

U.S. Congress

UNITED STATES



OF AMERICA

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 91st CONGRESS
FIRST SESSION

VOLUME 115—PART 12

JUNE 10, 1969, TO JUNE 19, 1969

(PAGES 15265 TO 16710)

stetter's analysis and mine is with respect to the extent to which the Russians could re-target some of their missiles to take account of failures of others.

Mr. Wohlstetter has assumed perfect information would be available to them about missile launch failures, failures during powered flight, and failures in separation and guidance of the individual warheads, and that they would be able to use that information with the high confidence required to make a pre-emptive attack a rational choice. I have assumed they would not be able to obtain and use information about such failures in a timely fashion. This accounts for most of the difference in our estimates of Minuteman survival.

There are five far more important points to be made.

There is no hard evidence that the Russians are determined to build a capability to effectively attack our ICBM's.

If they wish to do so, they can build such a capability by the mid-1970's.

If they do so, implementation of the Safeguard plan could be offset by a very small additional Russian effort. Even an expanded Safeguard system would be less satisfactory than other alternatives for strengthening our retaliatory capabilities.

Even if the Russians built the capability to destroy our Minuteman force, pre-emptive attack by them would be madness unless they could discount completely the possibility that we might launch some Minutemen before the arrival of their ICBM's, and unless they could be highly confident of also destroying the other components of our retaliatory strength essentially simultaneously, a possibility that is all but incredible.

The most effective means of insuring the continued viability of the Minuteman force is early agreement to stop MIRV testing and to preclude a large build-up in Soviet ICBM strength. Negotiations to achieve these ends clearly merit higher priority than the deployment of Safeguard.

GEORGE W. RATHJENS.

CAMBRIDGE, MASS., June 5, 1969

LETTER OF PROF. ALBERT WOHLSTETTER
To the Editor:

Responsible scientists like Drs. Bethe and Ruina, who feel we can delay starting ABM to protect Minuteman, testify that "any one . . . system, bombers, Polaris, Minuteman, has its own vulnerability;" that we need all three; that a threat to Minuteman concerns us gravely. One key issue then is whether that threat will develop by 1976 or 1977 when at the earliest Safeguard will be shaken down—or whether it is safe to wait years for a better ABM.

A disparate variety of calculations by Drs. Rathjens, Weinberg, Wiesner, and Lapp purport to show that it is safe to wait, that an attack by 500 Russian SS-9 missiles would leave untouched anywhere from one-fourth to three-quarters of our Minutemen.

They claim to square with official intelligence. Such confident inferences by scientists carry great authority and ought to be made with the utmost professional care. But despite their widely publicized claims, it is they (not those who would start ABM) who are careless of pre- as well as post-Nixon intelligence, and quite casual in their calculation.

They attribute to an SS-9 in the late 1970's poorer combinations of bomb yield, number of MIRV's, and accuracy than intelligence expects in the early 1970's; and compound these errors by presuming poor Russian tactics or higher blast resistance than designed.

BASIS FOR CALCULATION

In a note to me on his calculations, Dr. Rathjens assumed our silo could resist overpressures two-thirds higher than its design performance; and derived a probability some three-fourths too high that it could survive

a 1-MT burst. He bases his probability calculations on doubtfully relevant 1967 testimony about U.S. attacks on adversary silos of unspecified hardness with a range of destruction probabilities. Dr. Rathjens applies the low end of this range to late 1970 SS-9's attacking our silos—which hardly fits a proof that "the most worrisome projections" leave us nothing to worry about. The other end of the range yields roughly the appropriate lower survival probability.

Dr. Rathjens assumes only four one-MT MIRV's in the late 1970's SS-9. But (a) more than four one-MT MIRV's were attributed by pre-Nixon intelligence to the SS-9 in the early 1970's; and (b) an alternative of three 5-MT MIRV's is now public. 500 SS-9s equipped with either of these MIRV options could destroy about 95 per cent of Minuteman if the Russians use well-established techniques for reprogramming missiles to replace known failures. Using no reprogramming at all, the 1-MT MIRV force would destroy 92 or 93 per cent of Minuteman. The ability of the five-MT force to destroy 95 per cent of Minuteman presumes only half the failures after launch are replaced—a figure well within the state of the art.

