

Y4  
. C 73/2

1041

91 Y4  
273/2  
91-47

91-47 **AUTHORIZE APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE  
COAST GUARD**

GOVERNMENT

Storage

RECEIVED

MAY 17 1970

THE LIBRARY  
KANSAS STATE UNIVERSITY

**HEARING**

BEFORE THE

**MERCHANT MARINE SUBCOMMITTEE**

OF THE

**COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE**

**UNITED STATES SENATE**

**NINETY-FIRST CONGRESS**

**SECOND SESSION**

ON

**S. 3473**

**AUTHORIZE APPROPRIATIONS FOR PROCUREMENT OF  
VESSELS AND AIRCRAFT AND CONSTRUCTION OF SHORE  
AND OFFSHORE ESTABLISHMENTS FOR THE COAST GUARD**

\_\_\_\_\_  
FEBRUARY 19, 1970

\_\_\_\_\_  
Serial No. 91-47  
\_\_\_\_\_

Printed for the use of the Committee on Commerce



U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE

WASHINGTON : 1970

42-580

KSU LIBRARIES  
664799 ✓  
A11900 964799 ✓

RECEIVED  
MAY 1 1970  
THE LIBRARY  
KANSAS STATE UNIVERSITY

AUTHORITY APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE  
COAST GUARD

AY  
C. 1312  
11-41

COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE

WARREN G. MAGNUSON, Washington, *Chairman*

JOHN O. PASTORE, Rhode Island  
VANCE HARTKE, Indiana  
PHILIP A. HART, Michigan  
HOWARD W. CANNON, Nevada  
RUSSELL B. LONG, Louisiana  
FRANK E. MOSS, Utah  
ERNEST F. HOLLINGS, South Carolina  
DANIEL K. INOUYE, Hawaii  
JOSEPH D. TYDINGS, Maryland  
WILLIAM B. SPONG, Jr., Virginia

NORRIS COTTON, New Hampshire  
HUGH SCOTT, Pennsylvania  
WINSTON PROUTY, Vermont  
JAMES B. PEARSON, Kansas  
ROBERT P. GRIFFIN, Michigan  
HOWARD H. BAKER, Jr., Tennessee  
CHARLES E. GOODELL, New York  
MARLOW W. COOK, Kentucky

FREDERICK J. LORDAN, *Staff Director*  
MICHAEL PERTSCHUK, *Chief Counsel*  
EMANUEL ROUVELAS, *Staff Counsel*  
ARTHUR PANKOFF, Jr., *Minority Staff Director*  
J. PAUL MOLLOY, *Minority Staff Counsel*

MERCHANT MARINE SUBCOMMITTEE

RUSSELL B. LONG, Louisiana, *Chairman*

JOHN O. PASTORE, Rhode Island  
ERNEST F. HOLLINGS, South Carolina  
DANIEL K. INOUYE, Hawaii  
JOSEPH D. TYDINGS, Maryland  
WILLIAM B. SPONG, Jr., Virginia

ROBERT P. GRIFFIN, Michigan  
WINSTON PROUTY, Vermont  
CHARLES E. GOODELL, New York  
NORRIS COTTON, New Hampshire

(II)

## CONTENTS

---

	Page
Opening statement by the chairman.....	1
Text of S. 3473.....	1
Agency comments of the Federal Maritime Commission.....	2

### LIST OF WITNESSES

Beggs, James M., Under Secretary, Department of Transportation; accompanied by R. G. Prestemon, Director, Office of Budget; Adm. W. J. Smith, Commandant, U.S. Coast Guard, and Vice Adm. P. E. Trimble, Assistant Commandant.....	2
Questions asked by Senator Long.....	16

