

with the majority leader if we gave actually 30 minutes on each side to speak in morning business, to take us a little past the 10:30 hour. Does the majority leader see any problem with that?

Mr. FRIST. I think that would be fine.

Mr. REID. I ask unanimous consent we do that.

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

Mr. REID. I say to the majority leader, the Democratic leader even this morning indicated that he was extremely hopeful and confident we could work something out on an organizing resolution. Senator STEVENS was here this morning. I know he wants to move forward on the appropriations, and we do, too. We hope we can complete the work the leader has outlined.

Mr. President, that is all I have for the majority leader. I thank him very much.

Senator CONRAD is here and wishes to speak for 20 minutes. I ask Senator THOMAS: Senator CONRAD wishes to speak for 20 minutes. Do you wish to speak now?

If not, I ask unanimous consent that Senator CONRAD be recognized for 20 minutes.

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

The Senator from North Dakota.

THE ORGANIZING RESOLUTION

Mr. CONRAD. Mr. President, I thank my colleague, Senator REID, and I thank all of our leaders for working together. It appears now that we are on the brink of success for an organizing resolution. I must say, however, some of the rhetoric I heard yesterday I think was unfortunate. Talk about a coup in the Senate or in the United States—that is reckless talk. That is inappropriate talk. What has occurred here is a negotiation on the delicate subject of the organization of the Senate. At a previous time in just recent years, it took 6 weeks to have that negotiation occur. Nobody asserted that there was a coup occurring in this country. That is reckless talk. It is irresponsible talk. It may be good for headlines, it may be good for getting on television, but it does not serve this body well and it does not serve our country well. I hope colleagues will be more thoughtful in their use of language in the future.

THE ECONOMY

Mr. CONRAD. Mr. President, I rise today to talk about what the President has proposed in terms of an economic stimulus package or, as he now terms it, an economic growth package, because I think it is one of the key issues facing us and our country in the days ahead. As the chairman of the Budget Committee—at least until the new organizing resolution is adopted, at which time I will be the ranking mem-

ber of the Budget Committee—I think I have a special obligation to my colleagues to review what the President has proposed and to give my take on it.

I, along with my staff, have now given a detailed review to what the President proposes, and I have concluded that the President's proposal is, No. 1, ineffective with respect to giving stimulus to the economy;

No. 2, unfair in terms of its application;

And, No. 3, irresponsible because it will add almost \$1 trillion to our national debt when we are already back into serious deficits and adding to the national debt right on the eve of the retirement of the baby boom generation. I don't believe this is a growth package. Indeed, I think it will inhibit growth because I believe it will put upward pressure on interest rates, and when the economy does resume stronger growth, higher interest rates will tend to choke off that stronger growth.

I started by saying I think the President's plan is ineffective with respect to stimulus. I said that, because if one looks at the total cost of his plan, which we estimate at over \$900 billion—not the \$600 billion that has been advertised but over \$900 billion—with associated interest costs included, and, obviously, if you spend money or you reduce taxes, the interest costs to the Federal Government go up because you are adding to the debt. We are in debt now. We are paying interest on that debt. If you add to the debt you add costs.

It is stunning to me. But only \$36 billion of this \$900 billion cost in the President's plan is for this year. This year is the time we have economic weakness. This year is the time our economy needs to be stimulated. Yet only about 5 percent of the President's package—in fact, less than 5 percent—is for this year. That makes no earthly sense to me. If the rationale is the economy is weak and needs a boost, why would you only use 5 percent of the cost of your package for stimulus now?

Last year on a bipartisan basis, Democrats and Republicans on the Budget Committee in both the House and the Senate agreed on a set of principles to apply to a stimulus package. We agreed it ought to be effective immediately; that most of the money should flow in the first 6 months, and that it should have very little outyear effect to avoid adding to the deficit and debt. The President's proposal stands that set of principles on its head. When the President's plan was first introduced, they said it was going to give over \$100 billion of lift to the economy this year. Then they changed that and said that it would only be about \$58 billion. Now we have had a chance to do a detailed analysis of the President's proposal and we find that it is not \$108 billion; it is not \$58 billion; the lift to the economy this year is \$36 billion. The President might argue it should be a little bit more than that because of

the unemployment insurance legislation we have already passed. That is \$3 or \$4 billion. If you want to add that, fine. That would take us to about \$39 billion. It doesn't change the point at all. Less than 5 percent of the cost of the President's plan is available this year. It is ineffective in terms of stimulus.

