welcome China as it strives to become a truly great power. Our interests with China are too vital—the consequences of failing to build a constructive relationship with China too profound—to do otherwise.

Mr. President, how much time do I have left in my request?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has 8 minutes 4 seconds.

THE BOSNIAN ELECTIONS

Mr. BIDEN. Mr. President, I would like now to speak very briefly, 8 minutes, to the issue of Bosnia. Last weekend, the people of Bosnia-Herzegovina went to the polls to elect their various municipal governments. I know the President has recently been to Bosnia, as I have. These local elections had been postponed from last year because of tampering with registration, chiefly by the Bosnian Serbs.

But I am happy to report, and we have all observed, that this year's municipal elections were a success. Despite dire threats of violence against refugees and displaced persons who wanted to cross over to their former homes to vote, over 2 days, not one single incident of violence occurred in the entire country.

Why? For a simple reason, I believe, Mr. President. Because of the presence of SFOR, the NATO-sponsored troops on the ground led by recently reinforced American troops. SFOR made clear to all parties that violence would not be tolerated and force would be met with force.

Every single time over the past several years when the West has been forceful in its behavior, the ultranationalists in Bosnia, primarily the Serbs but all ultranationalists, have backed down—every single time.

The elections were carried out by the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe, the so-called OSCE, in which the United States is an active member, but only one of many. The OSCE observers deserve a great deal of credit for their successful labors.

The results of the election will not be known for another couple of days. Already, however, some encouraging signs are emerging. In Tuzla, a place I have visited on more than one occasion, the Muslim Party for Democratic Action, the SDA, conceded defeat by Mayor Selim Beslagic, who represented not just the Muslim party but the multiethnic joint group that was running.

I met the mayor last month. I met with him last month in Bosnia in Sarajevo. When I met with him, he indicated that he represents not just Muslims, but he represents this multiethnic slate and he represents just the kind, in my view, of democratic, tolerant, pragmatic politician that is going to be needed to rebuild Bosnia. But the point is, the controlling party in the area lost. The election was free.

Until now, three ethnically based parties that profess to represent the interests of the Muslims, Serbs, and Croats have been dominating the airwaves and the patronage system. Tuzla, and perhaps other cities in both the federation and the Republika Srpska, show that if SFOR and the international community guarantee equal access, the monopoly of these parties on power can be broken.

Moreover, Mr. President, I would argue it represents what I believe to be the majority view of Bosnian Serbs, Bosnian Croats and Bosnian Muslims, who, I might add, lived together in peace for decades and decades prior to this and the majority of whom wish to do that again. But it shows that the monopoly of the parties that are representing purely the xenophobic notions of their particular interests are not necessarily the views of the people of Bosnia.

Moreover, it is likely that, thanks to the absentee voting and the protection offered by SFOR for returning refugees, the election may reverse the vile ethnic cleansing of the war. For example, in the town of Drvar in western Herzegovina, it was 97 percent Serb until the town's inhabitants were driven out in the fall of 1995 by Croats. Last weekend, the Croats who displaced the Serbs did their best to harass returning Serb voters. International election officials from the OSCE, however, insisted the Serbs be allowed to vote, and it looks like there may be a turnaround in that community as well.

Several other towns, like Jajce and Srebrenica, site of the largest civilian massacre in Europe since World War II, may see their former inhabitants, in these two cases Muslims, forming the governments in those two cities.

The international community is now faced with the next—and this is an incremental thing, Mr. President—they are faced with the next stark question of whether now we will enforce the election results, whether we will now be part of that.

I realize that is a dicey deal, but I continue to argue that when we demonstrated force, and given the power of the people in those communities, we, the Western community, have prevailed.

So now the question is, will we enforce the results of the election by guaranteeing that the newly elected councils not remain governments in exile? Enforcing the election results, of course, means that the right of refugees and displaced persons to return must be honored, which Dayton calls for. In most cases, that would be able to be accomplished only by the international community being present and the presence of SFOR.

