

ADDRESS BY SENATOR ROBERT MORGAN
TO THE NORTH CAROLINA SCHOOL FOOD
SERVICE ASSOCIATION'S ANNUAL BANQUET
CHARLOTTE, NORTH CAROLINA
JUNE 22, 1978

SOME THOUGHTS ON THE NEED FOR A STRONG
CHILD NUTRITION POLICY

IT IS A PLEASURE FOR ME TO APPEAR BEFORE YOU TO DISCUSS
SOME OF MY THOUGHTS ON THE NEED FOR A STRONG CHILD NUTRITION
POLICY. THE POLICIES AND PROGRAMS THAT OUR NATION HAS ARE, AT
BEST, NOT FULLY INTEGRATED INTO A MEANINGFUL CHILD NUTRITION
POLICY. WE HAVE, AT PRESENT, THE MAKINGS OF SUCH A POLICY. WE
HAVE A STRONG, BUT INCOMPLETE, SCHOOL LUNCH PROGRAM. WE ALSO
HAVE A SCHOOL BREAKFAST PROGRAM AND THE BEGINNINGS OF A NUTRITION
EDUCATION EFFORT. BUT THE CIRCLE IS NOT COMPLETE. WHILE THE
PROGRAMS MENTIONED ABOVE REPRESENT A POSITIVE FORCE IN THE LIVES
OF OUR CHILDREN, THERE ARE NEGATIVE FORCES PULLING IN THE OPPOSITE
DIRECTION, ONE OF THE MOST IMPORTANT BEING TELEVISION ADVERTISING

DIRECTED AT CHILDREN.

WHILE I WOULD LIKE TO SPEND SOME OF MY TIME TALKING ABOUT THE NEED FOR AN OVERALL CHILD NUTRITION POLICY, I WILL PAY ESPECIALLY CLOSE ATTENTION TO A MATTER OF MUCH INTEREST TO EACH OF YOU, THE SCHOOL LUNCH PROGRAM. BUT BEFORE I START ON THIS SPECIFIC SUBJECT, IT WOULD BE USEFUL TO TALK BRIEFLY ABOUT WHERE THESE PROGRAMS FIT INTO THE GENERAL PICTURE OF FEDERAL PROGRAMS AND THE FEDERAL BUDGET. THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT HAS SEVERAL NUTRITION PROGRAMS OF WHICH THE SCHOOL-CENTERED CHILD NUTRITION PROGRAMS ARE A SIGNIFICANT PART. THIS YEAR THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT WILL SPEND AN ESTIMATED \$2.8 BILLION DOLLARS ON THE FOOD PROGRAMS THAT ARE OPERATED IN CONJUNCTION WITH SCHOOLS. THIS AMOUNT IS LESS THAN ONE-HALF OF ONE PERCENT OF THE FEDERAL BUDGET FOR THE COMING YEAR. IN FACT, THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT WILL SPEND MORE MONEY

IN TWO DAYS THAN IT WILL COST TO RUN THESE PROGRAMS FOR AN ENTIRE YEAR. WHILE THIS EXPENDITURE MAY SEEM LARGE IN ABSOLUTE TERMS -- AND IT IS -- IT MUST ALSO BE POINTED OUT THAT THIS PROGRAM FEEDS NEARLY 27 MILLION CHILDREN EVERY DAY OF THE SCHOOL YEAR, CHILDREN WHO MAY NOT OTHERWISE HAVE THE OPPORTUNITY FOR A HOT, NUTRITIOUS LUNCH.

Now these programs did not just happen. They have been the result of much hard work by organizations' such as yours, parent-teacher associations, and farm groups. These programs did not fully develop until after World War II, a time when our society became increasingly mobile and less family-oriented. I am not saying that we could ever go back to the days that preceded World War II. As much as I would like to return to these more simple days, that is unrealistic. We must live in the world of

TODAY AND TOMORROW, AND CONCERN OURSELVES WITH SPENDING TIME AND ENERGY ON SOLVING MODERN PROBLEMS. THE NATIONAL SCHOOL LUNCH ACT, WHICH WAS PASSED IN 1946, WAS JUST THAT--A MODERN RESPONSE TO A MODERN PROBLEM.

