a Republican task force, commissioned by then-minority leader Senator DOLE and chaired by former Senator Warren Rudman, drew similar conclusions.

This bipartisan agreement allowed Congress to quickly pass sweeping legislation to begin easing the pain of defense cutbacks and to help our cold war veterans beat swords into plowshares.

In the area of base closures, I am very pleased to report that success stories are just beginning to arise in many communities across our country. I would like to highlight a few.

At Chase Field in Beeville, TX, 1,500 jobs have now been created since the base closed in 1993. Pease Air Force Base in Portsmouth, NH, has created 1,000 new jobs since it closed in 1991. England Air Force Base in Alexandria, LA, has created over 600 new jobs due in large part to the J.B. Hunt Trucking Co.'s decision to use the old runways to train truck drivers.

I might add as a personal note, Mr. President, that the J.B. Hunt Trucking Co., proudly, is an Arkansas-based firm.

Each of these communities is learning that the loss of a military base can often bring opportunities for growth and renewed economic activity. They worked hard to achieve these results. They deserve tremendous credit.

In each of these cases, however, our defense reinvestment programs are helping these communities rebound. Congressionally approved funds for planning grants, worker retraining, environmental cleanup, infrastructure, aviation improvements, and other necessary measures are helping these towns prepare for their future and replace lost military jobs.

Without this assistance, base closure communities would not be able to rebound and find new work. But Congress and this administration provided the necessary support for our defense reinvestment programs. These are good investments, and they are just now beginning to bear fruit in base closure communities across our country.

The same can be said of our technology reinvestment programs that are focusing today on boosting American competitiveness in the private sector by integrating our military and civilian technology sectors. These programs are vital to our economic security, and as a result, are vital to our national security. They are certainly worthy of congressional support.

I am so deeply concerned by the recent statements by some of our colleagues in Congress who are suggesting these programs are pork, that they are a waste of money, and that they are in some way damaging our ability to fight and win future wars.

I truly hope, Mr. President, that our 11 new colleagues in the Senate do not share this view. I would like to caution my new colleagues, and the Senate as a whole, against turning a cold shoulder to the men, the women, the communities, and the companies that fought and won the cold war. We have only begun to see the results of our wise investments.

Mr. President, we are about to enter the base closing season once again. When the Commission submits its final list, workers and communities in our States will suddenly be thrown into economic downturn and in some cases economic despair. When this occurs, these defense reinvestment programs will not appear wasteful. Rather, they will be a helping hand to our communities' economic recovery efforts.

It is my sincere hope that this base closure round, with the pain and economic trauma that it is expected to bring, will once again underscore the importance of helping beat swords into plowshares.

Mr. President, last evening I had a visit with Senator SAM NUNN, the ranking member of the Senate Armed Services Committee. We have decided, Mr. President, to invite Defense Secretary Bill Perry to come to Capitol Hill shortly following the Clinton administration's budget submission to brief any and all interested Members of the Senate on the importance of funding these defense reinvestment programs. Secretary Perry strongly believes that these programs are worthy of our support, and I am proud to join with Senator NUNN in setting up this forum in which Secretary Perry can come forward and answer our questions about these particular programs and why they should be supported in Congress.

I encourage my colleagues, both Republicans and Democrats, to attend this particular briefing, the time and place of which will be announced soon.

Mr. President, I thank the Chair for recognizing me. I yield the floor. I see no other Senators on the floor; therefore, 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. BIDEN. 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. BIDEN. Mr. President, parliamentary inquiry, are we in morning business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. We are.

Mr. BIDEN. Mr. President, it is my understanding—I ask unanimous consent I be able to proceed to speak in morning business for 20 minutes.

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

OPPORTUNITY, PROMISE, AND ''THE BELL CURVE''

Mr. BIDEN. Mr. President, during a too short ministry among us of Martin Luther King, Jr., he spoke very eloquently, with great insight and I believe with profound wisdom, on many aspects of American life. He taught us about the promise of equality and about the meaning of community and about the greatness of our human potential. But of all the many things that Dr. King taught us—and we just memorialized his birthday the beginning of this week—of all the things he taught us, one in particular has held much meaning for me, particularly in recent months. And that is the standard he set for human behavior and the qualities he identified as being the true measure of humanity.