Even limiting the use of information to missile malfunctions before or during launch; the five-MT MIRV force would leave only 8 or 9 per cent surviving. These numbers are intrinsically uncertain—sensitive especially to changing accuracy.

400 SS-9s with one-MT MIRV's and accuracies better by only 250 feet would destroy more Minutemen than 500 with the accuracy expected in the early 1970's.

Dr. Rathjens' belief that variants of Safeguard help retaliation less than available alternatives is based on estimates of costs of these alternatives which I find as casual as his calculations on the threat to Minuteman.

Finally, unlike him, I don't believe a stable, monitorable agreement to limit strategic offense and defense would freeze ABM at zero. ABM can counter improvements in offense accuracy unlikely to be monitored; and can protect population against smaller powers that violate or do not sign the agreement. I doubt the Russians would accept a total ban on ABM.

ALBERT WOHLSTETTER,
University of Chicago.

LOS ANGELES, June 11, 1969.

NATIONAL TRAILS

Mr. MONDALE, Mr. President, the signing last October by President Johnson of the National Trails System Act signified the successful end of a long struggle which began legislatively on May 20, 1964, with the introduction by the Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. NELSON) of a bill to protect the Appalachian Trail.

It was the need to protect the Appalachian Trail, which was threatened by highway development and urban encroachment, that stimulated Senator NELSON to introduce his first legislation in 1964. And it was the success of the Appalachian Trail Conference that convinced the Congress that not only should the Appalachian Trail be protected but also that other trails across the country should be developed and protected in a similar way.

The end result is the national trails system, first proposed in Senate bill 827 introduced in 1967 by Senator NELSON and Senator HENRY JACKSON, which already includes the 2,000-mile Appalachian Trail and the rugged Pacific Crest Trail in the West. The act also designated for study and possible future in-

clusion in the system 14 other major scenic or historic routes across the country.

In an excellent article in the June-July issue of National Wildlife, published by the National Wildlife Federation, Senator NELSON describes the unique recreation opportunities for the Nation which such trails system will provide, and also eloquently describes the urgent need for the system in view of the fact that our green open space is rapidly being gobbled up by highways, buildings, and parking lots.

I ask unanimous consent that this very informative and interesting article by the Senator from Wisconsin be reprinted in the RECORD.

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

TRAILS ACROSS AMERICA

(By GAYLORD NELSON, U.S. Senator from Wisconsin)

This summer when I go hiking along one of my favorite forest paths in northern Wisconsin, a new feeling of optimism will go with me—a feeling I hope is being shared by all Americans who love our nation's outdoors.

That reassurance springs from the National Trails System Act signed into law last year by President Johnson.

Our kids aren't going to learn about the outdoors from a car window. They have to see our natural surroundings as the first settlers did to really appreciate this wonderful country.

That's why, when a hiking enthusiast buttholed me in Washington five years ago and complained bitterly that his beloved Appalachian Trail was in danger, I became interested in a law that would protect "his trail" as well as set up a national system. It took four years, and many people, to get the job done.

Hiking trails provide the entire American family with perhaps the most economical, most varied form of outdoor recreation. So this new law gives us a much needed opportunity to preserve and more widely enjoy many significant parts of our country's natural heritage.

The National Trails System will require some years to assemble. But even a beginning represents a major breakthrough for conservation and wise outdoor recreation development. The goal is to provide *all of us*, no matter where we live, with easy access to a wide variety of trails suited to our tastes and needs—whether we are grandparents on a Sunday stroll, kids on bicycles or horseback, or veteran hikers.

The system will move toward this objective through two major programs.

NATIONAL SCENIC TRAILS

Two great trails already exist. The world-famous *Appalachian Trail* extends 2,000 miles across the East, and the even longer, more rugged *Pacific Crest Trail* across the West. These continuous routes will be uniformly marked, their rights-of-way clearly defined and protected by easements or government land purchase. Essential shelters will be maintained.

The Appalachian will be a foot trail. The Pacific Crest will serve hikers and horseback riders or pack animals. No motorized vehicles are allowed—except in emergencies. The National Park Service is in charge of the Appalachian Trail; the United States Forest Service, the Pacific Crest.