Mr. President, I believe we have no choice in this matter. Both for moral and practical reasons, it seems to me we must move rapidly to enforce the resettlement of refugees as the results of the election will dictate. This will be a difficult task, and the time is short before the onset of the Balkan winter. Most likely we will have to begin with highly visible demonstration returns in one or two selected towns. But, Mr. President, we must keep the democratic momentum going.

Rebuilding shattered Bosnia is an immense undertaking, and now, for the first time in years, there has been a string of successes. The United States has been the prime mover in these, although not the prime player in terms of numbers. We must continue to exert our leadership on the European Community, and we must continue the valuable and honorable work we have undertaken, for, Mr. President, to do otherwise, I will predict, the result will be disastrous for Europe, disastrous for our interests.

I will end with a rhetorical question. How can we expect stability in Europe if the ethnic cleansing is able to be justified, and partitioning takes place? How do we then explain that to the other parts of the former Soviet Union who have equally deep divisions that exist? Mr. President, there are 5 million ethnic Russians in the Ukraine. There are 5 million of them. There are millions of people who have ethnic differences living throughout that area. How do we deal with Rumania and Hungary? If we say that this vile ethnic cleansing will be rewarded by us backing out and letting it return to the status quo, you know European leadership will not step up to the ball. Again, I want to make it clear, we play the smallest part relative to the rest of the world in this, in the sense that we are only a small portion of the overall effort, but the overall effort is occurring because of our leadership.

So, Mr. President, I acknowledge that this is a dicey deal. I acknowledge that it is going to be difficult, but I would suggest that those who have a different view from me acknowledge that there have been recent successes that at least lend hope to the possibility that we can continue down this path.

I thank the Chair, and I thank my colleague. I yield the floor.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1998

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate now resumes consideration of H.R. 2107, which the clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 2107) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1998.

The Senate resumed consideration of the bill.

Pending:

Ashcroft amendment No. 1188 (to committee amendment beginning on page 96, line 12, through page 97, line 8) to eliminate funding for programs and activities carried out by the National Endowment for the Arts.

Hutchinson amendment No. 1196, to authorize the President to implement the recently announced American Heritage Rivers

Initiative subject to designation of qualified rivers by act of Congress.

Mr. GORTON addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The distinguished Senator from Washington is recognized.

Mr. GORTON. Mr. President, the Senator from Delaware has used this time very much to good effect with thoughtful analyses of two questions, and he certainly did not interfere with debate on the Interior appropriations bill, as no one was here to present an amendment on the subject. I do have a unanimous consent request that has been agreed to by both sides, Mr. President, and I will present it now.

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT

Mr. GORTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at 1:30 p.m. today, the Senate resume consideration of the Ashcroft amendment No. 1188, and that the time be divided in the following fashion: 70 minutes under the control of Senator BYRD, or his designee; 70 minutes under the control of Senator ASHCROFT, or his designee; 5 minutes under my control.

I further ask unanimous consent that following the conclusion or yielding back of time, the Senate proceed to vote on, or in relation to, the Ashcroft amendment.

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

Mr. GORTON. Mr. President, I also express my strong hope and preference, and that of the majority leader, that after disposition of the Ashcroft amendment, unless it is adopted, that we proceed promptly to the consideration of the other amendments relating to the National Endowment for the Arts. They are: an amendment by Senator ABRAHAM; an amendment by Senator SESSIONS and Senator HUTCHINSON of Arkansas; and an amendment by Senator HUTCHISON of Texas. Each of them has been debated thoroughly. While no unanimous-consent request has been made with respect to any of them, I hope that we will be able to get relatively short debate periods and thereby finish dealing with the most controversial aspect of this bill.

There are also other outstanding amendments, some of which may require rollcall votes. I know of one relating to forest roads that will be proposed by Senator BRYAN of Nevada. I hope we will, within the hour at least, be able to arrange a time for its debate.

I believe that there are a couple of others. I am also delighted to report that Senator BUMPERS and Senator REID have apparently reached an agreement on an element in this bill which divided the two of them. I believe that, again, within the hour or hour and a half, we may be able to adopt an agreed amendment on that subject.