Dr. King challenged us, in his words, to ''rise above the narrow confines of our individualistic concerns to the broader concerns of all humanity.''

He reminded us that one of the true standards of success is ''the quality of our service and relationship to humanity,'' not, as he put it, ''the index of our salaries or the size of our automobiles.'' Dr. King's standard for humankind, set by him, was a very high one. To take responsibility not only for ourselves but for others as well, to take our guide—more as our guide a moral and rich vision of ourselves and the community of man. In this way he challenged us to become the guardians of our most precious American legacy, and that is the promise that each of us deserves: an opportunity to fulfill our potential, whatever that potential may be.

And that is what I would like to speak to this morning, and about why I am concerned that this Nation, and some of our leadership, is turning away from that promise.

The richness of Martin Luther King's vision has long inspired many Americans but today I find I need, and I believe our country needs, his inspiration even more. For today we hear increasingly from those who speak of human potential, not with hope but with hopelessness; whose voices do not celebrate the strength of community, but echo the fear of diversity; and who would abandon the fundamental American principle of equal opportunity to the long discredited notions of superiority and inferiority.

Today we hear from those who confuse the lack of opportunity with the inability to achieve.

Let me say that again. I think today we are hearing from too many people who confuse the lack of opportunity a person has with the inability of that person to achieve.

Today, we have a new chorus of voices whose sense of community extends no further than those just like themselves and who dismiss the potential of others who are different from themselves. Today those voices are drawing support from a book called ''The Bell Curve,'' the new intellectual sophistry, engaged in, as it has been over the past two centuries in this country, to justify an agenda that is abhorrent, in my view, to American principles.

This book attempts to persuade us with the language of science to forget about hope, to forget opportunity, to forget the power of new challenges and the promise of an inspired mind; to forget, indeed, the very principles on

which this Nation was forged. ''The Bell Curve'' tells us that our genes guide us toward a life of fulfillment or condemn us to a life of emptiness, and that we can do nothing to change our destiny. This book, written by the conservative social critic Charles Murray, and the late Harvard psychologist, Richard Herrnstein, essentially asserts three propositions. And I acknowledge in the brevity of time I will not do full justice to the propositions.

The first of those propositions asserted is that intelligence can be captured by a single quantitative measure, expressed as an IQ score. That is the basic premise. That we can determine the intelligence of a person by an IQ score test.

Second, that intelligence is genetically based and effectively unchangeable.

And third, that intelligence, more than any other factor, determines job performance, dependency on welfare, rates of birth and illegitimacy, crime, and other social behavior.

They are the three basic assertions in this book, among others. In other words, these modern day Social Darwinists posit that differences in what various races achieve result from genetic makeup alone, not from environmental factors, and that they cannot be changed.

Think about the consequences for this country if we adopt that proposition.

So the authors argue society should stop trying to help anybody who is not a member of their so-called intellectual or cognitive elite—that is the phrase they use: the intellectual and cognitive elite.

The science of ''The Bell Curve,'' I believe, and I will at a later date speak to this, has been widely and convincingly attacked on many levels by other experts, intellectuals, psychologists, and psychiatrists. First, many scientists have pointed out that it is widely disputed whether there is such a thing as intelligence quotient, IQ, a single figure that can quantify intellectual capacity, let alone measure creativity or originality or other productive talents.

Second, critics of ''The Bell Curve,'' the scientific critics, have pointed to all of the existing evidence that IQ scores can be improved, that they are not fixed, that they are not immutable. I ask the parents who may be listening, go look at the IQ test your children took when they entered first grade or second grade. Then, if they have had a good education, look at the IQ test they take as they enter high school. You will find a difference. It is changeable as a consequence of opportunity and exposure and education.

Indeed, even ''The Bell Curve'' authors acknowledge that improved nutrition—improved nutrition, not education—raises IQ: Nutrition.

