

UNITED STATES



OF AMERICA

*U.S. Congress.*

# Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 93<sup>d</sup> CONGRESS  
FIRST SESSION

VOLUME 119—PART 2

JANUARY 18, 1973 TO JANUARY 30, 1973

(PAGES 1319 TO 2610)

West Virginia to Florida, plus eight newly selected areas in the White Mountains of New Hampshire and the Green Mountains of Vermont.

These oases of wilderness all exist in national forests. They are known as "de facto" wilderness because they are, in fact, wild even though they are not on the list of lands which Congress in the 1964 Wilderness Act specifically required the Forest Service to study. The Forest Service contends that there is little or no wilderness in the East because any land that has ever felt the impact of human activities cannot qualify as wilderness. But that view contradicts the more reasonable, pragmatic language of the Wilderness Act itself, which defines wilderness as an area where "the imprint of man's work [is] substantially unnoticeable."

The Forest Service's purist stance is more responsive to the timber industry's economic objective than to a disinterested concern for the land. The timber industry vehemently opposes extension of the wilderness system because logging is forbidden in areas officially designated as wilderness.

Senators Talmadge, Georgia Democrat, and Aiken, Vermont Republican, chairman and ranking minority member respectively of the Senate Agriculture Committee, are sponsoring a bill to establish so-called "wild lands" in the East. Their bill rests on the Forest Service premise that no or few areas of genuine wilderness quality exist east of the Rockies. Some conservationists endorse this bill as a compromise but the risks of undercutting the Wilderness Act far outweigh any probable gain.

The Jackson-Buckley bill meets the need for new legislation by giving protection to areas which the Forest Service refuses to classify as wilderness. There is no need for a new subcategory of wilderness, be it called "wild lands" or whatever. What is needed is a new, more positive attitude on the part of the Forest Service toward conserving the eastern wilderness, and positive legislative protection, as in the Jackson-Buckley bill, for the few suitable areas that remain.

#### PHASE II: A FAILURE

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, there have been repeated statements by the administration reflected in turn by unthinking, uninformed, uncritical newsmen that phase II price controls was a success, that it worked well, slowed down inflation, did the job.

Mr. President, this erroneous view has become so widely held, that I think it must be answered.

The fact is that controls did not work. Surely they were popular, because everyone is against inflation. It seemed that the Government was acting to stop inflation by imposing controls on prices and wages. Since the administration made the decision to put controls into effect, since Congress overwhelmingly approved the decision, and since the country wanted the controls, it is now a simple political ploy to announce blithely that controls worked. It is human for everyone to want to believe they were right, so the assertion is accepted.

But did the controls work?

What are the facts?

At the time controls were imposed, inflation had already slowed considerably. All the economic factors were promoting a further slowdown in prices. Unemployment was high, and it has remained high. So the pressure on wage increases was lessening, as it always does when the labor markets are slack. Vacant plant

capacity was high and while it has improved a little, it remains high. And vacant plant capacity of course retards price increases as businessmen are tempted to hold down prices or cut prices in order to increase sales so they can use their additional volume and increase profits—even with stable or lower prices.

So the economic situation was ripe for a further reduction in inflation.

Then controls were imposed.

What was the result? The first 6 or 8 months of controls were not a good test. Here is why: In the first 3 months prices and wages were frozen. That worked, and worked well. When the freeze went off and prices were allowed to rise to reflect cost increases, there was a temporary bulge, while the economic readjusted to the end of the freeze and the beginning of price increases.

But that bulge certainly ended by June of this past year. The last 6 months of phase II is a fair period for judging the effect of phase II in holding down prices. Controls had been in place long enough to work. The freeze and the bulge were over.

Now let us compare the last 6 months of phase II with the period prior to the freeze, the period before President Nixon announced his new economic program. For comparison purposes the Bureau of Labor Statistics selects the period between December of 1970 and August of 1971. On August 15, 1971, President Nixon announced that he was involving at that time wage and price controls.

If we compare the latest 6 months of phase II with the period just before any controls were instituted, do we see an improvement in the cost of living? Do we see a big reduction in inflation stemming from controls, a small reduction, or no reduction at all?

Mr. President, the economic statistics are out today. What do they show? They show that prices actually increased more—I stress more—after controls were firmly in place—that is, in the latest 6 months—than they did before we had any controls. The statistics are the Consumer Price Index, 1971, prior to phase I, December 1970–August 1971. All items up 3.8 percent annual rate, latest 6 months, June 1972–December 1972, up 3.9 percent.

Now think about that for a minute. This Government decided to control the prices in our previously free economy, the result: Prices actually rose more rapidly under controls than with no controls and they did this in spite of the fact that unemployment was still high and plant capacity vacant.

I submit, Mr. President, that this Government should learn a lesson from this experience, it is this:

Wage and price freeze may work for a short period of time, perhaps for 3 or 6 months, but wage and price controls at least as conceived and executed by this administration did not work in this experiment we have just completed. It is imperative that our Government and our people learn this lesson. The temptation to pose wage and price controls is likely to continue to persist, and there may be controls of a kind and a duration that we might find are useful. But the

experience we have just had should make us very wary indeed of the glib, politically attractive claim that controls did the job against inflation in 1972. They did not. They failed.

#### FINANCIAL STATEMENT BY SENATOR MONDALE

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a statement of my estimated net worth as of December 31, 1972, be printed in the RECORD.

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

*Financial statement of Senator Walter F. Mondale, Dec. 31, 1972*

ASSETS	
Residence in Washington.....	\$63,000
<hr/>	
Automobiles:	
Chevrolet .....	1,489
Oldsmobile .....	1,565
Total automobiles.....	3,054
<hr/>	
Cash in deposits.....	584
Household and personal goods.....	5,000
Cash value of life insurance.....	4,450
Personal contributions to Federal employees retirement system.....	22,227
Total assets.....	98,315
<hr/>	
LIABILITIES	
Mortgage on residence in Washington .....	36,557
Miscellaneous personal bills.....	1,000
Total liabilities.....	37,557
<hr/>	
Estimated net worth.....	60,758

#### THE 75TH ANNIVERSARY OF TULSA, OKLA.

Mr. BELLMON. Mr. President, On January 18, 1898, U.S. District Judge William M. Springer signed papers which incorporated a new town in Indian Territory. That city, Tulsa, Okla., is celebrating its 75th anniversary.

As the mayor of Tulsa, Okla., Robert J. LaFortune, puts it:

No resident of Tulsa or expert on the growth of cities could have envisioned in 1898 that Tulsa would be the dynamic and enterprising city that exists today. Tulsa's growth is a result of the determination of our early day pioneers to build a new, viable, and progressive city in the fresh and invigorating environment of the Southwest.

While advantages of building a new city on the plains included abundant natural resources, ultimate success or failure of this growing city would be based on the courage, determination, and dedication of its citizens.

Tulsa has seen great change in its first 75 years and it will continue to change if it maintains its greatness. Its history, carved by hard working, adventurous pioneers will be carried on in the years ahead by, not only native sons and daughters, but others moving here from areas across the nation who want to be a part of the great promise which Tulsa holds for future generations.

Tulsa deserves to be congratulated on the achievements made during the last 75 years. Because of an abundant supply of natural gas, Tulsa has been able to grow industrially but has avoided the costly degradation of the environment which is closely associated with indus-