

the road to this arena, the Senate, would have been a lot rockier had Ann and Susie not been strong and capable partners in our lives. CRAIG's wife Susie has dedicated her time, her energy, and her talents to the service of teaching, teaching of the learning disabled. And my wife Ann was a teacher, too, when we married over 40 years ago and has long been involved in many educational, artistic, and mental health issues. They have both been an inspiration to all who know them and are well dedicated to their strong commitment in making a difference in their communities, whether Wyoming or here.

Susie Roberts Thomas comes from Barnum, WY, a town so small that the zip code is a fraction. In fact, a fellow who lived there said once it was so small he thought its name was "Resume Speed."

Her father was Harry Roberts, who was superintendent of public instruction in Wyoming, a very wonderful man, and her mother Toni.

Well, the road here is not an easy one. As someone said, on the high road of humility in Washington, DC, you are not bothered by heavy traffic, and that is true. But nobody has paid his dues more generously and willingly than CRAIG THOMAS, and the toughness he picked up during his service in the Marine Corps has served him well in life and politics. It is a contact sport.

So CRAIG began his service in Wyoming and pursued his interests and his business and his activities and his work with the Wyoming Farm Bureau, the American Farm Bureau, and the Wyoming REA. I recall he used to lobby me on those issues with his remarkable brand of straightforwardness and candor. Now he is on the other side of that fence, and he will be the object of other lobbying efforts. I cannot wait for the REA to show up and begin to work him over on the budget. I hope I can sit in.

We both came to this Congress with ties to our State government. He served in the statehouse from 1985 to 1989. I served there for about 13 years. We did not serve concurrently, but we both kept the lines of communication wide open on issues of concern to Wyoming. And then in 1989, President George Bush selected Dick Cheney to be his Secretary of Defense. CRAIG had already built a strong network of friends and supporters, so he was tapped to "lead the charge" for Dick's seat. To no one's surprise, he won—and worked very hard to do it. Soon after, he was asked by the media if he would be another Dick Cheney, and he quickly quipped that he would not. He said, "Where Dick would have accomplished something but perhaps would have done it through the 'insider route,' I would probably fuss more." And so he has. And Wyoming has been all the better for his "fussing." He said once that no one would have been more pleased to see Dick Cheney Secretary of Defense than he in his whimsical, wry

way of humor. He has never been a game player except on the sports field. He always tells you exactly how he feels and why, and he has a quality of outspoken honesty that is greatly appreciated out West where still to some their word is their bond.

And so now he has jumped in and become wet all over. As our old college coach said, "Jump in and get wet all over." Now he comes here and joins the Committees on Energy and Natural Resources, Foreign Relations, Indian Affairs, and Environment and Public Works. It will be great having CRAIG and our new Representative, BARBARA CUBIN, too, the first woman Congressman to represent Wyoming in the Equality State's history—and we are known as the Equality State—it will be an honor to serve with her.

So we have swiftly "jump started" this session. We have all hit the ground running this year. There has been dramatic change in our lives, and the resulting challenges we face may be a bit tougher than in past years, but the rewards will be great, too.

His dedicated spirit will help us all. It gives me a genuinely warm feeling and a great deal of pride to welcome CRAIG THOMAS to the Senate. I cherish his friendship. He is a wonderful man, of great strength, great rich good humor. I hope neither one of us will recite the "Cremation of Sam McGee" from memory, certainly not in the Chamber. But perhaps at some time we will certainly do that for you.

So I look forward to working with him, my old friend, during this historic 104th session of the Congress. God bless him and his work for Wyoming.

I thank the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota, under the previous order, is recognized for 30 minutes.

THE REPUBLICAN CONTRACT: IT DOES NOT ADD UP

Mr. CONRAD. Mr. President, ever since the November 8 election, the Republican majority and the media have been talking about the Contract With America. The contract sets out the Republican agenda for the first session of the Congress, and it has many good elements in it. For example, I strongly support the Congressional Accountability Act, which will ensure that Congress lives by the same rules it imposes on everyone else. That is something that we almost passed in the last Congress and that is something we will pass in this Congress.

I support the unfunded mandates bill, which will make it more difficult for Congress to mandate State and local governments to establish programs unless Congress appropriates funding to pay for them. That also makes common sense. And it is also something we were working on in the last Congress. But when it comes to the budget and tax elements of the contract, there are two big problems.