Second, it is not fair. It is not fair in its application. It is not fair in its distribution.

This chart shows the five quintiles—arranged in income order of earners in the United States. In other words, one-fifth of American taxpayers in each of these categories. We see the top 20 percent earn more than \$68,000 a year. Under the President's plan, they get 78 percent of the benefit. But look at what other folks get. It is fascinating. The bottom 60 percent get less than 8 percent of the benefit. The top 20 percent get 78 percent of the benefit. The bottom 60 percent get less than 8 percent of the benefit. It is not fair.

In fact, the unfairness of this plan becomes even clearer when you look at the other distributional effects. This shows the benefit of the plan to those people in our society who earn over \$1 million a year. Under the President's plan, they would get an average tax reduction of \$88,873.

These are not KENT CONRAD's numbers. This comes from the Center on Tax Policy. This is their analysis of the President's plan.

Interestingly enough, the typical taxpayer—that 20 percent of taxpayers who are right in the middle—get an average benefit of \$265. The President said this is fair. It is an interesting notion of fairness. I don't think it is fair. I don't think it is close to being fair to give to those who earn over \$1 million a year more than \$88,000 of benefit and to those who are right in the middle of the income stream in our society \$265. The President says that is fair. That raises a mighty serious question about fairness.

It is ineffective. I think it is clear. Only 5 percent of the stimulus is available this year at the time when our economy needs a lift. I think it is abundantly clear it is not fair.

But even more serious, I believe, is the reckless nature of their proposal. How is it paid for? That is a question too little asked around here. How is it paid for? Here is the reality. Every penny of this proposal is being paid for out of the Social Security trust fund. The President says it is class warfare when anybody questions the fairness of his plan. I think the President is engaging in class warfare to propose taking \$900 billion out of the Social Security trust fund to pay for a tax program that is overwhelmingly skewed to the wealthiest among us. That is wrong. It cannot stand and it should not be passed.

Not only does every penny come out of the Social Security trust fund, but it is going to dramatically increase the debt of our country.

You will remember in 2001 when the President told us that under his plan the debt of the country by 2008 would only be \$36 billion. He was going to have a maximum pay-down of the debt. Events have proved quite otherwise. Instead of being virtually debt free, the President's policies are exploding the debt. We are not reducing the debt. We will be increasing the debt even more if we adopt the President's plan. The debt will stand at \$4.7 trillion—nearly a \$900 billion increase, if the President's plan is adopted.

I think we have to consider this in light of our overall circumstances. This chart shows surpluses and deficits without using Social Security funds for other purposes—something virtually every Member of this body has pledged not to do. The President pledged not to do it. Yet, what we see is we are already on a path and are now using Social Security to pay for tax cuts and using Social Security funds to pay for the costs of government.

If we look back over an extended period—back to 1992, and look ahead to 2012—back in the 1990s we were able to make progress on stopping the use of Social Security money for other purposes. We achieved it in 2 years. We didn't use any Social Security money for other purposes for 2 years in the Clinton administration. Now you can see we have plunged back into deficit and in a very dramatic and substantial way. The deficit this year is going to be in the hundreds of billions of dollars. If Social Security were not used, we would have more than \$400 billion in deficit this year and be approaching \$500 billion in deficit next year.

Looking ahead, this top line of the chart shows the current circumstance we face. You can see that we face deficits without using Social Security virtually the whole rest of this decade. If the President's additional tax cut plans are adopted, we will not escape from deficits the entire rest of this decade. Instead, we will be running massive deficits each and every year all of this decade.

Now, some say: Well, Senator, we have run big deficits before. We did in the 1980s, and we were able to escape from it. That is true. The difference now—and I hope colleagues are listening, because there is a big difference now—the difference is the baby boom generation poised to retire. And this is not a matter of projection. It is not a matter of conjecture. It is a matter of fact. The baby boomers are alive. They are going to be eligible for Social Security and Medicare. They are going to begin to retire at the end of this decade, and it is going to change everything.