As a next step, 14 other major scenic or historic routes are to be studied by the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation as National Scenic Trails. This means that at long last a number of old trails, rich in natural splendor or deeply woven into the nation's history,

will be saved before all of them are obliterated by the impact of our industrial society.

Many, in fact, are now mostly under concrete, but some remain in the back country—old, almost forgotten paths worn deep by the feet of Indian warriors, trappers or traders, or grass-covered ruts in the prairie where once rolled the wheels of covered wagons.

NATIONAL RECREATION TRAILS

High priority is given to developing a variety of paths for various uses in or near our proliferating metropolitan areas. Two out of three Americans now live in urbanized communities; in 30 years, it will be three out of four.

As green open space is gobbled up by highways, buildings and parking lots, the people—especially the youngsters—have less and less place to hike, jog, ride bicycles or horses, or birdwatch, study plants and animals, sketch or photograph natural surroundings. We have built fabulously expensive automobile expressways, but have almost completely neglected those who like to move on foot, even though walking and hiking are the most economical and second most-popular form of public recreation.

National Recreation Trails are intended to meet this urgent human need. The possibilities for such trails are almost endless—if we use our imaginations and plan ahead. Our goal should be hundreds of miles of recreation trails in and around each major city. I have long felt that there should be a place to hike, to enjoy a natural environment, not more than an hour away for every American.

These trails are to be planned by local and state governments; those which meet the standards for National Recreation Trails will be eligible for Federal cost-sharing from the Land and Water Conservation Fund.

FOR BICYCLES, TOO

Urban trails are relatively inexpensive and can be built quickly. A number of small-scale demonstration projects undertaken in 1966 have already produced happy results. In congested Arlington, Virginia, just across the Potomac River from Washington, D.C., bicycle riders can now escape the perils and fumes of highway traffic by using an all-weather trail which runs for several miles along a creek, through existing park land most of the way, to the river. The Federal cost, matched by state and local funds, was only \$48,000. In Seattle, Washington, a Federal investment of \$49,500, matched by the University of Washington, created a nature trail through a marshy wildlife area to an island bird sanctuary and arboretum.

A GOOD START

The new law provides only a framework, of course, one which must be filled out by Federal, state, and local planners—with much help from conservation-minded citizens.

"This is a new kind of pioneering," one Federal planner told me. "It's exciting. We're getting all kinds of suggestions from all kinds of groups—Boy Scouts, women's clubs, historical societies and, of course, from many trail clubs."

The Appalachian Trail is a continuous footpath which runs along the backbone of the Appalachians from Mount Katahdin, Maine, to Springer Mountain, Georgia. Its hikers move among green, primitive surroundings much of the way, or have views of pleasant farm valleys—yet most portions of the trail are not far from great cities along its route.

There is a human angle, too. The trail owes its existence to the volunteer work of many outdoor clubs and individuals along its way. These enthusiasts, banded together as The Appalachian Trail Conference, have managed the trail, built shelters, marked it with the well-known A-over-T signs, and published maps and guidebooks.

RIGHT-OF-WAYS NEEDED

Since the trail crosses private lands for about two-thirds of its length, agreements had to be maintained with landowners to preserve the right-of-way. This became increasingly difficult in recent years due to the intrusion of roads, housing and commercial developments.

Under the new law, the Appalachian Conference will continue to be the principal guardian of the Trail—and I believe this volunteer idea can become a key to the success of other national hiking trail systems. Volunteers at the Appalachian Conference have done a remarkable job of developing and maintaining the trails. Thousands of people, young and old, have been involved in the efforts. This principle of participation should be extended to all trails.

People should feel that they have a stake in maintaining the trails, keeping them clean and attractive. Learning how to "brush out" a trail properly isn't difficult, and it gives one a close-up understanding of some aspects of conservation. Picking up trash is a long-lasting lesson that man shouldn't thoughtlessly desecrate the good earth. I know of young families who take responsibility for maintaining portions of the Appalachian Trail because they believe such work builds character by involving youngsters with nature, giving them a sense of man's responsibility toward his environment.

The second grand-scale model, the Pacific Crest Trail, is both a hiking and riding route for 2,300 miles, from Canada to Mexico, along the high ridges of the Cascades and the Sierra Nevadas. It offers some of the most dramatic and sublime mountain landscape in the world. As four-fifths of the trail is on Federally-owned land, the right of way can be established easily.