I know the majority leader still would like to finish this bill tonight. That may be a vain hope, but I certainly hope we will get a long way toward that end. With that, 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. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

SUPPORTING THE NATIONAL ENDOWMENT FOR THE ARTS

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, here we go again. Every year since 1989, Congress has held a highly charged debate about the future of the National Endowment for the Arts. This year is no different. Ironically, extremists opposing NEA have recently been claiming that there has been inadequate oversight of the agency. Dollar for dollar, it is likely that no agency has been more heavily scrutinized than the Arts Endowment.

The arts and humanities have, and deserve to have, a central role in the life of America. The Arts Endowment has contributed immensely to that role. It has encouraged the growth and development of the arts in communities across the Nation, giving new emphasis and vitality to American creativity and scholarship, and to the cultural achievement that are among America's greatest strengths.

Americans have a great deal to celebrate and learn about our extraordinary cultural traditions. The arts are an important part of our complex and modern society, and will play a key role in fulfilling our country's many possibilities for the future.

Critics used to claim that the Endowment spent money unwisely—awarding grants to unqualified artists or to artists that clearly did not merit Federal aid. But the critics quickly ran out of examples. Over the period of its entire 32-year history, a grand total of about 25 of the tens of thousands of grants awarded by the Endowment have raised genuine concerns. Yet, the budget for the Arts Endowment has been cut to penalize the agency for these so-called inappropriate grants. Other restrictions have also been imposed—on content, on seasonal support grants, on grants to individuals, and on subgrants.

Nothing will ever satisfy the critics, because their real intent is to eliminate any Federal role in the arts. Their goal is to abolish the agency—either directly by denying it any funds at all, or, indirectly by block-granting all the funds to the States.

In fact, the Arts Endowment has an extraordinary record of successful achievement. As a result of the its leadership over the past three decades, there are now double the number of orchestras in America, 11 times the number of dance companies, and 50 times the number of local arts agencies. The NEA reaches out to thousands of America's communities and neighborhoods. It is functioning as it should, encouraging the arts in all parts of the country, providing the seed money that enables local arts to grow and thrive.

Let us be honest. In recent years, since the rightwing's misguided ideological assault on the agency first began, Congress has gone the extra mile. We have taken every reasonable action to ensure that the Arts Endowment only supports grants and programs that are responsible, that fulfill the agency's widely accepted mission, and that reach the widest possible audience. Every year the agency has to run the appropriations gauntlet and every year it convinces a majority of Congress that it deserves support. This year should be no different, because there is no new evidence to justify the critics' shameful attack.

The Labor and Human Resources Committee recently approved a 5-year reauthorization of the Arts Endowment. The bill includes appropriate restrictions and set-asides, so that the arts will reach as many communities across the country as possible. The bill also establishes arts education as a primary focus of the agency. The bill was approved by a solid bipartisan committee vote of 14 to 4.

I commend Senator JEFFORDS of the Labor Committee for his excellent job in guiding that authorization through the committee. He is a strong supporter of the arts and has been thorough and conscientious in his oversight of the Endowment.

The Appropriations Committee has also demonstrated its support for the Endowment, by recommending just over $100 million for the Arts Endowment in this bill. I commend the committee for its support.

The agency has made a significant contribution to the quality of life in thousands of communities in our country. The arts have broad appeal, and the Endowment's mission is to encourage artists and institutions across the country to create, produce, and present programs to tap and encourage that appeal. In 1996, for example, the NEA supported significant programs such as the Delaware Theater Co., the Atlanta Ballet, the Tulsa Philharmonic Society, the University of Southern Mississippi's Folk and Traditional Arts Program, and the International Association of Jazz Educators.

Countless other examples can be cited. Federal support for the arts has clearly made a large difference in communities across the country. The current Federal role is significant, and it has overwhelming support in every State. Families want their children to visit symphonies and museums. They want to enjoy theater and dance. The arts are more than a diversion or entertainment. They are educational and enriching, and their central place in the Nation's life and experiences should be supported and increased.

The Conference of Mayors has strongly endorsed the Arts Endowment. These local officials, who know their communities best, clearly understand the positive role of the arts. They know that the arts contribute to the vitality of their locality, and increase its economic base as well.