Finally, scientists have rebutted the notion that IQ scores are a predictive of a life of accomplishment. They have identified ''The Bell Curve'' psychometrics as the latest incarnation of the discredited pseudoscience of eugenics. Remember back in the 1920's? I remember studying this when I was in undergraduate school. There was a school that talked about whether or not—all you had to do was measure the circumference of the skull and you could determine whether or not someone had an intellectual capacity that was inferior or superior. While these so-called researchers measured the circumference of a skull in a similarly perverse effort to justify racial discrimination in the 1920's, we now have those who have a different way of doing the same thing. That is, just measure the IQ and you have a determinative of everything that is going to happen to that young child.

You young pages here, if we measure your IQ and you have a high IQ and cognitive ability—and I am sure you all do—then in fact you are marked for success. If you have an average IQ or lower IQ, you are in trouble according to the authors of ''The Bell Curve.''

But it seems to me that exposing the weakness of the authors' science, which I have not done fully and I will over a period of the next 6 months, while necessary, is not sufficient. It seems to me that Dr. King taught us that what is wrong with the conclusions of the authors of ''The Bell Curve'' goes far beyond the errors of their scholarship or the weakness of their science.

It seems to me that the basic premise of what we all celebrated in Dr. King's birthday this week is that Dr. King teaches us that the view of humanity purveyed by those who speak the language of ''The Bell Curve'' is bankrupt because they ignore the very characteristics that Dr. King knew mark the true measure of humanity.

The definition of human value was richer by far than mere IQ, or even of intelligence more broadly conceived and measured. Dr. King told us that:

> Everybody can be great. Because anybody can serve.
>
> You don't have to have a college degree to serve. You don't have to make your subject and your verb agree to serve. You don't have to know about Plato and Aristotle to serve.
>
> You don't have to know Einstein's theory of relativity to serve. You don't have to know the second theory of thermodynamics in physics to serve.
>
> You only need a heart full of grace. A soul generated by love.

Dr. King's words teach us to think more broadly of human achievement:

To think about those achievements that depend on generosity, on thoughtfulness, on sacrifice, on respect for others;

To think about those that depend on creativity and originality: the most inspired painting, the most soothing melody, the most piercing wit, the most graceful dance, the most insightful social commentary, the most unexpected athletic achievement.

In other words, we must be guided by the very things that make life most worth living, when we seek to measure human achievement.

Is not the acknowledged reality of achievement more important than the mere abstraction of I.Q., particularly when we recognize that statistical abstraction—by its very nature—lends itself all too readily to misconstruction in the service of narrow-minded mischief.

Of course, achievement built on talent, discipline and a sense of moral obligation can not be weighed and measured on an arithmetical scale.

Indeed, as each generation finds new ways to outperform the last, we learn how futile it is to place limits on human accomplishment, and how foolish we would be to forget that our potential is as great as our imagination.

In this way, Dr. King spoke to the first fallacy of ''The Bell Curve''—

> The notion that human intelligence, much less human worth, is so narrow and pinched as to mean only what can be measured by an I.Q. score.

Even more importantly, Dr. King warned us that ''intelligence is not enough''; rather, he said, we must strive for what he called ''intelligence plus character.''

Because, as he reminded us, ''the most dangerous criminal may be the man gifted with reason but with no morals.''

King saw that intelligence divorced from morality is worth little.

As an undergraduate at Morehouse College, he wrote that the segregationist former Georgia Governor, Eugene Talmadge,

> possessed one of the better minds of Georgia, or even America * * * he wore the Phi Beta Kappa key.
>
> By all measuring rods, Mr. Talmadge could think critically and intensively; yet he contended that I am an inferior being * * *.

''What did he use all that precious knowledge for?''—King asked. ''To accomplish what?''

''To accomplish what?''

Thus, Dr. King spoke to the second fallacy of ''The Bell Curve.''

> The notion that intelligence uninformed by morality can create a worthy woman or man.

Only an immoral person, no matter how intelligent, could ever think it acceptable to judge another on the basis of his or her membership in a group.

King taught us that no one has the right to say that another's fate should be—or can be—enslaved by the color of his or her skin, or by the nature of his or her religious beliefs, or by the origins of his or her ancestors, or by the wealth of his or her family.

Dr. King understood that there are real differences among individuals.

But for him, those differences reflected the richness of the human condition, they were an accepted part of the greater community of man—not a reason for division, and never an excuse for relegating whole groups of people to a permanent underclass.