THE NATIONAL SCHOOL LUNCH ACT OF 1946 WAS NOT THE FIRST NUTRITION EFFORT IN THIS COUNTRY. PREVIOUSLY, LOCAL GOVERNMENTS AND PRIVATE CHARITIES WERE DEEPLY INVOLVED IN FEEDING HUNGRY SCHOOL CHILDREN. MUCH OF THIS EFFORT DATED BACK TO THE EARLY 1900'S AND THE INFLUENTIAL BOOK HUNGER BY ROBERT HUNTER. HUNTER'S WORDS WERE POIGNANT, BOTH THEN AND NOW. LET ME QUOTE: "...THE POVERTY OF ANY FAMILY IS LIKELY TO BE MOST SERIOUS AT THE VERY TIME WHEN THE CHILDREN MOST NEED NURTURE, WHEN THEY ARE MOST DEPENDENT, AND WHEN THEY ARE OBTAINING THE ONLY EDUCATION WHICH THEY ARE EVER TO RECEIVE. GUIDANCE AND SUPERVISION OF THE PARENTS

ARE IMPOSSIBLE BECAUSE THEY MUST WORK; THE NURTURE IS INSUFFICIENT BECAUSE THERE ARE TOO MANY MOUTHS TO FEED; LEARNING IS DIFFICULT BECAUSE HUNGRY STOMACHS AND LANGUID BODIES AND THIN BLOOD ARE NOT ABLE TO FEED THE BRAIN. THE LACK OF LEARNING AMONG SO MANY POOR CHILDREN IS CERTAINLY DUE, TO AN IMPORTANT EXTENT, TO THIS CAUSE."

HUNTER CONTINUES: "IT IS UTTER FOLLY, FROM THE POINT OF VIEW OF LEARNING, TO HAVE A COMPULSORY SCHOOL LAW WHICH COMPELS CHILDREN, IN THAT WEAK PHYSICAL AND MENTAL STATE WHICH RESULTS FROM POVERTY, TO DRAG THEMSELVES TO SCHOOL TO SIT AT THEIR DESKS, DAY IN AND DAY OUT, FOR SEVERAL YEARS, LEARNING LITTLE OR NOTHING. IF IT IS A MATTER OF PRINCIPLE IN DEMOCRATIC AMERICA THAT EVERY CHILD SHALL BE GIVEN A CERTAIN AMOUNT OF INSTRUCTION, LET US RENDER IT POSSIBLE FOR THEM TO RECEIVE IT, AS MONARCHIAL COUNTRIES HAVE DONE, BY MAKING FULL AND ADEQUATE PROVISION FOR THE PHYSICAL NEEDS OF THE CHILDREN WHO COME FROM THE HOMES OF POVERTY."

HUNTER'S WORDS, ALMOST SINGLEHANDEDLY, SET THE NATION IN MOTION. VARIOUS GROUPS--WOMENS' GROUPS, LABOR UNIONS, AND CIVIC ORGANIZATIONS--BEGAN TO DEVELOP PROGRAMS AT THE LOCAL LEVEL. UNFORTUNATELY, THE CONGRESS WAS NOT AS RESPONSIVE. AT THAT TIME, IT WAS THOUGHT THAT A NATIONAL SCHOOL LUNCH PROGRAM WOULD BE CENTERED IN THE CITIES AND THAT SUCH A PROGRAM WOULD DRIVE RURAL POOR INTO THE ALREADY CROWDED CITIES. MEANWHILE, CITIES SUCH AS PHILADELPHIA, BOSTON, MILWAUKEE, ST. LOUIS AND CINCINNATI, AMONG MANY OTHERS, DEVELOPED PROGRAMS TO BRING CHILDREN PROPER NUTRITION DURING THE SCHOOL DAY.

AS ONE MIGHT EXPECT, RURAL SCHOOLS HAD SPECIAL PROBLEMS.

ALMOST WITHOUT EXCEPTION THERE WAS NO ROOM AVAILABLE FOR SETTING UP A KITCHEN AND DINING AREA TO PROVIDE WARM LUNCHES FOR CHILDREN.

RURAL CHILDREN TRAVELLED LONG DISTANCES TO SCHOOLS, OFTEN WITH

ONLY COLD SANDWICHES OF DUBIOUS NUTRITIONAL VALUE. IT WAS THE
INGENUITY OF INDIVIDUAL TEACHERS WHO MET THE NEED IN MANY PLACES.
CHILDREN TOOK TURNS IN BRINGING DIFFERENT DISHES WHICH WERE
WARMED OVER THE STOVES WHICH HEATED THE SCHOOL ROOM.