Mr. DURBIN. Will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. CONRAD. I am happy to yield.

Mr. DURBIN. On the question of the continuing deficits and the projections, I recall the Chairman of the President's Council of Economic Advisers suggesting a war in Iraq might cost us

\$100 billion and then it being kind of open ended as to what it would cost us to continue to occupy that nation and keep it under control for some period of time.

When we project out the deficits which you said you can see on the horizon, based on the President's tax cut and the current state of the economy, does it anticipate that kind of emergency situation where we would be involved in a war in Iraq or we would be involved in a long-term occupation?

Mr. CONRAD. I am glad you asked the question because in these projections the full cost of a war with Iraq has not been included. This only anticipates proposals the President has already made on spending and taxes, as well as an anticipated supplemental to cover the defense buildup that is currently underway, but it does not cover the additional cost of a war. Those numbers would add to the deficit and debt I have outlined here.

I might say to my colleague, it is true the President's Chief Economic Adviser said it could cost \$100 billion, perhaps as much as \$200 billion. In fact, if we are engaged in a 5-year occupation, the Congressional Budget Office has told us the cost would be in the range of \$250 billion. None of those numbers are in these projections.

Mr. DURBIN. One last question. I know the Senator wants to complete his presentation.

So we can be certain that the baby boomers are going to arrive in need of Social Security and Medicare. That is coming. But we have this uncertainty when it comes to war and its cost, which could dramatically increase the deficit, money taken out of the Social Security trust fund, just as the baby boom generation comes of age and expects their benefits will be paid.

Mr. CONRAD. I don't know how to say this in a way that will catch the attention of my colleagues and catch the attention of the American people: We are headed for a train wreck of enormous proportion. We are headed for a circumstance in which the head of the Congressional Budget Office said we are headed for either unsustainable debt and an unprecedented tax increase to 30 percent of gross domestic product—that would be a 50-percent tax increase from where we are now—or the elimination of the rest of Government as we know it.

That is not a Democrat speaking. That is the head of the Congressional Budget Office, who is nominated and put in place by our Republican colleagues. He is telling the truth. The Comptroller General of the United States has given us the same warning. We are headed for a cliff, as a Nation, as a country.

Let me show you what that cliff is.

This chart shows that the Social Security trust funds face a cash deficit as the baby boomers retire. But the words do not capture what is really going to happen. "Cash deficit" sounds pretty cold and impersonal—not a very meaningful couple of words.

But here is what is going to happen. This chart shows where we are now. The trust fund is running surpluses. But in 2017, those surpluses turn to deficits. It is this money that is being used now to pay for those tax cuts, to pay for the defense buildup. But look what is about to happen. That trust fund, in 2017, as the baby boomers retire, is going to go cash negative, and then it is going to go cash negative in a huge way. It is going to achieve negative annual cash-flows of over \$1 trillion a year.

Is anybody listening? Is anybody paying attention to where we are headed? And the President says: Dig the hole deeper. More tax cuts, tax cuts that cost hundreds of billions of dollars this decade but cost trillions of dollars at the very time this is happening. At the very time the trust funds go cash negative, he is saying: Cut the revenue more—even in the face of increased spending for defense and homeland security, even in the face of an attack on this country, even in the face of the prospect of war with Iraq, even in the face of a crisis with North Korea. It is not responsible. It does not add up. It is reckless. And it should not go forward.

And it is not just the Social Security trust fund. Shown on this chart is the Medicare trust fund. It has exactly the same pattern. We are running surpluses now—smaller than the surpluses in Social Security—but look what is going to happen in 2016. We are going to see, as the baby boomers retire, the costs mount geometrically, and the annual deficits approach \$1 trillion in Medicare alone.

Is anybody paying attention? Is anybody thinking about where we are headed? Is anybody thinking about what this will mean to a future Congress and a future administration?

Economic growth? Absolutely. Stimulus package? Yes. We ought to take steps to strengthen the economy now. That makes sense. But we have to be very careful about the long-term effects of what we do because we are headed for a cliff.

Let me just conclude by saying, there are other stimulus packages out there that provide much more stimulus this year—the Baucus package, the Pelosi package—in comparison to the Bush package, but have much lower costs over the 10 years.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. CONRAD. I thank the Chair.

