a similar situation where one side is trying to load up a small, noncontroversial proposal when the logical vehicle for the debate and consideration of these larger questions is only a few months away.

We have never really considered these issues in committee. To be fair, Senator MURRAY offered her class size amendment to the Ed-Flex bill last year. But Republicans felt then, as we feel now, that this issue should be considered as part of the ESEA reauthorization. The amendment was not adopted.

Reducing class size in our Nation's schools is a fine idea. Common sense tells us that a smaller class allows a teacher to spend more one-on-one time with each student. According to my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, common sense has been backed by data that also reinforces that small class size is correlated to higher student achievement.