THE 1930s BROUGHT THE GREAT DEPRESSION, A PERIOD WHICH
IMPOVERISHED MILLIONS OF AMERICANS. FORTUNATELY, AMERICA WAS
MORE DOLLAR SHORT THAN IT WAS FOOD SHORT. PRESIDENT ROOSEVELT
DEvised A COMMON SENSE PLAN FOR ADDRESSING THIS PROBLEM. THE
PRESIDENT DIRECTED THE USDA TO PURCHASE SURPLUS FARM COMMODITIES,
WHICH HAD DEPRESSED FARM PRICES, AND DIRECTED THAT THESE COMMODITIES
BE MADE AVAILABLE TO SCHOOLS FOR A LUNCH PROGRAM. THIS PROGRAM
WAS THE BEGINNING OF THE COMMODITY DISTRIBUTION PROGRAM THAT
CONTINUES TODAY AS PART OF OUR SCHOOL LUNCH PROGRAM.

BY THE END OF WORLD WAR II, ADEQUATE POLITICAL SUPPORT HAD DEVELOPED FOR A NATIONAL SCHOOL LUNCH PROGRAM. IN 1946, CONGRESS MANDATED A PERMANENT SCHOOL LUNCH PROGRAM. SINCE THEN, WITH ENCOURAGEMENT OF YOUR ORGANIZATION AND OTHER CIVIC GROUPS, INCLUDING FARMERS, CONGRESS HAS DEVELOPED THIS PROGRAM INTO A TRULY COMPREHENSIVE NATIONAL EFFORT. TODAY, THIS PROGRAM FEEDS 27 MILLION CHILDREN DAILY IN VIRTUALLY EVERY PUBLIC AND NONPROFIT PRIVATE SCHOOL IN THE COUNTRY. THIS PROGRAM IS TRULY A STRONG EXAMPLE OF HOW PUBLIC NEEDS, WHICH CANNOT NORMALLY BE MET WITH THROUGH OUR SYSTEM OF FREE ENTERPRISE, CAN BE EFFECTIVELY DEALT WITH BY THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT.

TODAY, THE SCHOOL LUNCH PROGRAM OFFERS SUBSIDIZED LUNCHES TO ALL CHILDREN, REGARDLESS OF INCOME, AND FREE OR REDUCED PRICE LUNCHES TO CHILDREN OF POOR FAMILIES. CONGRESS HAS NOT ONLY

ACTED TO IMPROVE THIS IMPORTANT PROGRAM OVER THE PAST THREE DECADES, BUT IT HAS ALSO ACTED TO CREATE A SCHOOL BREAKFAST PROGRAM. THIS PROGRAM IS ESPECIALLY INTERESTING TO ME, NOT ONLY FOR ITS POTENTIAL, WHICH IS LARGE, BUT ALSO IN THE WAY IN WHICH IT WAS CREATED. AS MANY OF YOU KNOW, THIS PROGRAM WAS BEGUN IN 1966 AS A SERIES OF PILOT PROJECTS. BY ADOPTING A PILOT APPROACH, CONGRESS WAS IN A BETTER POSITION TO ESTABLISH THE EFFECTIVENESS OF THIS PROGRAM.

IN THIS SESSION OF CONGRESS, WE ARE CURRENTLY DEBATING HOW MUCH THIS PROGRAM SHOULD BE EXPANDED. THE SENATE HAS A BILL, S. 3085, THE CHILD NUTRITION AMENDMENTS OF 1978, WHICH WOULD EXTEND THE BREAKFAST PROGRAM SUBSTANTIALLY TO SERVE MORE THAN THE 2.5 MILLION STUDENTS IT REACHES TODAY. I WILL SUPPORT THIS LEGISLATION IN SOME FORM, PRIMARILY BECAUSE OF THE HIGH PERCENTAGE

OF WORKING MOTHERS THAT WE HAVE IN NORTH CAROLINA.