First, the numbers just do not add up. There has been a lot of talk about what will not be cut, but the specific proposals on what Republicans believe should be cut fall far short of what is needed to balance the budget. And if the math does not work, the contract will balloon our deficits, explode the national debt, slow our economy, and leave future generations to clean up the mess.

Second, the tax cuts proposed by the Republicans are unfair because they are clearly designed to benefit the wealthiest among us far more than average Americans. And the program cuts necessary to finance these tax cuts, or the higher interest rates that will result when the Republicans fail to balance the budget as promised, will hurt the middle class. Let me explain why the contract does not add up and why it is unfair to average Americans.

We first have to look at the current budget outlook. The contract calls for a balanced budget amendment to the Constitution, which would require a balanced budget by the year 2002. I strongly support this goal. Deficit reduction has been at the top of my agenda since I came to the Senate in 1986, and I have spent an enormous amount of time working on the Federal budget, learning about it, and devising plans to put our fiscal house in order. Every year I have been in the Senate, I have offered comprehensive plans in the Budget Committee, or far-reaching amendments in the Budget Committee or on the floor of the Senate, to achieve more ambitious deficit reduction goals.

Unfortunately, the rest of the Republican contract that is before us makes it far more difficult to meet the balanced budget goal. According to the Congressional Budget Office, it will take more than \$1 trillion in cuts over the next 7 years to reach a balance by the year 2002. That is what this chart shows. This is what is necessary to achieve balance by the year 2002—over \$1 trillion in budget cuts.

This is not millions of dollars; this is not billions of dollars—this is a trillion dollars, one thousand billion dollars. And that is only if we do not do anything to make the problem worse before we start to solve it.

But the contract makes things far more difficult because it promises hundreds of billions of dollars in tax cuts, most of which would benefit the wealthy far more than average Americans.

The Republicans call it the Contract With America. I call it a Contract on the Middle Class. In order to pay for the tax cuts, the Republicans will have to cut an additional \$364 billion in the next 7 years, much of it from programs that benefit middle income families. So let me be clear. If we do not do anything to make the problem worse before we begin to solve it, we need \$1 trillion in cuts over the next 7 years to

achieve a balanced budget. But the Republicans suggest the first thing we do is not to cut the spending, but to cut taxes by \$364 billion over 7 years. So they have dug the hole deeper. Instead of a \$1 trillion problem to solve, they present us with a \$1.4 trillion hole to fill.

This chart shows that. The blue indicates the \$1 trillion necessary to bring the budget into balance. And if you add the \$364 billion of tax cuts Republicans have called for, you then see we have a \$1.4 trillion problem to solve.

In fact, the effects of these tax cuts will be worse than it appears from these charts. By design, the tax cuts are structured so that the adverse effects are not readily apparent until after the end of the 5-year budget window that Congress uses to measure the effect of proposed changes in taxes and entitlements. In the first 5-year period the tax cuts would cost \$197 billion. But between fiscal years 2001 and 2005, their cost more than doubles to \$514 billion. Over the 10-year period, those tax cuts cost \$712 billion.

This is at a time when we already have a \$1 trillion problem to solve over the next 7 years. Without going further on that point, let me just say this means we will have to make additional cuts after 2002 to keep pace with the growing cost of these giveaways to the wealthy and corporate America.

In addition, the contract calls for more spending on defense. Everyone wants a strong national defense, but the world has changed. We now spend more on defense than the next top 10 countries combined, even though there is far less danger to defend against than just a few years ago. In fact, we are the only remaining superpower in the world. Certainly we see this to be true when we look at the Russian Army that cannot even effectively deal with one element of its country that is in revolt.

The extra \$82 billion the Republican defense buildup will add to our budget will raise the total cost necessary to reach balance by 2002 to a staggering \$1.48 trillion—\$1.48 trillion. So we start with a \$1 trillion problem and the Republicans immediately proceed to add \$364 billion of tax cuts and \$82 billion of additional defense spending, making the hole deeper, making the problem bigger, and making the prospects of success more remote.

Just to put that in context, the entire Federal budget this year for everything but interest on the Federal debt is \$1.36 trillion. That is, to reach balance by 2002, to pay for all of the proposals in the Republican contract, will require the equivalent of eliminating every Government program—except interest payments—for more than 1 year.

That would be a tough enough problem to address and to solve even if the Republicans in their contract did not do other things to make it even more difficult. But after all the Republican goodies are added on top of our current fiscal problems, we need to cut nearly

\$1.5 trillion in order to reach a balanced budget by 2002. Clearly that will not be easy.

