

U.S. CONGRESS

UNITED STATES



OF AMERICA

# Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 92<sup>d</sup> CONGRESS  
FIRST SESSION

VOLUME 117—PART 5

MARCH 9, 1971, TO MARCH 16, 1971

(PAGES 5461 TO 6806)

the moon, or, and I hesitate, Federal assumption of welfare costs. In each instance we are technically spending money "that we do not have."

The most fundamental basis for revenue sharing is the belief on the part of its supporters that the State and local governments should be permitted to share in a small but fixed fractional part of federally collected revenues, not in a fixed fractional part of the net profits from government operations. Such a sharing will strengthen and revitalize State and local governments and tend to thwart the future development of greater centralism. I do not believe that the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means or any of the other critics of the proposal have successfully refuted these basic arguments in support of revenue sharing.

One other comment of the Chairman's caught my eye, and I am even hopeful enough to find some encouragement in it. As is well known, Mr. MILLS has been discussing as an alternative to revenue sharing a gradual Federal assumption of all State and local welfare costs. Even though the distinguished ranking minority member of the committee, Mr. BYRNES, appears to prefer some sort of tax credit approach to either welfare takeover or revenue sharing, it is the lion's share of attention.

A number of statistical studies have revealed that only 11 of the 50 States would receive greater fiscal relief from a Federal assumption of welfare costs than they would from the enactment of the President's revenue sharing proposal. Conversely, 39 States would receive less under such a welfare scheme.

In his recent interview, Mr. MILLS is quoted as having said that:

We could say to the states that, in order to get the government into welfare, they would have to pass on half of what they save to the cities and counties.

Mr. MILLS is not the sort of man to make such a remark off the top of his head, and I intend to read into it everything that I can. There are two things about the remark that are of particular interest. First, it seems to imply that the powerful Federal Government might actually use the assumption of welfare costs as a vehicle to impose certain conditions on State governments. But this cannot be a fair interpretation of what Mr. MILLS meant, because we have just learned how treacherous he finds such an act on the part of the Federal Government. Why, if the prospect of the Federal Government using revenue sharing as a vehicle for enforcing its own ideas on the States is such anathema to Mr. MILLS, surely he would not propose using the welfare system for such a purpose.

The second thing about this remark that interests me is the fact that he is describing something suspiciously similar to the pass-through requirement of the President's general revenue sharing proposal, which would require that roughly half of each State's allocation be passed through directly to cities and counties. If Mr. MILLS is endorsing section 501 of S. 680, it is a most welcome

endorsement. Although it remains true that, under Mr. MILLS' welfare savings pass-through proposal, the cities and counties of 39 States would receive less fiscal relief than they would under the President's proposal, at least they would get something, and that is a step in the right direction.

Mr. President, I am confident that the will of the 77 percent of the American people reported by George Gallup to favor revenue sharing will not be frustrated by the Congress. Although objections to the proposal can be effectively argued, there is no doubt in my own mind that the overwhelming assets of the proposal greatly outweigh whatever tenuous liabilities it might contain.

#### THE UNILATERAL JAPANESE RESTRAINT ON TEXTILE EXPORTS TO THE UNITED STATES

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, I am extremely encouraged by the news that the Textile Federation of Japan has agreed to voluntarily limit their textile exports to the United States over the next 3 years.

The negotiations to seek a formal signed agreement by the two nations proved to be frustrating and disappointing to all concerned, and I feel that the Japanese have acted both wisely and courageously in coming up with a unilateral voluntary agreement.

I am hopeful that this agreement can provide the basis for similar agreements on the part of other textile exporting nations.

I know that our own textile industry has been extremely concerned over the recent increases in imported textiles, I know, too, that they have been seeking controls on the most favorable terms to our own domestic industry, and have held out the hope that the Congress would enact quotas.

But I would hope that our industry, and our administration, will look carefully at this Japanese agreement in light of our overall trade problems and the promise this agreement provides for resolving the most difficult question of all—the need for restraining imports without precipitating a trade war and retaliation against our exports.

I believe that this action does hold the key toward providing relief to our own industry without the threat of a disastrous international trade war which would inevitably result from the imposition of legislated quotas in violation of the GATT.

I think we have now seen an act of statesmanship on the part of the Japanese. I hope it can be met with similar conciliation on the part of our own industry and our administration, and that we can now turn toward positive, responsive, and responsible trade legislation to the benefit of American labor and industry.

#### SENATOR RICHARD BREVARD RUSSELL

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, the Nation will long grieve the loss of the great Senator from Georgia, Richard Brevard

Russell. His unfortunate death has removed not only a good and true friend but also an inspirational and dedicated leader whose equal will not soon be seen again in this body.

He gave to the Nation 38 years of devoted and exemplary service. Throughout that time his performance measured up to the highest ideals of the U.S. Senate, in the finest tradition of Webster, Clay, and Calhoun. He brought to the body thinking that was ahead of his time.

It is noteworthy that well over half of Dick Russell's life was spent in this body. The only man who served longer was Senator Carl Hayden.

Senator Russell's remarkable record of tenure provides ample evidence of his character as seen by those who know him best—the residents of his beloved native State of Georgia. In all his election campaigns, he had only one serious challenge.

Sometimes in its enthusiasm for its subject, the press understandably falls victim to exaggeration. But its erstwhile description of Senator Russell as the most powerful man in the Senate was never an understatement. None of us who knew him and worked with him would question his dominance.

What might not have been generally understood by the public which did not know him personally, however, was the reason for his power in this body. They did not have the good fortune of enjoying his charity and compassion, his sincerity and willingness to accept responsibility, and the deep personal sense of honor which guided all his actions.

Dick Russell's courtly manner and his straightforward approach to all his dealings were more than tools of the trade which helped him to rise rapidly to a position of leadership. They were such ingrained qualities of the man that any other type of behavior for him would have been impossible.

He was a statesman in the truest sense of the word. He was a man born to serve his people. His record of public service is one of the most remarkable and inspiring in our Nation's history.

He paid a fierce allegiance to the Senate as an institution and the necessity for it to function by rule and precedent. He knew so well that departure from those rules and precedents would erode and destroy the usefulness and high position of the body.

Elected to the Georgia House of Representatives 1 year after his graduation from law school, he became speaker of the house 6 years later. In another 4 years, he became the youngest Governor in the history of the State. Then he came to the U.S. Senate, for which he had been destined.

The omnipotent Creator who has watched over the Nation throughout its history has been fit to give each generation a cadre of dedicated and inspired leaders, to guide our destiny and to protect us from evil. Richard Russell served that role for the past 38 years. He will be sorely missed, but his memory will be cherished by generations to come as one of the men who has led the country on its path to glory.