CONTENTS

Introduction ..... 1

Chapter I ..... 10

Chapter II ..... 25

Chapter III ..... 45

Chapter IV ..... 65

Chapter V ..... 85

Chapter VI ..... 105

Chapter VII ..... 125

Chapter VIII ..... 145

Chapter IX ..... 165

Chapter X ..... 185

Chapter XI ..... 205

Chapter XII ..... 225

Chapter XIII ..... 245

Chapter XIV ..... 265

Chapter XV ..... 285

Chapter XVI ..... 305

Chapter XVII ..... 325

Chapter XVIII ..... 345

Chapter XIX ..... 365

Chapter XX ..... 385

Chapter XXI ..... 405

Chapter XXII ..... 425

Chapter XXIII ..... 445

Chapter XXIV ..... 465

Chapter XXV ..... 485

Chapter XXVI ..... 505

Chapter XXVII ..... 525

Chapter XXVIII ..... 545

Chapter XXIX ..... 565

Chapter XXX ..... 585

Chapter XXXI ..... 605

Chapter XXXII ..... 625

Chapter XXXIII ..... 645

Chapter XXXIV ..... 665

Chapter XXXV ..... 685

Chapter XXXVI ..... 705

Chapter XXXVII ..... 725

Chapter XXXVIII ..... 745

Chapter XXXIX ..... 765

Chapter XL ..... 785

Chapter XLI ..... 805

Chapter XLII ..... 825

Chapter XLIII ..... 845

Chapter XLIV ..... 865

Chapter XLV ..... 885

Chapter XLVI ..... 905

Chapter XLVII ..... 925

Chapter XLVIII ..... 945

Chapter XLIX ..... 965

Chapter L ..... 985

# TO AUTHORIZE APPROPRIATIONS FOR PROCUREMENT OF VESSELS AND AIRCRAFT AND CONSTRUCTION OF SHORE AND OFFSHORE ESTABLISHMENTS FOR THE COAST GUARD

THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 19, 1970

U.S. SENATE,  
COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE,  
MERCHANT MARINE SUBCOMMITTEE,  
Washington, D.C.

The subcommittee met, pursuant to notice, at 10:05 a.m., in room 5110, New Senate Office Building, Hon. Russell B. Long (chairman of the subcommittee) presiding.

Present: Senators Long, Hollings, and Cotton.

## OPENING STATEMENT BY THE CHAIRMAN

Senator LONG. This morning we will consider S. 3473, a bill to authorize appropriations for procurement of vessels and aircraft and construction of shore and offshore facilities of the Coast Guard.

(The bill and agency comments follow:)

[S. 3473, 91st Cong., second sess.]

A BILL To authorize appropriations for procurement of vessels and aircraft and construction of shore and offshore establishments for the Coast Guard

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That funds are hereby authorized to be appropriated for fiscal year 1971 for the use of the Coast Guard as follows:*

### VESSELS

For procurement and increasing capability of vessels, \$62,295,000.

#### A. Procurement:

- (1) one replacement polar icebreaker;
- (2) design of vessels.

#### B. Increasing capability:

- (1) increase fuel capacity and improve habitability on high endurance cutters of the three hundred and twenty-seven foot class;
- (2) improve habitability on cutter Storis and selected buoy tenders.

### AIRCRAFT

For procurement and extension of service life of aircraft, \$12,865,000.

#### A. Procurement:

- (1) six medium range helicopters.

#### B. Extension of service life:

- (1) replace center wing box beam on seven HC-130 aircraft.

### CONSTRUCTION

For establishment or development of installations and facilities by acquisition, construction, conversion, extension, or installation of permanent or temporary public works, including the preparation of sites and furnishing of appurtenances, utilities, and equipment for the following, \$24,840,000.

Staff member assigned to this hearing: Emanuel Rouvelas.

- (1) San Francisco, California : complete radio station construction ;
- (2) Washington and Oregon ; relocate and improve communications facilities ;
- (3) Portsmouth, Virginia : consolidate and improve facilities ;
- (4) Neah Bay, Washington : improve station facilities ;
- (5) Barnegat, New Jersey : improve station facilities ;
- (6) Barbers Point, Hawaii : improve air station facilities ;
- (7) Governor's Island, New York : improve base facilities ;
- (8) Western Long Island, Connecticut and New York : improve station facilities ;
- (9) Curtis Bay, Maryland : modernize and replace Yard equipment and utilities ;
- (10) Various locations : transportable pollution control equipment ;
- (11) Various locations : aids to navigation projects on selected waterways ;
- (12) Various locations : automate light stations ;
- (13) Various locations : modernize LORAN-C equipment ;
- (14) Various locations : modernize LORAN-A equipment ;
- (15) Alaska : improve and rehabilitate selected loran stations ;
- (16) Various locations : public family quarters ; and
- (17) Various locations : advance planning, survey, design, and architectural services ; project administration costs ; acquire sites in connection with projects not otherwise authorized by law.