He urged each of us, whatever our talents, to accept responsibility for

ourselves and to strive for excellence. He said:

If it falls to your lot to be a street sweeper, sweep streets like Michelangelo painted pictures, like Shakespeare wrote poetry, like Beethoven composed music;

Sweep streets so well that all the host of heaven and earth will have to pause and say, ''here lived a great street sweeper, who swept his job well.

Of course, he also know what artificial barriers could do to limit individual achievement.

He knew that the street sweeper was dealt his hand not solely by the configuration of his DNA, but was the product of a complex tangle of forces shaped by families, by communities, by social and economic systems—and by government.

Dr. King's great struggle, first for civil rights and later for economic justice, was itself a testament to his conviction that people of all races, colors, creeds, and religions deserve an equal chance to achieve their potential—an equal chance, a level playing field.

And so we come to the third fallacy of ''The Bell Curve'': that all people stand today on a level playing field, free to reach their potential, because implicit in the book and those who are espousing its principles is that there is already a level playing field.

The reality, of course, is that we have not yet achieved a society where all people enjoy equal opportunity.

Instead we remain a society where too many minds are stifled by poverty, paralyzed by violence, stunted by poor education, starved by poor nutrition, and diseased by unsanitary housing.

We need only look around us to see how much such deprivation costs us as a society, and we need only listen to Martin Luther King to understand that we can not—indeed, we must not—promise anyone an easy way out.

Dr. King never promised to make it easier on anyone—he sought equal opportunity for all people, but he knew it was up to each individual to seize the challenge.

By assuming personal responsibility, by preparing for the hard work opportunity demands, by striving for excellence in every endeavor, and by dedicating achievement always to moral ends.

Martin Luther King was by no means an easy taskmaster—but he challenged our society as a whole as much as he challenged each of us as individuals.

He knew—and this is the crux of his teaching—that personal responsibility and the drive for excellence can develop and succeed only in the context of equal opportunity.

Ask yourselves: if your personal achievement was limited or blocked by prejudice or by policy.

Would you push as hard as you could to get ahead? Would you be able even to imagine your potential achievement?

Maybe the people on this floor can answer yes to that question. But I ask it another way. How many of you know people you grew up with, if you did not grow up in affluent circumstances, who are still behind, the exception being a person who makes it here or its comparable place in our society when they come from limited means? Why are there so few? Is it because we are so special, or is it because the human condition is impacted upon and one's potential is impacted upon by what is expected of them and what they are exposed to?

When individuals are stereotyped by personal prejudice or by prejudicial statistics, bleak expectations become a sober reality. And the natural talents we all possess in some measure rarely blossom in the shadows of such a circumstance. Do not think for a moment that ''The Bell Curve'' is merely an idle academic debate. The authors do not hesitate to convert their conclusions into policy recommendations, and there are many today eager to act on that advice. Indeed, their recommendations sound all too familiar to anyone listening to the current debate on education, on aid to pregnant women and children, and on efforts to respond to job discrimination, among other issues.

In short, ''the authors of the Bell Curve'' view all programs designed to level the playing field as doomed to fail, because intelligence—or more precisely, i.q.—is the only thing that matters, and it can not be changed, according to them.

Government—or private organizations, for that matter—are simply incapable of making a difference and shouldn't even try.

Now, I believe that a number of Federal programs originally intended to level. The playing field are in need of reform.

For 22 years here, I have tried to get rid of some, voted against others, and am prepared to jettison still others that I thought had a chance but have shown not to work.

Some have had unintended, detrimental consequences; all would benefit by a sharp look at what is working and can be maintained or expanded, and at what is not working and should be jettisoned.

But that is beside the point to the authors of ''The Bell Curve,'' because their attack is aimed at the very concept that Government should try to ensure equal opportunity to all our citizens. The authors argue that we should end, not reform, but end such efforts by Government.

The authors say their recommendations are intended to prevent what they see as the inevitable end of the road we are on, a ''custodial'' state, something like a ''high-technology Indian reservation,'' where the permanent underclass is minimally fed and housed.

To their credit, the authors say they want to avoid this nightmare vision, but what they recommend is obviously insufficient on a practical level and entirely unacceptable on a moral one.