IN THIS PAST SESSION OF CONGRESS, WE ENACTED SOME MAJOR REFORMS WHICH OFFER GREAT PROMISE. THE MOST IMPRESSIVE OF THESE REFORMS HAS TO DO WITH A NEW NUTRITION EDUCATION PROGRAM. THIS PROGRAM WILL PROVIDE A MEANS FOR TEACHING OUR CHILDREN PROPER NUTRITION. AT THIS TIME, IT IS TOO EARLY TO TELL HOW THE STATES WILL UTILIZE THESE FUNDS AND WHAT IMPACT THIS NEW PROGRAM WILL HAVE ON THE PLATE WASTE PROBLEM.

I AM VERY INTERESTED IN THIS PROGRAM AND I AM CAREFULLY FOLLOWING ITS DEVELOPMENT IN NORTH CAROLINA. THERE MAY BE A TENDENCY BY LOCAL ADMINISTRATORS TO VIEW THIS PROGRAM AS ANOTHER FEDERAL GIVEAWAY. THIS WILL NOT BE THE CASE IN NORTH CAROLINA. I ANTICIPATE THAT THE STATE WILL EMPLOY A DISTINGUISHED NUTRITIONIST FOR OVERSEEING THIS EDUCATIONAL EFFORT, ONE THAT WILL

BRING NORTH CAROLINA A FIRST-RATE PROGRAM. AS MANY OF YOU KNOW, THE PHILOSOPHY BEHIND THE APPROACH ADOPTED BY THE CONGRESS IS THAT THIS PROGRAM WOULD BE DEVELOPED AT THE STATE LEVEL, NOT BY EDICT FROM WASHINGTON. OUR HOPE WAS TO HAVE 50 DIFFERENT PROGRAMS. THEN, AFTER TWO YEARS, WE COULD DETERMINE WHICH PROGRAMS ARE WORTH DEVELOPING INTO A MODEL FOR THE NATION.

ANOTHER CHALLENGE BROUGHT ABOUT BY THE RECENT LEGISLATION IS THE POSSIBILITY OF CASHING OUT THE COMMODITY PROGRAMS -- PROVIDING CASH IN PLACE OF FOOD COMMODITIES. CURRENTLY, CONGRESS SPENDS ABOUT \$330 MILLION ON THIS PROGRAM WHICH PROVIDES COMMODITIES INCLUDING PEANUTS, DAIRY AND POULTRY PRODUCTS TO OUR SCHOOLS. THE IDEA BEHIND THIS APPROACH IS THAT COMMODITY DISTRIBUTION IS EXPENSIVE AND THAT SCHOOLS, IF GIVEN THE CASH, COULD DO A BETTER JOB. I DO NOT SUBSCRIBE TO THIS POINT OF VIEW. FIRST, THE USDA

CAN ACQUIRE THESE COMMODITIES AT A MUCH LESS COST THAN LOCAL SCHOOL DISTRICTS. SECOND, THESE COMMODITIES ARE SURPLUS COMMODITIES AND THE PURCHASE OF THESE PRODUCTS HELPS ALLEVIATE DEPRESSED PRICE CONDITIONS FOR FARMERS. I FULLY REALIZE THAT THERE HAVE BEEN PROBLEMS WITH THIS APPROACH, YET I REMAIN CONVINCED THAT IT MAKES MUCH BETTER SENSE THAN GOING ON A TOTALLY CASH BASIS.

THE CONGRESS ALSO ACTED LAST YEAR TO RETURN TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE THE AUTHORITY TO BAN JUNK FOOD FROM BEING SOLD ON SCHOOL GROUNDS UNTIL AFTER THE LAST CLASS PERIOD HAS ENDED. RECENTLY, THE USDA ISSUED PRELIMINARY REGULATIONS TO STOP THE SALE OF FOODS SUCH AS SODA POP AND CANDY BARS. THIS EFFORT, COMBINED WITH THE NEW NUTRITION EDUCATION PROGRAM, WILL HELP REVERSE THE SERIOUS PLATE WASTE PROBLEM THAT HAS BROUGHT SO MUCH UNFAVORABLE ATTENTION TO OUR SCHOOL LUNCH PROGRAM.