FEDERAL MARITIME COMMISSION,  
Washington, D.C., March 12, 1970.

HON. WARREN G. MAGNUSON,  
*Chairman, Committee on Commerce,  
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.*

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN : This is in response to your request of March 2, 1970, for the views of the Federal Maritime Commission with respect to S. 3473, a bill to authorize appropriations for procurement of vessels and aircraft and construction of shore and offshore establishments for the Coast Guard.

Inasmuch as the bill does not affect the responsibilities or jurisdiction of the Commission, we express no views as to its enactment.

The Bureau of the Budget has advised that there would be no objection to the submission of this letter from the standpoint of the Administration's program.

Sincerely,

HELEN DELICH BENTLEY, *Chairman.*

Under Secretary of Transportation, James Beggs, I believe, will be making a presentation assisted by Admiral Smith. I believe you have two of your associates with you. Would you please identify them for the record?

**STATEMENT OF JAMES M. BEGGS, UNDER SECRETARY, DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION, ACCOMPANIED BY R. G. PRESTEMON, DIRECTOR, OFFICE OF BUDGET, DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION; ADMIRAL W. J. SMITH, COMMANDANT, U.S. COAST GUARD; AND VICE ADMIRAL P. E. TRIMBLE, ASSISTANT COMMANDANT, U.S. COAST GUARD.**

Mr. BEGGS. Yes, sir, Mr. Chairman. This morning, in addition to Admiral Smith, the Commandant of the Coast Guard, I have with me Mr. Robert Prestemon, of our Budget Office, and Admiral Paul Trimble.

May I proceed, sir?

Senator LONG. By all means.

Mr. BEGGS. I appreciate the opportunity to appear on behalf of Secretary Volpe in support of appropriations authorization for the Coast Guard for fiscal year 1971.

The Coast Guard plays a vital role in the total array of transportation programs administered by the Department. Its broad mission is to assure that our waterborne commerce moves safely and efficiently. From the vantage point of more than a full year of close association with the Coast Guard, we are greatly impressed with the "can do" attitude so often demonstrated, and we are convinced that their outstanding reputation for "cost effectiveness" is fully deserved.

I wish to call your attention to two areas of activity which we believe require immediate increased emphasis. The Department, through the Coast Guard, has been increasingly active in marine pollution matters. The Coast Guard has developed, and will test in the next few weeks, an imaginative new airdrop containment system for oil pollution. This year's authorization request includes procurement of operational equipment.

In addition, the Secretary has directed the submission of a plan by early March for a comprehensive marine pollution control and detection system. Implementation of the plan may well have future authorization implications although we feel that a systems approach can increase effectiveness within existing resources during the first phases of this effort.

We also face a rapidly developing situation in the Arctic. The Department has been studying transportation needs for this area and believes that improved sea transportation is essential for resource development. Whether improved sea transportation leads to year around shipping, which appears possible, or only an increase in the length of the shipping season, we believe that it is urgent that the Coast Guard improve its capability to operate in the Arctic.

This need for improved capability coincides with the progressive deterioration of the present U.S. icebreaker fleet to a critical level. Performance of this fleet is now only marginal. Current icebreaker missions include logistic support for U.S. defense units, logistic support for U.S. scientific and applied Arctic research, and search and rescue in the polar areas. Since time has run out on the "Wind" class icebreakers, the authorization request includes one replacement icebreaker.

We appreciate the interest of this committee in the Coast Guard programs and your prompt attention to our legislative needs. The Department is looking forward to appearing before you at a later date in support of S. 3199, the administration's boating safety bill which has been referred to this committee for consideration. I can assure you that boating safety is a matter of great interest to the entire Department.

You are, of course, aware of the stringent budget which the administration has submitted for fiscal year 1971, made necessary by the current state of the economy. We believe that the Coast Guard request, while austere, is responsive to the most urgent needs, will insure maintenance of essential services and, at the same time, reflects added emphasis in areas of growing responsibilities. We urge your continued assistance in aiding the Coast Guard carry out its responsibilities.

Admiral Smith and his able associates will now describe in detail the activities of the Coast Guard and the specific items which are included in the pending bill.

Senator LONG. Thank you.

Admiral Smith, I think we will hear from you next so that we get your statement. I think it will help if I hear from both of you and then you may want to farm the questions out. We will have both presentations at this point.