You have heard our friends on the other side of the aisle suggest over and over that they are going to close this budget gap by cutting agriculture, maybe eliminating farm programs completely and by cutting welfare. Mr. President, that is less than 5 percent of the Federal budget. They have a long, long way to go. The only thing they have come up with so far is welfare, foreign aid, and agriculture, a small fraction of overall spending.

This chart shows where the money is going in the 7 years leading up to 2002. We are going to be spending—if we do not make changes—and clearly we must—some \$13.2 trillion over the next 7 years. Where is the money going? Interest is just over \$2 trillion, and defense is just over \$2 trillion. In fact, we are going to be spending more on interest than we are going to be spending on defense over that 7-year period. Medicare will be about \$1 trillion. Social Security will be almost \$3 trillion. Foreign aid will be \$162 billion, a little sliver of the spending pie. Domestic discretionary spending will be \$2 trillion. Medicare will be nearly \$2 trillion. And agriculture, that I hear the other side talking about so loudly, is far less than 1 percent of the budget over this period, only \$87 billion. This little tiny sliver here on the chart is agriculture. All other Federal spending over that period will be about \$1 trillion.

Mr. President, it's clear we cannot balance the budget just by cutting agriculture programs, cutting foreign aid, and cutting welfare. That is less than 5 percent of what we spend. That is not going to do the job. Once again, we have public statements that sound good but just do not stand up to budget reality. They just do not add up. What we have is a Republican credibility gap.

Unfortunately, instead of giving us a detailed plan that tells us what they are going to cut in order to reach their goal, the Republicans have been telling us what they will not cut. First, they say we cannot cut interest payments on the Federal debt. Of course, that is true. If we did try to cut interest payments, the Federal Government would default and the economy would be thrown into turmoil. This takes over \$2 trillion off the table of the \$13 trillion we are going to be spending over the next 7 years.

Second, the contract authors say they are not going to cut Social Security. That takes an additional \$2.9 trillion off the table.

Third, the contract authors have promised to increase rather than decrease defense spending. So cuts in defense spending are also off the table. That removes another \$2.1 trillion from consideration. In fact, after the contract authors have finished making their promises, more than half of the budget is off the table. More than half

of the budget cannot be considered in order to solve the budget problem that we face.

On the other side of the ledger, the Republicans have detailed only \$277 billion in spending cuts over the next 7 years. Mr. President, I earlier outlined the extent of the problem. If we are going to balance the budget over the next 7 years we have to make cuts of \$1.48 trillion, almost \$1.5 trillion. The Republicans have so far identified \$277 billion of cuts. That leaves the Republicans with a credibility gap of \$1.2 trillion—not million, not billion, but trillion. The size of the problem is \$1.5 trillion but they have identified less than \$300 billion of budget cuts. That means somewhere out there is \$1.2 trillion of budget cuts our Republican friends have failed to identify.

We have heard the good news from our Republican friends. But as Paul Harvey would ask, "What is the rest of the story?" They have only two choices. Either the Republicans detail Draconian cuts in programs to close this gap or they fail to balance the budget by 2002.

This failure to talk about specific spending cuts sounds like *deja vu* all over again. We have heard it all before, Mr. President. History reminds us of the failed trickle down economics of the 1980's. They can say it is a new Contract With America. They can put new clothing on it, but it is the same old trickle down theories, the same old voodoo economics.

History also tells us that faced with a choice between making tough specific spending cuts to pay for their proposals and letting the budget run out of control, the Republican Party will balloon the deficit and run up more and more red ink.

In the 1980's President Reagan came to town promising huge tax cuts, increased defense spending, and a balanced budget. Does it sound familiar? Well, it is. It did not work then. It is not going to work now.

Instead, during that period the average annual deficits under Presidents Reagan and Bush were five times that under President Carter. The national debt tripled under President Reagan, from \$900 billion to \$2.6 trillion, and grew by half again under President Bush to \$4 trillion.

Mr. President, all we have to do is go back and look at what happened when we previously relied on this economic theory. Here is the budget deficit line. From 1940 to 1980, the national debt of the United States was relatively stable. But the Republicans came to town in 1980 with this theory that they could cut taxes, increase defense spending, and somehow the budget would be balanced—even though it was not balanced when they began. It proved to be a complete fraud and hoax. Mr. President, this is what happened. We very nearly destroyed the economy of this country by creating a fourfold increase in the national debt.