In Massachusetts, the arts community is thriving and dynamic. A wealth

of cultural and educational activities is available to every citizen. These activities also attract tourists to our State. Recently, the Museum of Science presented its hugely successful Leonardo da Vinci exhibition. A major retrospective on Picasso's early years is about to open at the Museum of Fine Arts. Many of my colleagues, I am sure, had the opportunity to see this extraordinary exhibition at the National Gallery of Art in Washington. The Endowment's support helped to make this dramatic exhibition possible.

People in every State treasure their own arts institutions and arts programs in the same way. Whatever the size of the State or community, the impact of the arts is significant and indisputable, from the youngest child to the oldest senior citizen.

Leaders in State and local institutions across the country are convinced that support by the Arts Endowment has been a significant part of their success. Federal aid is seed money. It has never been intended to replace State or local or private support for the arts. But it has often been a critical component in the overall development and success of countless local institutions.

In many communities, the Federal role has been indispensable, especially in disseminating innovative programs to institutions that might not have the resources to develop and produce their own programs.

Arts education is an excellent example of this impact. Music is an especially effective tool in developing the discipline and the learning potential of students. Recent studies by the college board show that students who have studied 4 years of music or more do significantly better in both their math and verbal scores on standard SAT tests.

Let me just repeat that. The studies by the college board show that students who have studied 4 years of music or more do significantly better in both their math and verbal scores on standard SAT tests—up to about 50 points more.

You would find it extremely difficult to point to any single particular educational program that results in that kind of a bump in terms of educational achievement and accomplishment. But there it is. There are the statistics. And it should not be any mystery.

We know, for example, for 300 years the Greeks had the greatest mathematicians in the world. It is interesting to note that the reason that they had the greatest mathematicians in the world is that they taught their youngest children mathematics through the arts and through music—for 300 years.

I have 10 schools in my own city of Boston where the Conservatory of Music is working with those schools to try and provide the same kinds of initiative in terms of the music and the math that was used many hundreds of years ago with phenomenal success.

I remember being in the Trotter School in Boston with Larry Lesser, who is probably one of the world's great cellists, and the time he was working in an inner-city school and working with those inner-city children in terms of enhancing their academic achievement and accomplishment. You would, as I say, rarely find a particular educational program that would have that kind of result.

We are all looking to what is going to be magical in terms of education, that is going to enhance academic achievement. We have the results in with regard to those students who study music for 4 or more years and how that has enhanced children who have that 4 or 5 years of study in their academic achievement. And it is out there for all of us to see.

So it is not only an issue that we are talking about in terms of the value of the arts, in terms of the culture, and the values which we value in our society, but it is very, very tangible and a very important component in terms of education.

We have some important alterations and changes in the authorization to try and enhance and build on that in the reauthorization which Senator JEFFORDS and I have been strongly supportive of.

We should be doing more, not less, for the arts. The heavy-handed attempt by the House Republican leadership to eliminate the Arts Endowment should be categorically rejected, and it is gratifying that President Clinton has pledged to veto any bill that reaches his desk that attempts to do so. In fact, many of the agency's strongest and most effective supporters are on the Republican side of the aisle.

Congress should start listening to the people and stop bashing this small agency. When we listen to the exaggerated protests of the critics, it is hard to remember that we are talking about a program that costs each taxpayer 37 cents a year.

We have already taken a full range of steps to see that the agency operates as effectively and responsibly as possible. It is time to support fair funding for this important agency, and give it the solid vote of confidence it deserves.

Mr. President, I remember last year—maybe others do—when we had the Vermeer exhibition at the National Gallery. It was in the wintertime. I remember over a weekend going down to try and visit that exhibit on a cold and blustery day and getting there on a Sunday morning at 8 or 9 o'clock in the morning, and seeing the lines there four blocks long, people outside waiting 4 hours.

Finally, when I was able to get in there a number of people came up and spoke to me just quietly saying to me, ''Senator, we hope you will tell Members in the Congress and the Senate that we value the arts. We are prepared to wait for the 3 or 4 hours outside to see this extraordinary exhibit of the arts.''