I hope our colleagues will think carefully about the consequences of what we do here.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SMITH). The Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, it is my understanding we have about 10 minutes left in morning business on the Democrat side before the Republicans have their time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Nine and one-half minutes.

Mr. DURBIN. I thank the Chair. If there is no one else on the floor, I would like to claim that time.

Mr. President, before Senator CONRAD leaves, I say to the Senator, thank you for your presentation. I hope those who are following this debate will reflect for a moment on what Senator CONRAD has brought to us this morning. He is the Democratic ranking member of the Senate Budget Committee. I am very proud of the work he does, and the American people should be grateful for the time he spends analyzing these tough issues.

I know at times it must be a lonely assignment because in this revelry we have about the President's tax cut and the President's so-called stimulus package, few people are really reflecting on the overall impact of this package on our economy.

What Senator CONRAD has told us this morning is very graphic because he has pointed out the fact that the President's package is fundamentally unfair, fundamentally unfair, in that the benefits he is providing for tax benefits are benefits that are, frankly, going to the wealthiest people in this country.

The argument has been made on the Republican side of the aisle that many people working for a living today are "not paying taxes." I actually heard a Pennsylvania Senator, a Republican, say: You know, a third of the workers in America don't pay taxes. Well, I wish he would have a little conversation with those workers who would be happy to remind him they pay taxes every single day for every hour they work. They are payroll taxes, taxes that come right out of their paycheck. These are people struggling to keep their families together, trying to guarantee to their kids the same quality of life we all want to see in America.

The President has forgotten them. The Republican side of the aisle appears to have forgotten them. But we don't believe they should be forgotten. These are wage earners who, if given some resources through tax breaks, would end up spending that money to invigorate this economy and to move us forward again to get us out of this recession which just won't go away.

The President's people like to say: You mean the Clinton recession? We inherited that problem.

There is no question but that the statistics show the beginning of a downturn toward the end of the Clinton administration. But who would have guessed we would be stuck in this rut on the side of America's economy for so many months under the Bush administration? By now we should have emerged.

Two years ago, the President said: I have the perfect formula. I am going to give you an economic stimulus package that will bring the economy back.

He persuaded this body and a dozen Democratic Senators to join him and vote for a tax package which I opposed, another tax package designed to cut taxes on the wealthiest people in America. As we look back on that decision, which has added geometrically to

the debt and deficit with which we are coping, you have to ask the basic questions: Did it work? Is America better today? Is our economy moving forward? The honest answer is no, it didn't work.

So the President comes back this year and says: I have a magic formula that will move this economy forward, get us out of the recession, finally start restoring jobs in America, profitability to businesses, and portfolios will increase in size.

We say to the President: What is it?

He says: More of the same. Let us give tax breaks to the wealthiest people in America, and I just guarantee you that it will help.

It doesn't stimulate the economy. As Senator CONRAD and others have pointed out, most of the benefits the President wants us to enact really won't occur for many years to come. So we are going to give tax breaks to wealthy people, implemented over a long period of time, which will not have an immediate impact on this economy. We know they will have an immediate impact on the deficit and debt of America.

How can we in good conscience say to the American people that we are going to ignore the millions in the baby boom generation who have paid into Social Security their entire working lives, who have played by the rules and followed the law in anticipation that when they reached eligibility for Social Security, it would be there to help them? We ignore them if we enact the President's so-called stimulus package because what the President does is create a deeper deficit and greater national debt by borrowing from the Social Security trust fund just as we need it for the baby boom generation.

President Bush's economic stimulus plan betrays the baby boom generation. At a time when we promised them Social Security would be strong enough to provide the benefits for the baby boomers, the President is taking hundreds of billions of dollars out of the Social Security trust fund. It not only betrays that generation, it betrays their children and grandchildren, who will be saddled with that debt for years and years to come. Is that the legacy we want to leave? Think about it.

At this moment in our history, when we are this close to engaging in a war, with 130,000 American troops positioned to invade Iraq, with consequences unpredictable at this moment, with the ultimate possibility that we will be occupying that nation, trying to stabilize it for a long period of time, the President doesn't say: America, come together, unified; be prepared to sacrifice, stand behind the men and women in uniform.