WHILE WE HAVE MADE SIGNIFICANT STRIDES IN THE PAST TEN YEARS, WE MUST DO BETTER. ONE OF THE AREAS OF IMPROVEMENT WOULD BE THE ENACTMENT OF A UNIVERSAL FREE SCHOOL LUNCH PROGRAM, WHICH I INTRODUCED. I BELIEVE, VERY STRONGLY, THAT SUCH A PROGRAM IS LONG OVERDUE. MY PHILOSOPHY REGARDING THIS PROGRAM IS VERY SIMPLE: THE SCHOOL LUNCH PROGRAM SHOULD BE AS MUCH A PART OF OUR EDUCATIONAL PROGRAM AS TEXTBOOKS AND BATS AND BALLS.

MY PROPOSAL HAS BEEN CRITICIZED BY VARIOUS INDIVIDUALS. THE OPPOSITION SAYS THAT THIS PROGRAM WOULD BE VERY EXPENSIVE. I THINK THAT THE OPPOSITE IS TRUE. THESE INDIVIDUALS SIMPLY HAVE NOT EXAMINED, AS I HAVE, THE TIME AND COST OF LOCAL SCHOOL DISTRICTS AND STATE GOVERNMENTS IN ADMINISTERING THE CURRENT PROGRAM OF FREE AND REDUCED PRICED LUNCHES. OTHERS OPPOSE THIS APPROACH ON THE GROUNDS THAT THEY DO NOT WANT TO PROVIDE THE

CHILDREN OF RICH PARENTS WITH FREE LUNCHES. MY RESPONSE TO THIS ARGUMENT IS THAT THE COSTS AND BENEFITS OF A TOTALLY FREE APPROACH WOULD BE LESS THAN THE COSTS AND BENEFITS OF THE CURRENT PROGRAM. IN ORDER TO DETERMINE WHETHER OR NOT THIS IS TRUE, I HAVE INTRODUCED LEGISLATION FOR A PILOT PROGRAM OF FREE LUNCHES. INCIDENTALLY, I NOTE THAT HOKE AND EDGECOMB COUNTIES IN NORTH CAROLINA HAVE ALREADY DETERMINED THAT SUCH AN APPROACH IS FEASIBLE AND THEY ARE RUNNING A TOTALLY FREE LUNCH PROGRAM. AT THIS TIME, I AM OPTIMISTIC THAT MY PROPOSAL WILL BE INCLUDED IN A BILL WHICH THE SENATE WILL ACT ON BY LATE SUMMER.

PERHAPS A MORE SERIOUS CHALLENGE CONCERNS LEGISLATION PENDING BEFORE THE HOUSE AND SENATE WHICH WOULD TRANSFER THE CHILD NUTRITION PROGRAMS FROM THE USDA TO A PROPOSED DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION. I WANT YOU TO KNOW THAT I INTEND TO VIGOROUSLY OPPOSE

THIS TRANSFER. THERE ARE SEVERAL REASONS FOR MY OPPOSITION.

THE FIRST IS THAT THE USDA HAS A PROVEN CAPABILITY FOR RUNNING

THESE PROGRAMS. THE SECOND REASON I HAVE IS BECAUSE STUDIES

INDICATE THAT SUCH A TRANSFER WOULD CAUSE THE PRICES OF SCHOOL

LUNCHES TO INCREASE. NOT SURPRISINGLY, RALPH NADER, HUNGER

ACTIVISTS, CATTLEMEN, PEANUT GROWERS AND YOUR ORGANIZATION HAVE

DECIDED TO OPPOSE THE TRANSFER.

I CANNOT CONCLUDE MY COMMENTS TONIGHT WITHOUT SHARING SOME

OF MY CONCERNS TO YOU ON THE PROBLEM OF FOOD ADVERTISING DIRECTED

AT CHILDREN. I AM STUNNED BY THE ADVERTISING THAT CHILDREN SEE

ON TELEVISION, ESPECIALLY THE ADVERTISING OF SUGAR-COATED CEREALS.