First, the authors suggest that we abandon our efforts to create the equality of condition among all people that our Founding Fathers believed was a self-evident human heritage.

Indeed, they suggest we return to ''an older intellectual tradition,'' unburdened by our historic American belief that ''all men are created equal.''

Instead of trying to ensure equal opportunity so that every person has a fair chance of success, they say we should simply focus on improving the fabric of family and community.

They suggest that we return a wide range of social functions to neighborhoods or municipalities, to improve our sense of community.

They propose that we should simplify Government regulations that make it more complicated for people to function—rules governing education, taxes, Government assistance, to name a few.

They recommend reforming the criminal justice system to make it simpler to know what is a criminal offense and what is the sanction for it.

And they suggest reemphasizing the unique legal status of marriage, as the only relationship with legal benefits, as well as legal obligations. I do not necessarily quarrel with these practical recommendations; it seems to me that some of them may well be worth pursuing.

What I do quarrel with—and vehemently so—is the idea that we, as a society, should give up what has been a bedrock principle of our Nation: that all men are created equal, and thereby abandon any idea that Government has a role in seeing that no one is denied an equal opportunity to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

Government cannot manipulate people's heredity, and it should not attempt to do so, but I believe a moral government can—and must—pursue policies that treat every person as a resource.

If low IQ's are the problem, why not try to raise them, through better nutrition, which the authors of ''The Bell Curve'' acknowledge does make a difference?

If the fabric of families is torn, why not focus on programs that enable them to mend themselves—

Programs that keep children from going hungry, that help young people get off and stay off drugs;

That keep the streets safe so local businesses can flourish and families can get to and from work and school;

Programs that help new factories open and train and retrain our workers for new jobs.

As we consider this challenge, we should remember what Martin Luther King never forgot—that opportunity is not a substitute for personal responsibility.

New ideas are being proposed that build on the twin pillars of opportunity and responsibility, and new programs are being tested in communities across

the Nation, such as housing and transportation programs that help minorities move out of ghettos and buy their own homes.

If the positive effects of Head Start fade out several years after children leave the program, why eliminate Head Start rather than improve the rest of the education system to extend its success?

If answers tried in the past have failed, it means we should try new answers, not give up on the problem. As a government—and as a society—our policies must have a moral dimension:

They must respect the value of each individual, and never dismiss anyone or any group of people as unworthy of a fair chance.

Shredding the social safety net will not avert a crisis; in my view, it only propels us ever faster toward crisis.

It will swell the divisions between rich and poor; it will lead to more racial animosity and ethnic hatred; it will sacrifice the dream—the very American dream of Martin Luther King, who foresaw a day when his four children would, in his words,

> Live in a nation where they will not be judged by the color of their skin, but by the content of their character.

He spoke of a ''beloved community,'' his vision of an America living in racial harmony, where individuals judge each other on individual merit and achievement; where values triumph over charts, graphs, and stereotypes; where all people are nourished and expected to succeed.

This is a vision of a moral society—the kind of society our forefathers saw as their bequest to the Nation—and it stands in stark contrast to the custodial state envisioned in ''The Bell Curve.''

Fulfilling Dr. King's vision of a beloved community, founded on both individual responsibility and equal opportunity—a community that rewards achievement and places barriers before no one—has always been and remains today the foremost challenge for American society.

Martin Luther King understood that better, perhaps, than any other American of this century, and we can offer him no greater memorial today—we can offer ourselves no greater assurance of maintaining our American heritage—than by rejecting both the arguments and the conclusions of ''The Bell Curve'' in favor of that ''beloved community'' for which Martin Luther King, Jr., lived and died.

Mr. ASHCROFT. Mr. President, I yield the distinguished Senator from Tennessee 7½ minutes of my time.

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

The Senator from Tennessee is recognized.

(The remarks of Mr. THOMPSON, Mr. ASHCROFT, and Mr. BOND, pertaining to the introduction of Senate Joint Resolution 21 are located in today's RECORD under ''Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.'')

ORDER OF PROCEDURE

Mr. LIEBERMAN addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. LIEBERMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I be allowed an opportunity to speak for up to 10 minutes that I was provided for in morning business, and that the time for resumption of consideration of S. 1 and the corresponding time for a vote on amendments that have been set down be moved up accordingly.