He says to us: We can have it all. We can have our deficit. We can have our recession. We can have these tax cuts for wealthy people. We can pay for a war, and we can take care of Social Security.

Who in the world is watching the store down at the White House? Who is adding up the numbers? I am afraid people are not really taking cognizance of the reality of what we face. For once can we step back when it comes to tax cuts and say: Instead of being dedicated to leaving no millionaire behind, we are not going to leave any middle-income American behind? Wouldn't that be a much better dedication for this country?

Should we not take those who have been activated in Illinois and Ohio and across the Nation in the reserves and say: What are we doing in our tax package to help these people who are giving of their lives and sacrificing for the Nation? Should we not be providing tax benefits for them as opposed to the wealthiest people in America who will stay home and follow the war in Iraq on the nightly news?

I say to the President: Simple fairness dictates and the economy requires us to put a stimulus package together that is 1 year in duration, that is fair in terms of the tax benefits so the majority of benefits go to the majority of Americans to make certain that what we do ultimately will stimulate this economy, will not drive us deeper into debt, and will not sacrifice the Social Security trust fund.

If we stick to those principles, we can have an economic stimulus plan to help America. Otherwise, we are committed to a plan the President has already demonstrated will fail. This plan will fail, and it will fail at great expense not only to the baby boom generation but to their children and grandchildren.

I know some Republicans have said they have misgivings about this plan. That is encouraging. It is time we have an honest bipartisan discussion and say to the people in the White House: You have gone too far. You have suggested something not good for America, something that is not fair, something that does not move us forward.

That is the discussion we need. That is the bipartisan conversation in which we should be engaged.

Why are we not talking about dedicating our resources and time to things American families really care about? In Illinois right now, the No. 1 business complaint and labor complaint is the cost of health insurance. The yardstick by which I will measure the President's State of the Union Address is whether or not he has the political courage to step up and address this issue. If the President doesn't address the cost of health care in America, he is ignoring a major business expense and a major worry for families across the Nation.

He can talk about dividend taxes, tax breaks of \$89,000 a year for millionaires, but for goodness' sake, help the average family pay for their health insurance, be sensitive to the fact that millions of Americans have no health insurance protection. These are things real families worry about every single day. They are not concerned about

whether or not Bill Gates or his father have added tax benefits. They want to know if they can protect their kids, if they can protect their family with health insurance.

These are the real issues being ignored by this White House. I sincerely hope the Senate will not ignore them.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, I rise to speak in morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has that right.

CRITICAL ISSUES

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, we have heard some strong views, which, of course, is appropriate for the Senate. That is what we ought to be doing. We will always have a difference of view as to how we approach the problems that confront us. What we ought to do is approach some of those problems rather than stand in disrepair here for another few days and not do anything with the issues. But we will always have a difference of view. That is what it is all about.

It is interesting that the Senator from Illinois talks about a bipartisan solution when we have no bipartisanship at all in this Chamber. There can't be a word, there has not been a word, offered about any of these proposals without criticizing the White House. You can have a different point of view, but you don't always have to criticize the person who has a different point of view than you do.

We have a unique situation. We find ourselves with a difficulty in the Middle East, the challenge of war there. We have a challenge in North Korea as well. We also have an economy that has slumped. We have to do something about that. These are quite different situations than 2 years ago. We have to do some things that are different.

With respect to the economy, we need to do something. All I hear is criticism from the other side. I don't hear a plan. I don't hear any proposal. I don't see anything happening except just criticism.

The fact is, we need to have a plan. The President has put forth a plan. His plan deals with the issue. Should it be altered? Could there be changes? Of course, that is always the case.

The fact is, there is a plan that has three main goals: To encourage consumer spending that will continue to boost the economy; to promote investments by individuals and businesses that will lead to economic growth and job creation; and to deliver critical help to unemployed citizens, which we have already done to some extent and need to continue to do.

The difference in point of view, apparently, as my friend from the other side of the aisle said, is they want to redistribute income and pass out money. That is their plan; \$300 to everyone. And they talk about just doing

it for 1 year. The fact is, what we need to resolve this problem is more investment and more jobs. Mr. President, \$300 doesn't solve a family's problems; \$300 doesn't solve anyone's future. But a job does, and jobs require investment. The President's proposal would speed up the 2001 tax cuts to increase the pace of recovery and job creation, encourage job-creating investments in small and large businesses by ending some of the double taxation and giving other incentives to invest. These are the kinds of things that create jobs, that will help people and provide for unemployed Americans, which we have done to some extent.