Whether the National Endowment supported that particular exhibit or not, it is doing otherwise, primarily in exhibits that might not have as high a visibility as the Vermeer exhibit but certainly still bringing the value of those programs to the American people.

Mr. President, in his 1960 campaign for President, President Kennedy discussed the close historical relationship between great achievement in public life and great achievement in the arts. He said, ''There is a connection, hard to explain logically but easy to feel, between achievement in public life and progress in the arts. The age of Pericles was also the age of Phidias. The age of Lorenzo de Medici was also the age of Leonardo da Vinci. The age of Elizabeth also the age of Shakespeare. And the New Frontier for which I campaign in public life, can also be a new frontier for American arts.''

Three years later, as President, in a major address at Amherst College in October 1963, he said this:

> I look forward to an America which will reward achievement in the arts as we reward achievement in business or statecraft. I look forward to an America which will steadily raise the standard of artistic accomplishment and which will steadily enlarge cultural opportunities for all our citizens. And I look forward to an America which commands respect throughout the world not only for its strength but for its civilization as well.

Those are timeless goals. They apply to our own day and generation as well. I urge the Senate to heed them, to give the arts in America the strong support they so eminently deserve.

Mr. President, I have one further observation. Yesterday one of the critics of the Endowment raised the issue of elitism and cited a grant to my State as an example of the elitist focus of the National Endowment for the Arts.

Well, I agree. This grant—to the Phillips Academy—is a perfect example. It is an example of a worthwhile program—and an example of the distortion that critics of the agency rely on to make their specious arguments.

The Addison Gallery of American Art, which is affiliated with Phillips, applied for a NEA grant as the lead members of a consortium. The grant seeks support for a project entitled ''To Conserve a Legacy: American Art From Historically Black Colleges.'' The other consortia organizations are Clark Atlanta University, Fisk University, Hampton University, Howard University, North Carolina Central University, the Studio Museum of Harlem, and the Williamstown Art Conservation Center.

Art work from each of the five participating black colleges and universities will be selected for conservation and inclusion in the exhibit which will travel to Clark, Hampton, Howard, and the Studio Museum of Harlem, in addition to the Addison.

The works in the exhibition will represent artists such as Romare Beardon, Sam Gilliam, Jacob Lawrence, and others. And one component of the project

is a year-long training program in which minority students will be selected by the participating universities to work on-site for one school year during the selection and conservation of the art work.

This is one of those grants that is going to Massachusetts—yes, it is, but its scope and audience and impact is national. And the funds were matched on a 3-to-1 basis.

I believe that this grant is not only defensive but also commendable. And I think those that have criticized this grant as an elitist grant will take a second look.

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1998—CONFERENCE REPORT

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the hour of 10:45 having arrived, the Senate will now proceed to consideration of the conference report that accompanies H.R. 2016, which the clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 2016) having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses this report, signed by all of the conferees.

The Senate proceeded to consider the conference report.

(The conference report is printed in the House proceedings of the RECORD of September 9, 1997.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, there will be 5 minutes' debate each for the Senator from Montana, the Senator from Washington, and the Senator from Arizona.

The distinguished Senator from Montana is recognized.

Mr. BURNS. I am pleased to bring before the Senate the military construction conference report for fiscal year 1998.

Mr. President, this conference report was passed by the House of Representatives yesterday by a vote of 413 to 12 and sent to the Senate last night. Now it awaits final passage here.

Mr. President, we worked very hard with our House colleagues to bring this military construction conference to a successful conclusion. Both sides did take a little bit different perspective on the allocation of military construction funding for the Department of Defense, but in the final conference report we met our goals of promoting the quality of life, other initiatives, and enhancing the mission for readiness.

Mr. President, this bill has some points I want to highlight. It provides a total of $9.2 billion for military construction. Even though this is an increase of $800 million over the President's budget for fiscal year 1998, it is still a reduction of $600 million from what was appropriated just a year ago. That is an overall reduction of 6 percent.

Some 42 percent of this bill is allocated to family housing, for a total of $3.9 billion, so this includes new construction, improvement in existing housing, and funding for operation and maintenance of housing.