"The Pacific Crest passes include a generous share of the continent's most verdant forests, tallest and oldest trees, highest peaks, and most breathtaking waterfalls. The unique golden trout and almost extinct giant condor call them home. . . . Abandoned mines, old frontier towns and other relics of pioneer days still remain," says "Trails in America" a nationwide study.

TRAILS UNDER STUDY

It seems probable that the first two additional national scenic trails Congress will consider will be the Potomac Heritage and the Continental Divide. Surveys indicate both routes are "nationally significant", and the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation is now making in-depth studies. Each trail would provide its own, distinctly different outdoor experience.

The Potomac Heritage Trail would follow the banks of this history-rich river for 825 miles, from its headwaters in the mountains of Pennsylvania and West Virginia, past Washington, D.C.—where it would interconnect with a proposed system of metropolitan area trails—and on through tidewater country, still reminiscent of Colonial days, to Chesapeake Bay. No other trail in America offers such a concentrated scenic, cultural, natural and historic assortment.

The Continental Divide Trail would stretch for 3,082 miles through the grandeur of the Rocky Mountains from the Canadian border to Silver City, New Mexico. It would provide a wide range of both wilderness and western history experience, enabling riders and hikers to sample majestic mountain scenery, Indian reservations, and the Spanish-flavored Southwest. Most of the route is on Federal lands.

Twelve other potential scenic or historic trails await systematic study. All of them played a part in shaping the life of this country. They are:

Old Cattle Trails—such as the Chisholm Trail—over which the herds of Longhorns moved from the range of southern Texas to shipping points in Kansas.

Lewis and Clark Trail, 4,600 miles from

St. Louis, Missouri, to the mouth of the Columbia River on the Pacific (trail includes return by alternate route).

Natchez Trace, first used by Indians, then traders, became the main early-day route between Nashville, Tennessee, and Natchez, on the lower Mississippi River.

North Country Trail, 3,170 miles, from the Appalachian Trail in Vermont through northern states to the Lewis and Clark Trail in North Dakota.

Santa Fe Trail, the 800-mile wagon route between Independence, Missouri, and Santa Fe in the Mexican Southwest.

Oregon Trail, the 2,000-mile pioneer route from Independence, Missouri, to Portland, Oregon.

Long Trail, 250 miles, from Massachusetts through Vermont to Canada.

Mormon Trail, the 1,200-mile route of the exodus from Nauvoo, Illinois, to Salt Lake City, Utah.

Mormon Battalion Trail, 2,000 miles from Mount Pisgah, Iowa, to Los Angeles, California.

Kittanning Trail, across the Allegheny Mountains, from Shirleysburg to Kittanning in Pennsylvania.

Gold Rush Trails in Alaska.

El Camino Real, the King's Road of Spanish Florida.

FUTURE RECREATION TRAILS

Specific plans for this part of the national system originate with local and state governments, and are just getting under way. And here I strongly believe in aggressive citizen involvement. We have done virtually nothing with recreation trails in this country mainly because state conservation departments with a few exceptions, haven't had the imagination or vision to plan them. One state conservation director once told me, "We don't build hiking trails because we have so few hikers."

He was putting the cart before the horse. How can there be hikers unless they have some place to go? And he obviously did not realize that making it easy for people to get out into the countryside, to learn about natural resources on their feet, is vital to conservation.

When conservation departments are stimulated to look systematically for potential trails in their states, they will be astonished by the number and variety available. After all, a good trail doesn't take much room. For example, along the Brule River in my state are the deep-worn paths left by Indians and fur traders. They are only a few feet wide and meander through the woods. To protect such a strip of history with easements, mark it, put it on a map, and keep it passable is fairly simple and should not be a very expensive task.

Several years ago I made a rough study of some of the more obvious trails we might develop in Wisconsin. When we put them on a map it showed a network totaling 3,000 miles! Running mainly along river banks, lake shores, and through state and national forests, these trails would put a hiking path within reach of virtually every family in cities, suburbs and small towns.

