

Springfield through his donations to construct and improve such places as schools, hospitals, and theaters. His generosity and personal participation in the life of the community have benefited us all.

Mr. Hammons' celebration of 80 years of life is a testament to me and all Missourians. His achievements are significant and deserve to be recognized on this special occasion. I would like to join his many friends and relatives in wishing him good health and happiness in the future.

THE VERY BAD DEBT BOXSCORE

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, at the close of business Friday, March 5, 1999, the federal debt stood at \$5,652,546,580,761.78 (Five trillion, six hundred fifty-two billion, five hundred forty-six million, five hundred eighty thousand, seven hundred sixty-one dollars and seventy-eight cents).

One year ago, March 5, 1998, the federal debt stood at \$5,528,530,000,000 (Five trillion, five hundred twenty-eight billion, five hundred thirty million).

Fifteen years ago, March 5, 1984, the federal debt stood at \$1,473,914,000,000 (One trillion, four hundred seventy-three billion, nine hundred fourteen million).

Twenty-five years ago, March 5, 1974, the federal debt stood at \$468,399,000,000 (Four hundred sixty-eight billion, three hundred ninety-nine million) which reflects a debt increase of more than \$5 trillion—\$5,184,147,580,761.78 (Five trillion, one hundred eighty-four billion, one hundred forty-seven million, five hundred eighty thousand, seven hundred sixty-one dollars and seventy-eight cents) during the past 25 years.

MORRIS K. UDALL

Mr. HOLLINGS. Mr. President, yesterday this body paid tribute to one of the greatest men to serve in Congress in the twentieth century, Morris "Mo" Udall from Arizona. Yesterday, I was proud to sign the resolution honoring him, and I would like to pay tribute to him now.

Mo Udall was a giant. For thirty years, he straddled politics in Arizona and America. He was a statesman as well as a legislator, and an intellectual as well as a politician. Although Mo believed passionately in many causes and was a Democrat through and through, his wit and warmth helped him forge many productive, bipartisan relationships with his colleagues across the aisle. Mo's intelligence, commitment, and personal touch helped him create a legislative legacy that still shines bright today, almost forty years since he entered the House of Representatives.

As everyone who follows public affairs knows, Mo Udall hailed from a family with a rich tradition in politics and public service. His ancestors were pioneers who helped transform the Ari-

zona Territory into a great state. Mo entered Congress after winning a special election in 1961 to replace his brother, Stewart, whom President Kennedy had tapped to head the Department of the Interior.

Today, the Udall name continues to resonate in Congress. Mo's son, MARK, and his nephew, TOM, both were elected to the House in 1998. I know they will carry on the great tradition of public service and Congressional achievement set by their fathers.

Mo was such a modest and easy-going man that one sometimes overlooks the enormity of his legislative record. After rising to the chairmanship of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, a position he held until his retirement in 1991, Mo wrote much of the nation's most important environmental legislation. He pushed through important regulations concerning land, water, mineral, and timber use. Mo also helped reform America's postal system and our campaign finance laws, and he was instrumental in reforming the seniority system in Congress.

In addition to being a great legislator, Mo Udall was a great man. He bridged divisions and always sought to bring people together to work for the good of the country.

Like many of my colleagues, I believe Mo's wit and self-deprecating manner were largely responsible for his successes. Perhaps the best way to illustrate his humor is to relate a joke he loved to tell about one of his campaign visits to New Hampshire during his 1996 Presidential race. At one stop, Mo approached a group of men to tell them he was running for President, only to be told, "Yes, we were just laughing about that."

Mr. President, if ever a public servant deserved to be taken seriously, it was Mo Udall. It is a sign of his stature as a man that despite his many accomplishments, he never took himself too seriously.

Today I am honored to pay my respects to my friend Mo Udall, whose legacy of public service and bipartisan achievement will be remembered for many lifetimes.

TRIBUTE TO CHARLES PAONE OF REVERE, MASSACHUSETTS

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, next week, on March 17th, St. Patrick's Day, one of Revere, Massachusetts' finest sons, Charles Paone, will celebrate his 90th birthday. Charlie, as he is known by his many friends, has spent most of his life in his hometown of Revere. He graduated from Immaculate Conception High School in 1927, and went on to Georgetown University, graduating in 1931. After college, Charlie returned to Massachusetts and attended Boston College Law School, receiving his law degree from that outstanding college in 1935.

Charlie was inducted into the Army in 1942, where he served with distinction in the 209th Counter Intelligence

Corps. He's been a member of the American Legion for more than 50 years, and he's been very active in his post. He has also been a member of the Knights of Columbus for more than 60 years, and is a past Grand Knight. In 1981 he retired from the Revere Public School System after four decades of outstanding service.

Charlie is loved by his family and friends as a wonderful role model who is always willing to go the extra mile for those in need, whether it's helping someone with their taxes or providing a ride to the local store for groceries. And, of course, all of us in the Senate know Charlie's nephew Marty, who does an excellent job as our Secretary for the Minority.

In many ways, our country is great today because of Americans like Charlie of the World War II generation. They served their country far above and beyond the call of duty in the war, and they came back from the war to rebuild the nation on the home front and make America the great country it is today. Tom Brokaw, in his current number one best-seller, calls them "The Greatest Generation," and it's leaders like Charlie that he's writing about.

It's a privilege to join Charlie's family and friends in wishing him a very happy 90th birthday and a very happy St. Patrick's Day, and to commend him for all that he has done for his family, his friends, his community, and our country.

BENJAMIN H. HARDY, JR.

Mr. COVERDELL. Mr. President, I am honored to rise this morning to pay tribute to a distinguished American 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.

There is something else that most of the data says. It says that the quality of the teacher leading that classroom makes a significant difference. Contrary to statements made on the floor last week, the class size proposal of my colleague from Washington does little or nothing toward improving teacher quality. Funds allocated for professional development are limited to 15 percent in the first 3 years it is authorized. Worse yet, the legislation prohibits funds from being used to enhance teacher quality in the last 2 authorized years. What kind of sense does that make?

Only after class size is reduced to an average number of 18 students does a school district have the flexibility to use those funds to improve the quality of teaching in the classroom. Proponents point to studies which show that smaller classes make a difference and improve academic achievement. I argue that class size is less important than having a quality teacher. That, to me, is common sense.

As I mentioned, this common sense idea can also be backed with hard data. Ronald Fergeson, in an article entitled "New Evidence on How and Why Money Matters," notes:

What the evidence here suggests more strongly is that teacher quality matters and should be a major focus of efforts to upgrade the quality of schooling. Skilled teachers are the most critical of all schooling input.

Bill Sanders, a statistician at the University of Tennessee, stated in a 1997 article in "The Tennessean":

Teacher effectiveness is the single largest factor affecting the academic growth of students. Poor teachers hold students back,