SOMETHING HAS TO BE DONE ABOUT THIS ADVERTISING IN THE NEAR FUTURE,

IF OUR CHILD NUTRITION PROGRAMS ARE TO MAKE SENSE. IT IS NO

WONDER THAT THE EATING HABITS OF OUR YOUNG ARE SO BAD. THE
FUNDAMENTAL ISSUE HERE IS WHETHER OR NOT CHILDREN CAN
DISTINGUISH BETWEEN ADVERTISING AND REGULAR PROGRAMMING. ALONG
THIS LINE, I WOULD LIKE TO QUOTE DR. RICHARD FEINBLOOM OF THE
HARVARD MEDICAL SCHOOL: "TO CHILDREN, NORMALLY IMPULSIVE,
ADVERTISEMENTS FOR APPEALING THINGS DEMAND IMMEDIATE GRATIFICATION.
AN ADVERTISEMENT TO A CHILD HAS THE QUALITY OF AN ORDER, NOT A
SUGGESTION."

MY PRINCIPAL CONCERN HERE HAS MORE TO DO WITH THE FACT
THAT NORTH CAROLINA IS LARGELY A RURAL STATE. NOT SURPRISINGLY,
RURAL PEOPLE TODAY ARE LARGELY DEPENDENT UPON TELEVISION AS
THEIR PRIMARY SOURCE OF INFORMATION. STUDIES HAVE SHOWN THAT
90 PERCENT OF OUR RURAL HOMES HAVE A TV, BUT ONLY A THIRD SUBSCRIBE
TO A DAILY NEWSPAPER. THEREFORE, RURAL CHILDREN ARE MUCH MORE

VULNERABLE TO ADVERTISING WHICH LEADS TO POOR NUTRITIONAL
HABITS.

Now, I AM AS CONCERNED ABOUT THE LONG ARM OF THE FEDERAL
GOVERNMENT AS YOU ARE. WE MUST KEEP IN MIND THAT TELEVISION
IS BROADCAST OVER THE PUBLIC AIRWAVES AND THAT ALL TV STATIONS
ARE LICENSED TO OPERATE IN THE PUBLIC INTEREST. IN THIS AREA,
CHILDRENS' FOOD ADVERTISING, THE TELEVISION MEDIA ARE NOT ACTING
IN THE PUBLIC INTEREST. I HAVE ENCOURAGED INDUSTRY TO CORRECT
THIS SHORTCOMING. IF THEY ARE UNWILLING, I WILL SERIOUSLY
CONSIDER INTRODUCING LEGISLATION TO REMEDY THIS PROBLEM.

MY COMMENTS IN THIS AREA WOULD NOT BE COMPLETE UNLESS I
LINKED TV ADVERTISING WITH THE PLATE WASTE PROBLEM. CLEARLY,
THERE IS A RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE TWO. WE SIMPLY CANNOT
ALLOW THIS TYPE OF ADVERTISING TO CONTINUE AND PRETEND TO HAVE

A CHILD NUTRITION POLICY.

IN MY REMARKS I HAVE TRACED THE DEVELOPMENT OF OUR PROGRAMS, TALKED ABOUT SOME OF THE PROBLEMS AND PROSPECTS, AND EXPLAINED THE RELATIONSHIP OF VARIOUS FEDERAL CHILD NUTRITION EFFORTS.

I BELIEVE THAT WE HAVE THE MAKINGS OF A STRONG CHILD NUTRITION POLICY, BUT THAT THE CIRCLE WILL ONLY BE COMPLETE WHEN WE LOOK

AT WHAT IS HAPPENING IN THE REALM OF TV ADVERTISING. CERTAINLY, WE NEED TO MOVE FORWARD TO THE ESTABLISHMENT OF A UNIVERSAL

FREE SCHOOL LUNCH PROGRAM. ALSO, WE MUST CAREFULLY WATCH AND BUILD UPON THE NUTRITION EDUCATION EFFORT THAT SOON WILL BE

UNDERWAY. IN THE FINAL ANALYSIS, WE MUST REMEMBER THAT WE ARE CONCERNING OURSELVES WITH THE WELFARE OF OUR CHILDREN AND WHAT

WE DO, OR DON'T DO, CONCERNING THEIR WELFARE WILL DETERMINE THE AMERICA THAT WE HAVE TOMORROW. I SUBMIT THAT WE HAVE NO MORE

PRECIOUS RESOURCE THAN OUR YOUTH AND THAT THE YOUNG OF THIS
NATION MUST BE PROTECTED AND ENCOURAGED IN WAYS THAT OFFER
OUR COUNTRY AND WORLD A BRIGHTER TOMORROW.

I FULLY APPRECIATE THIS OPPORTUNITY TO SHARE MY THOUGHTS
WITH YOU.