Long, continuous trails are not essential, however. Sites for many short ones, possibly 5 to 15 miles long, can be found in any state. Once developed, they become in effect linear parks where oncoming generations can learn the vital fabric of the earth, its vegetation and its creatures, through their own eyes, ears, hands and feet. Personally, I believe that every trail should have tree collections at suitable intervals—small plantations, perhaps only an acre, where youngsters could see every tree native to their state, each one identified with a plaque giving its name and important characteristics.

WHAT WILL TRAILS COST?

The National Trails System Act authorizes appropriations of \$5,000,000 for acquiring

lands and easements for the Appalachian Trail, and \$500,000 for these purposes for the Pacific Crest Trail, most of which already is on public land. The total investment will be relatively modest. A splendid nationwide network of all types of trails can be established for less than the cost, say, of a few hundred miles of superhighway.

The Federal share of the National Trails System is to be financed from the Land and Water Conservation Fund, as available and appropriated. As states complete their comprehensive outdoor recreation plans and proposals, including those for trails, they may apply for cost-sharing grants from the Fund.

FUND NOT ENOUGH

One trailblock, however, is that more conservation and recreation projects have been authorized than can be readily financed by the Fund. It isn't that the nation is over-committed on projects—quite the contrary. Rather, the sights of the Fund have been set *too low*.

Congress recently sought to correct this by earmarking \$200 million a year for five years for the Fund from Federal off-shore oil revenues—again, if appropriated. Even so, the massive task of saving and restoring our natural environment cannot be mastered unless we use general funds for this purpose on a much larger scale.

Still, conservationists should be optimistic. A more concerned, more constructive attitude is taking hold. I keep in mind a cold weekend one October when I hiked over a fine new trail being completed through the Chequamegon National Forest near Lake Superior. The work was being done by a group of college students who wanted that trail for themselves and others. Twenty-five of them invested their Saturday in trimming out brush, hauling off fallen trees and leveling hummocks. By the end of a long day they had created a pleasant 7-mile footpath where none had been before.

That kind of spirit can give America the trails it needs—and the trails can give us more of the America we need.

SPEECH BY WALTER J. McNERNEY, PRESIDENT, BLUE CROSS ASSOCIATION

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, several committees and subcommittees of the Senate, including the Subcommittee on Executive Reorganization, are deeply concerned with the problems facing those responsible for the delivery of health care.

There are no easy answers in this field. But we are fortunate in that many dedicated individuals and groups are hard at work at developing solutions to the difficulties of organization, financing and delivery of health care.

Walter J. McNerney, president of the Blue Cross Association, is one such individual. In a recent speech before the Group Health Institute annual meeting in New York, he gave a very impressive summary of the problems. His remarks on the subject of the prepaid group practice of medicine bear special attention.

I ask unanimous consent that his speech be printed in the RECORD.

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

THE HEALTH ADMINISTRATION ESTABLISHMENT: UNDERACHEIVER

A serious discrepancy exists in the relative investment our nation is making in the delivery of health care and biomedical research.

As a result, we know a great deal about diagnosis and treatment of illness, but less than we should about how to translate our know-how into effective service at a reasonable price. Also, the health establishment, excessively preoccupied with old values and yesterday's problems, lacks the flexibility and motivation to create the right setting or to capitalize on opportunities that exist.

Last year the Federal government spent approximately \$1.6 billion on biomedical research. During that same year, it earmarked—but spent less than—\$18 million for research on ways to improve delivery of health services. In a market where significantly less than 50 percent of the new expenditures for health are translated into new services or modernization, the disparity is devastating in terms of both human compassion and economic soundness.

The essential fault cannot be ascribed to Congress. It is indeed true that past Congresses have generously appropriated money for biomedical research, with funds often exceeding requests of the Administration. But, for the most part, members of Congress are not health experts. It is to be expected that as members of a wealthy society, confident of overcoming challenging problems through massive infusions of money, they would feel that major health appropriations would bring concrete benefits to individuals and to their communities. Further, Congressmen are members of a society only now emerging from a long period of consumer unassertiveness (with the help of more effective mass media and more widespread education). They proceed gingerly in health matters for fear of interfering in quality of care (or, perhaps, risking some sort of personal retribution). Thus, it is natural for legislators to avoid significant involvement in the highly-charged problems of health care financing and organization.