Mr. President, these debts did not finance investment in our future. Instead, they reduced our national savings. The result was record high real interest rates.

This chart shows exactly what happened to interest rates as a result of those failed economic policies. From 1968 to 1973, real long-term interest rates, the difference between the interest people paid and the rate of inflation, was less than 1 percent. From 1974 to 1979, real interest rates, the difference between inflation and the interest rates people paid was a negative point 6 percent. But look at what happened from 1980 to 1989 to real interest rates. The difference between the level of inflation and the interest rates people paid was 5.5 percent—record high real interest rates. What did that do? It stopped economic growth in its tracks, it killed job creation in this economy, and it weakened us for the future.

RECORD high real interest rates means that we invested less in the 1980's than in previous decades resulting in less economic growth for the future, stagnating wages, and a bigger struggle for the average guy to get ahead. It is true. The rich got richer but the middle class got nothing in the 1980's.

These policies squeezed the middle class while better off Americans, the top 20 percent of earners, saw their incomes increase. In fact, this chart shows the changes in family after-tax incomes by income group from 1977 to 1992.

Here is what happened. The bottom 20 percent in our country, the lowest one-fifth in terms of income, saw their after-tax incomes decline 12 percent. The next 20 percent in our country saw their incomes decline 10 percent. The next 20 percent of the income ladder in this country saw their incomes decline 8 percent.

This is the harsh reality of what occurred under a flawed economic policy and plan. Those 60 percent of Americans in the lowest income categories saw their incomes decline during this period. The next 20 percent of the people in this country saw their incomes rise a modest 1 percent. But look what happened to the top 1 percent. The top 1 percent saw their incomes increase 136 percent.

The facts are startling. Working men without college degrees—about three-fourths of all working men—saw a 12-percent decline in real wages since 1979. It is no wonder they are angry; it is no wonder they are upset; it is no wonder they are anxious about the future.

Average weekly compensation has actually fallen to its lowest level since 1960. The only reason that real median family income stayed level overall is because families have added additional earners. My family is an example. I was raised by my grandparents and grew up in a middle class, extended family, with three uncles and aunts and their families in my hometown. In our family—like most middle-class families at

that time—the mothers were able to stay home until the kids went to school. Now, in my generation, with 13 grandchildren—all with advanced degrees—every single family has both spouses working to maintain the same middle-class existence. This is not just the reality of the Conrad family. It is the reality of every family in America, and it is, in part, because of a flawed economic policy and plan that was put in place in the 1980's—a plan that proved to be an economic disaster for this country.

Meanwhile when middle-class incomes were falling, the cost of health care, a college education, and homes were rising faster than inflation, squeezing the middle class. Middle-class incomes are buying less and middle-class families are saving less. At the same time, the pay of the average chief executive officer of a corporation, has risen from 29 times as much as the average worker in 1979 to 93 times as much as the average worker today. It is no wonder, I suppose, that a major corporation gave \$2.5 million to the Republican Party in the last campaign. They like this policy. This policy is good for them. I understand that. They are looking out for their economic self-interest.

Mr. President, our obligation here in this Chamber is to look out for all Americans, not just the wealthiest 1 percent, not just those at the top of the income ladder, but everyone.

If we look at the tax provisions of the contract, we see more of the same trickle down economic theory. I would like to focus for a few minutes on some of the tax provisions proposed in the contract, because they point so clearly to why the contract is not fair, why it is more of the same old trickle down economics that hurt the middle class in the 1980's.

Middle-income Americans are being led to believe that the tax changes proposed by the Contract With America are directed primarily at them. Nothing could be further from the truth. In fact, only 46 percent of the contract's proposals benefit families with incomes under \$100,000.

Mr. President, this chart shows that reality. A majority of the benefits—54 percent—go to families with incomes greater than \$100,000, only about 3.5 percent of all Americans. Put another way, only 46 percent of the proposed Republican tax cuts go to benefit the 96.5 percent of Americans who earn less than \$100,000, while 54 percent of the benefits go to 3.5 percent of the people who earn more than \$100,000 per year. That is the old trickle down economics. That is the way it worked then and that is how it would work now. It is no wonder the middle class got left behind in the 1980's. And if such a policy is enacted now, they would be the first ones hurt in the 1990's.