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

WELCOME SENATOR ASHCROFT

Mr. LIEBERMAN. Thank you, Mr. President.

Mr. President, before our new colleague from Missouri leaves the floor I want to add my welcome. I do so with a personal sense of pride and pleasure because he and I were classmates together at college. It gives me great pride to see him join Members here.

The Chair will no doubt hold this revelation against the Senator from Missouri and me, but in any case, he was an honorable, decent, intelligent person when I knew him back more years than I will state for the record. I know he brings those talents with him here and beyond. As the senior Senator said, he is a person of extraordinary faith and comes here not only with great talent but with an appropriate spirit and a religious sense of humility. We could use that around here. I look forward to working with him in the years ahead.

Mr. President, I thank the Chair.

(The remarks of Mr. LIEBERMAN pertaining to the introduction of S. 246 are located in today's RECORD under ''Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.'')

Mr. LIEBERMAN. I yield the floor.

WAS CONGRESS IRRESPONSIBLE? THE VOTERS SAID ''YES''

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, anyone even remotely familiar with the U.S. Constitution knows that no President can spend a dime of Federal tax money that has not first been authorized and appropriated by Congress, both the House of Representatives and the U.S. Senate.

So when you hear a politician or an editor or a commentator declare that ''Reagan ran up the Federal debt'' or that ''Bush ran it up,'' bear in mind that it was, and is, the constitutional duty of Congress to control Federal spending. We'd better get busy correcting this because Congress has failed miserably to do it for about 50 years.

The fiscal irresponsibility of Congress has created a Federal debt which stood at $4,806,933,452,098.25 as of the close of business Wednesday, January 10. Averaged out, every man, woman, and child in America owes a share of this massive debt, and that per capita share is $18,247.20.

MARIO CUOMO AND COMMON SENSE

Mr. HOLLINGS. Mr. President, the wail and cry around Washington today is similar to what we heard 14 years ago when President Reagan came to town—get rid of the Government, downsize, the Government is the enemy. Today, like 14 years ago, the game to blame Government sounds good to many voters across the land. But look at the reality that has been inflicted on our country by 12 years of Republican rule—a deficit that is exploding and a debt that has more than quadrupled. The return of this feel-good kind of blaming in Washington is what Mario Cuomo related in his last official talk as Governor of New York. As he told reporters at the National Press Club on December 17, 1994, the game being played is ''deja voodoo'' and return to ''plastic populism.''

Government is not an evil that the Founding Fathers thrust upon the people. Government in its best form is a means to provide economic opportunity, create jobs, and rebuild our American standard of living. It is time for all of us to work together to rebuild America, instead of only harping, squawking, and howling at the Moon.

Mr. President, I urge my colleagues to read and study this talk by Governor Cuomo. He speaks commonsense truths that are rooted in reality. As he says, we need a cure for our problems not a simple reaffirmation of the disease. We have to fix what is broken, but not break what works. To that end, I ask unanimous consent that his talk be reported in its entirety in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the talk was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS OF GOV. MARIO CUOMO AT THE NATIONAL PRESS CLUB, DECEMBER 16, 1994

Governor CUOMO. Thank you very much. Thank you very much. There are a lot of things I wanted to say immediately, just in quick response to Gil Klein's introduction. I—the truth about 1992 was that Klein, or somebody like him, just before that plane took off, over the wire came a story in which I was referred to as a consummate liberal. And that did it. I decided to stay behind in New York State. (Laughter.)

And I must say this—although I was going to say nothing at all, because I don't want to use the 25 minutes they gave me—there's a lot I do want to tell you. I did note with some interest that the two biggest laughs from this rather difficult looking groups were for the postmaster general and Dan Quayle. (Laughter.)

I am going to do something unusual now in this, what appears I think to be the last time I'll be able to speak as a public official, because nothing is going to happen over the next couple of weeks—and that didn't strike me until I sat down and started making some notes. But maybe especially because it is the last opportunity—there is a whole lot I want to get in. And because of that I'll stay close to my notes, closer than I usually do—and I'll rush a bit, if you don't mind, because