They talk about not doing anything immediately. They want to give somebody \$300. Under the President's proposal to speed up tax relief, 2 million taxpayers would receive an average tax cut of over \$1,000 in 2003; 46 million married couples would receive an average tax cut of \$1,700; 34 million families with children would receive an average benefit of \$1,400; 6 million single women with children would receive an average tax cut of over \$500 immediately, this year; 23 million small businesses would receive tax cuts averaging over \$2,000, which would help create more jobs and continue to move in the direction we would like.

There is a chart in today's Washington Times that compares the \$300 with the things the Bush bill would do, and talking about a single person who makes an income of, say, \$50,000, he gets more under the Bush plan. But more importantly, when you have a married couple, they get more like \$1,700 as opposed to \$600 or \$300 each.

So we can have a different view as to how we do this, but two or three things are important. One is we get the facts out there as to what is really going to happen. Two is we have a plan that applies more than just the distribution and redistribution of money, and the other, that would create jobs to stimulate the economy. We have seen what economies can do in terms of deficits. No one hates deficits worse than I. I am probably one of the more conservative spenders here, but I believe when you have a turndown in the economy, you have to do some things differently, particularly when they are coupled with the problems we have overseas. But a strong economy will replace that and we have seen that happen in the past. The best way to deal with the deficit is to have that strong economy and to get it moving again.

Generally, the President's growth and job package provides for a short-term boost for the economy, creates jobs, promotes sustained and long-term economic growth. Accelerating the 2004, 2006 tax rates to 2003 will provide 28 million taxpayers with an average of \$1,100. We don't hear that when we talk about it.

Mr. President, again, I respect the idea that we have different views as to how to deal with problems. I think it is very important that we make sure we

get the facts out and, No. 2, if you disagree with it—and there is a problem as there is here—that there be an alternative, that there be some choices, and not just full-time criticism.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio is recognized.

TRIBUTE TO STEVE YOUNG

Mr. DEWINE. Mr. President, at this hour in Ohio, final tributes are being paid to Steve Young. I rise this morning on the Senate floor to pay tribute to Steve Young. He is an Ohioan who dedicated his life to keeping our communities safe and free from crime. Steve was well known and a well-respected figure in the law enforcement community; he was elected by his peers to serve as the national President of the Fraternal Order of Police. He held this position until his death from cancer last week, on January 9. Steve was just 49 years old.

Steve Young grew up in Upper Sandusky, OH, and was a graduate of Upper Sandusky High School. He joined the Marion City Police Department in 1976 and spent his entire law enforcement career as an active duty officer in Marion. It was in Marion that Steve first became a member of the FOP, joining lodge 24 in Marion. Steve later went on to serve as President of this local lodge in Marion.

Leadership in the law enforcement community came naturally to Steve as his hard work and dedication earned him the respect and admiration of his peers. Steve went on to become active in the Ohio State Lodge of the FOP and served first as Vice President and then as President of the State FOP, representing Ohio's 24,000 law enforcement officers. Through the Ohio State Lodge, Steve helped to create the Ohio Labor Council. This council created a model for improved labor-management negotiations in police forces—a model that has now been adopted in at least 14 other States.

Mr. President, Members of the Senate, Steve's leadership in the Ohio law enforcement community and his expertise in labor issues earned him a national reputation. In 2001, after serving 4 years as national Vice President, Steve was unanimously elected to serve as the national President of the FOP. In this capacity, Steve represented over 300,000 law enforcement officers nationwide and worked to protect the interests of our Nation's finest. This was, I can tell you, a job that Steve loved and one he did with dignity and pride.

While Steve Young had an incredibly successful career with multiple accomplishments, I also want to take a few moments to discuss my personal connection with Steve. I had the privilege of knowing not just Steve Young the police officer, but also Steve Young the man. Steve was a dear friend for many years. He was someone in whom I had a great deal of trust, and I was fortunate to be able to call on him as a trusted advisor.