All in all, almost one-third of the benefits under the Republican plan go to households with incomes of more than \$200,000. That is how the Repub-

licans targeted this plan—with one-third of the benefits going to the top 1 percent.

Mr. President, I think it is useful to look more closely at a few of the tax proposals—the major ones—that our friends in the Republican Party have proposed. Let's examine them and see who benefits.

The most costly of the tax cuts in the contract are aimed at the very wealthy. For example, 95 percent of the benefits from the expanded IRA provision would accrue to the top 20 percent of income earners, at a net cost of \$45 billion over 10 years. This chart shows how that works. Ninety-five percent of the benefits of the IRA tax incentive they have proposed go to the top 20 percent of income earners who are more likely to already benefit from other tax-favored pension and retirement plans, while only 5 percent of the benefits go to 80 percent of the population.

Capital gains tax relief, which has also been proposed, strikes a chord with many Americans, including some of my constituents who are small business owners or farmers. The proposal in the contract is not a reasonable relief measure, however. Again, it benefits primarily the wealthy. In fact, almost half of the benefits from the capital gains provision would accrue to the wealthiest 1 percent of the population.

It should be pointed out that, through indexing and direct exclusion, taxes would be eliminated on most capital gains profits. The overwhelming winners would be higher income individuals who hold stocks and bonds, while no change would be made in the treatment of interest income from the savings accounts that ordinary middle-class Americans hold. For interest earnings, no adjustment for inflation or exclusion from taxation would be provided. This is the reality of the Republican Contract With America.

Mr. President, I do not know what can be more clear. This shows that the top 1 percent of income earners receive 50 percent of the benefits of the proposed capital gains tax cut. The other 50 percent goes to the other 99 percent. This is the Republican idea of equity. It is not my idea of equity, not my idea of fairness, not my idea of an economic plan that is right for America.

Tax cuts that benefit primarily the wealthy are particularly ironic in view of the fact that I mentioned earlier—income for the top 20 percent of the population has dramatically increased over the past 20 years. I am glad to see that. But what happened to the rest of the folks in this country?

As I noted earlier, the next 20 percent saw a 1 percent gain, and the income of the bottom 60 percent in this country actually declined. This is the reality. In fact, the wealthy are taking home the largest share of national income ever. Yet, the contract proposes tax cuts to ensure that the wealthiest become even wealthier.

The problem is further compounded by the certainty that while upper income families are receiving the benefit of the lion's share of these tax cuts, they secure a much smaller percentage of their income from Government benefits than average families at lower- and middle-income levels. Upper income families would be affected the least by budget cuts necessary to balance the budget and pay for further tax cuts, primarily for their benefit.

We are giving these benefits to the wealthy at a very high price to the country. At a time when we should be focusing on fiscal restraint, further deficit reduction and spending cuts, the Republicans instead are focusing on tax cuts.

The proposals in the contract are simply a recycling of the hollow promises from 1981: large tax cuts, defense spending increases, and a balanced budget. That is what they said then; that is what they are saying now. They did not keep their promises then and they can't do it now.

The Reagan administration predicted the economy would improve from a \$55 billion budget deficit in 1981 to a surplus of \$5.8 billion in 1985. In reality, the Federal deficit actually rose during that period to \$212 billion—another gap between rhetoric and reality. They inherited a deficit of \$55 billion and they ran it up to \$212 billion, all the while saying they would achieve a surplus.

Mr. President, the contract is just as irresponsible. The contract's tax cuts will cost \$364 billion, and the Republican defense increases will add another \$82 billion. That means the Republicans need \$1.4 trillion of spending cuts to balance the budget by the year 2002. Let me repeat: The Republicans need \$1.4 trillion in spending cuts over the next 7 years to balance the budget after their tax cuts and after their defense increases.

But where are their spending cuts? Where are they? "Where is the beef?" The only specific cuts the contract identified add up to \$277 billion over the next 7 years, not even enough to pay for their tax cut proposal, let alone start to balance the budget.

The bottom line is that there is a \$1.2 trillion—not million, not billion, \$1.2 trillion—Republican credibility gap, the gap between Republican rhetoric and Republican reality. It gives new meaning to the phrase "Don't ask, don't tell." That is the economic policy the Republicans are asking the American people to buy—a pig in a poke. "We will balance the budget." The problem is \$1.4 trillion. They have shown \$277 billion of spending cuts. Where is the rest? Where is the other \$1.2 trillion?