The base realignment and closure part of the bill accounts for 23 percent of our total funding, about $2.1 billion. Yes, there is talk of another round of BRAC, and I want to tell my colleagues that base closure does take up a lot of funds. This encompasses funding for environmental cleanup of the closing of those bases and for the construction of new BRAC-related facilities.

Mr. President, I continue to be concerned about the growing cost of the environmental cleanup of our BRAC installations. These costs frequently continue long after the base is closed. In some way or another we have to get a handle on that cost. But right now it seems like it is almost impossible to do.

We strongly protect the quality-of-life initiatives. We provide $724 million for barracks, $32 million for child development centers, $163 million for hospital and medical facilities.

We provide a total of $640 million for guard and reserve components, a reduction of $100 million from the Senate-passed bill. Overall, this represents an increase of $290 million from the President's budget request. Many of those projects will enhance our readiness and mission capabilities of our reserve and guard forces. I have to say, they are vital in the overall national defense scheme. It seems like every year when the budget comes down from the administration, those two parts of our military complex are forgotten about.

I thank my ranking member, Senator MURRAY of Washington State, for her assistance and support through this process. She and her staff have been extremely cooperative. I also want to commend our colleagues in the House, because we went through the conference, and I think it is a good lesson on get your work done before you go and it makes it a lot easier when coming to an understanding and bringing all the minds together.

I commend this product to the Senate. I recommend that it be signed by the President without modification.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I am pleased to strongly support and recommend to the Senate this military construction appropriations conference report. The final amount, $9.18 billion, is slightly below the Senate-passed amount, and is about $800 million above the budget request. Nevertheless, it is a frugal bill, some $600 million, or 6 percent below last year's appropriated amount.

We have added $800 million to the bill to correct what the subcommittee perceived to be serious shortfalls in quality-of-life initiatives particularly housing and also including child care centers and medical facilities, as well as what has been the annual shortchanging of our guard and reserve forces. In particular, the budget request was for approximately $172 million for our guard and reserve forces, and the conference result was about $460 million, some $290 million over the request. I would point out that the Senate conferees reduced the Senate-passed figure for our guard and reserve forces by over $100 million in order to reach an acceptable compromise with the House.

In the housing area, the conferees added some $210 million over the requested amount, for a total of $3.9 billion, or 42 percent of the total bill. Even so, the committee ended up approximately $250 million below last year's appropriated amount.

Furthermore, the committee worked to satisfy the request of Senators on both sides of the aisle for worthy projects that were not included in the request, and I believe we ended up with a very balanced recommendation.

I do hope that the President will support the bill as passed, and not disturb the balance that we carefully constructed to satisfy the needs of our Nation from coast to coast.

Mr. President, I would point out to my colleagues that the conference report protected all the design, minor construction, and reporting initiatives that we included in the Senate report, so my colleagues may be assured that those initiatives which were included in the Senate report have been preserved.

Fully 23 percent of the bill is for the base realignment and closure accounts, and we have included $153 million for NATO initiatives. I would point out, however, that the Senate report includes a requirement for a report on future costs of NATO expansion, as well as a burden-sharing report regarding our initiatives in Southwest Asia. The committee expects these requirements to be taken seriously and to have a full report from the Department of Defense on these matters.

I am particularly pleased that the conference was able to retain the funding that we included in the Senate-passed bill for new quality-of-life initiatives in Washington, in particular a new library/education center at Fairchild Air Force Base, a barracks replacement at Fort Lewis, health clinics at Fort Lewis and Everett Naval Station, an expansion of an important dining facility and a new child development center at Bremerton Naval Shipyard, and housing at Whidbey Island Naval Air Station.

I thank the distinguished Senator from Montana, Senator BURNS, for the excellent cooperation that he has extended to me throughout this process. I want to thank him for all of his courtesies and for the congenial and cooperative way that his staff, particularly Ms. Ashworth, has extended to all of us. We have enjoyed working with them and all their staff. And I thank Dick D'Amato, from my staff, and Ben McMakin for a job well done.