The fault lies within the field of health. It is here, primarily, that heavy emphasis has been placed on professional versus consumer rights. The illusion that a noncompetitive economy can become efficient largely through the good intentions of practitioners and institutions given semi-monopoly power through licensure is still being perpetuated. It is here that we see emphasis on new hearts for the hundreds while millions suffer from lack of preventive care.

The example cited is symptomatic of the fact that our scientific acumen has badly outstripped our delivery know-how. Furthermore, massive infusions of research money from The National Institutes of Health, Medicare or Medicaid or from other quarters without corresponding attempts to improve the delivery of care, will simply heighten the problems we face. This is not to imply that we can arbitrarily stop spending or make wholesale cuts in health expenditures. As we already have seen, undercare can be result. The health system, like the economy as a whole, is in delicate balance. Expenditures must be coupled with more imaginative delivery systems, and this concept must evolve more rapidly than to date.

There are signs that the need for more effective delivery of health services is enjoying wider appreciation and that more dramatic changes in health care are in prospect for the next five years than we have seen in the last 20. While ready answers are not easily at hand, there are signs that health problems will be conceptualized and solutions will be sought by consumers, as well as by practitioners, drawing upon the help of task-oriented experts who are as much concerned with results as with processes. To put it another way, a strong dose of anti-intellectualism in health administration matters, which we have experienced in recent years, may be on the wane.

FORCES CALLING FOR CHANGE

Where do we see the signs of these changes? A good place to start is the population re-

ceiving health services. The orientation of the young needs little elaboration. The majority of them are wed less to gradualism than their elders. They are more inclined to act now when problems, such as access to care among the poor, become apparent, and they are less impressed with institutional form than with payoff. As access to and influence over health grow, these points of view will become increasingly influential. The growing number of medical students and allied professions interested in community medicine—whether in a neighborhood health center, a hospital, or the Peace Corps—suggests that receptiveness to these points of view within the health establishment will increase in the near future.

A second influential group, smaller in size but similar in impact, is the poor and near poor. Blue Cross asked Louis Harris to study the health problems of the total population last year. This and other surveys reveal that the poor—in relation to the average citizen—have a significantly greater incidence of major and minor medical complaints and less insurance. Also, the poor have a pervasive fear of major medical episodes and a despair about reasonable access to care. Surprisingly, the poor appreciated the value of specialty care as well as the non-poor and discussed the hazards of air and water pollution as well as the extensive use of pesticides in agriculture.

At the 1969 National Health Forum, sponsored by the National Health Council several of the ghetto residents who participated in the discussions gave unanimous support to programs that would cut through old ways to produce health professionals below the doctor level who might attend to their needs. They expressed great impatience with a system that requires upwards of ten years to produce a doctor—and doesn't produce doctors for their neighborhoods. "We may see them occasionally, but never the same one twice," they said. Obviously, the poor have a strong interest in change, and they, like the young, express a sense of urgency which the principals of the establishment lack thus far.

The gainfully employed who are supporting the poor and the young are also pressuring for change through both the public and private sectors. For example, in California, all of the major unions have combined to form a California Council for Health Plan Alternatives. Its general objective is to seek out and bargain for more effective means of organizing, operating, and financing health services. Recognizing the susceptibility of health services to inflation, its members see this problem as a matter of degree and not in terms of absolute license to justify rapidly increasing deductions from payroll to pay for the same or similar services, which often fall far short of full health care. With less formal organization, thousands of working groups around the country are concerning themselves with costs and effectiveness of care. By now, the story is a familiar one to all of you.

Importantly, several key consumer groups again are beginning to focus on the effectiveness of the total health system on a national scale and now just how it might affect a given subgroup or locality. For example, Walter Reuther has launched an exhaustive inquiry into the whole structure of our health system and the reasons lying behind its less than superior overall performance, as measured by mortality and morbidity experience (as the world's wealthiest nation), its low efficiency in some parts and its shortcomings in reaching out consistently to the disadvantaged. The AFL-CIO is similarly concerned. A key underlying assumption of these groups is that, whereas more money will be needed to do the job, much more can be done with the money we are now spending. The proposition is slowly emerging that adequate care for everyone is