You really have to wonder what the Republicans are hiding from the American people.

We have seen these sorts of promises before, so we know what is going to happen. These tax breaks for the wealthy will end up busting the budget and the middle class will get stuck

with the bill in one of two ways. Either they will be paying through huge cuts in middle class programs, from Medicare to student loans to keeping our highways in good repair, or they will pay with higher interest rates on home loans, car loans, and educational loans, and economic stagnation caused by falling investment in our future.

The Republicans have been enormously successful at selling their contract as a benefit to the middle class.

Mr. President, the reality is that, hidden in the fine print of the contract, are enormously expensive tax breaks for the wealthy that will bust our budget.

Instead of talking about more defense spending and tax breaks for the wealthy, the Republicans need to tell us their specific proposals for balancing the budget. Where are they going to cut the other \$1.2 trillion necessary to balance this budget? That is \$1,200 billion.

We are waiting to hear from the Republicans. Where are they going to make the cuts specifically? Not these nostrums, "Oh, we will maybe eliminate agriculture funding."

In closing, let me again say we have heard this all before. There was a credibility gap in the 1980's between what the Republicans promised and budget reality. Earlier, I said the Contract With America was a contract on the middle class.

I would warn those middle class Americans who listened to the promises of the Republicans in the 1980's. What happened to you? What happened was the rich got richer, the poor got poorer, and the middle class paid the bill.

Mr. President, political rhetoric in a campaign is one thing. Performing when one has the responsibility of governing is another thing. I call on the Republicans and I challenge the Republicans to come forward with their plan to balance the budget.

What are they going to do to close the gap between the \$1.48 trillion necessary to balance the budget over the next 7 years and the paltry \$277 billion of budget cuts they have identified? Where is the other \$1.2 trillion the Republicans need in spending cuts in order to balance this budget?

We are waiting. The American people are waiting. We wait with great interest to see how our friends on the other side of the aisle will begin to close the gap between rhetoric and reality.

I thank the Chair and I yield the floor.

NATIONAL AUTISM AWARENESS WEEK

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, I rise today in honor and recognition of National Autism Awareness Week, January 9–15. Many of you may recognize autism from Dustin Hoffman's character in "Rainman." What some of you may not know is that autism is a neurological disorder that affects some

380,000 individuals in the United States today. Individuals with autism often have trouble with communication and social interaction; their brains don't process information in the same manner as yours or mine. Yet, some forms of autism are mild and individuals can be extremely talented in areas like math or music. Because of this vast range of impairment, autism is referred to as a spectrum disorder. It is a bewildering disability—a mystery science is still trying to unravel.

As we recognize National Autism Awareness Week, it is fitting that we also recognize the Autism Society of America, currently celebrating its 30th anniversary. The society offers those affected by autism and their parents and families, support and advocacy. The society has also been a persistent force on Capitol Hill, and I have been pleased to work with the society in our joint effort of advocating for increased funding for biomedical research. Last year, I was proud to play a role in directing the national Institutes of Health to hold the first ever national workshop in autism which is scheduled for this spring. This year I am looking forward to the findings and conclusions of the workshop.

Understanding is the beginning of acceptance and support. Awareness of the autism spectrum disorder is critical to further research efforts, eradicating discrimination and stigmatization, and improving the quality of the life of individuals with autism, as well as that of their friends and families. That is why it is important to recognize this week, and every week, as National Autism Awareness Week. The work we have before us cannot be completed in 1 week out of every year. It will require all of us, and every week.

Mr. President, I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing this week as National Autism Awareness Week.

MEMORIAL TO BILL SMULLIN

Mr. HATFIELD. Mr. President, with the passing of Bill Smullin, Oregon has lost another of its pioneers. Bill was for over 50 years a legendary figure in broadcasting and was, in the words of a National Association of Broadcasters chairman, "a great standard-bearer for all broadcasters."

Growing up in the shadow of Mt. Hood as the son of homesteaders, Bill Smullin was one of the first newspapermen to make the transition to broadcasting. Acquiring first radio, then television and cable operations, Bill built his California Oregon Broadcasting Co. into a sophisticated, cutting-edge system which featured the best technology had to offer.

Bill's interest in serving rural areas was avid. In an effort to ensure that smaller television markets had access to films, he helped form Television Station, Inc., in the 1960's, which bought and distributed films to rural stations. About the same time, Bill