Admiral SMITH. Before discussing the specifics of our 1971 program this morning I would first like to tell you briefly of some of the things we have done this year and of some of the things that have happened to us.

History was made last summer when the specially modified tanker *Manhattan* traversed the legendary Northwest Passage and returned with a symbolic cargo of oil from Prudhoe Bay on the North Slope of Alaska. We emerged from that operation with mixed emotions: Pride in the prominent part played by Coast Guard personnel in helping to make the project go; elation over the success of the project; and some frustration, shared with the determined, dedicated, but disappointed crews of the icebreaker *Northwind* who labored to keep their tired old ship in the fray. I will say more about that later.

In the President's program to Vietnamize the conflict in Southeast Asia, we have transferred 12 patrol boats and withdrawn 11 percent of our personnel there. We have also completed plans to turn over two high-endurance cutters, *Yakutat* and *Bering Strait*, to the Vietnamese Navy and we have already started training the Vietnamese crews for them.

In San Francisco Harbor we are now operating on a 1-year test basis, this country's first harbor advisory radar system to assist in moving traffic quickly and safely through the port. By this time next year we should be able to draw some conclusions about whether to continue and the extent to which we should undertake this project in other ports. A part of our study is to determine the basis for financing operating costs.

Weather has played an even more important role than usual for us this year. As you know all too well, Mr. Chairman, Hurricane Camille wreaked havoc with our stations and aids to navigation on the Gulf Coast. But it also gave our Coast Guard crews a chance once again to live up to the old adage "When others are coming in, the Coast Guard is going out."

Starting at the approach of the storm and working right on through it—often in winds approaching 100 knots—and long afterwards in the cleanup, our aircraft, ships, and shore teams assisted over 230 people transporting 140 to hospitals and medical aid, and saving 55 lives. We directly assisted 39 vessels. The same sort of service was performed on a smaller scale many times over throughout the Coast Guard all year. All of which serves to remind us constantly that our people are the greatest asset in the Coast Guard.

Weather was a factor in the July 4th tragedy on Lake Erie and in hundreds of smaller cases. It was a dominant factor, too, in the decision to deploy a weather ship just off the East Coast.

Incidentally, we expect CGC *Gresham* will sail today and open the station tomorrow by 3 p.m. eastern standard time.

Planning for future Coast Guard activities in the fields of pollution control, pollution monitoring, data buoys, oceanography, and polar operations, as well as the traditional ocean station and search and rescue effects are also greatly affected by weather.

Water pollution problems continue to rank high on our list of priority programs. Our efforts this year were devoted to Federal coordination of prompt and effective cleanup or containment to minimize adverse ecological effects and development of a plan for increased aerial surveillance to provide early warning and as a deterrent to pollution offenders. Full implementation and effectiveness of the surveillance plan depends on additional resources in future years, development of sensors for all-weather observation, and legislation to facilitate enforcement.

A factor which has had a broad impact on our ability to accomplish the programs you authorized last spring was the President's program to cut Federal construction spending by 75 percent. We have been able to go forward with some of our more critical projects, for example the metal trades building at the Coast Guard yard, aids to navigation, the Academy cadet barracks, and New Haven station. Postponed were the Academy library, Boston base, Houston station, Guam housing and others as shown on the listing you have. We expect funds to be released in fiscal year 1971 to do the deferred work.

Finally, the recently announced decision to phase out the Selected Reserve part of the Coast Guard Reserve will have an impact in many areas, not the least of which is our various training commands. We are exploring that in detail now.

So, you see, it has been an interesting several months. I wish I had time to tell you of some of the individual rescues, but I think I had best go on to the various projects that make up the proposed bill.

Our request this year for replacement and augmentation of the Coast Guard's capital plant is directed toward orderly replacement and improvement of obsolete facilities and equipment. The diversified missions assigned our units demand complex and unique equipment. Replacement of overage equipment or facilities of marginal capability is vital if we are to continue to perform effectively and provide the taxpayer a maximum return on his investment in us. Limited expansion to meet newly developing and increasing requirements is also needed.

I will discuss the various projects as they appear in the bill before you.

Appearing first, and appropriately so, is the largest single line item in this year's request, and for that matter, the largest ever placed before you. We need to construct the first of a series of replacements for our old and tired "Wind" class icebreakers. These vessels are becoming less and less reliable and their mission effectiveness is declining commensurately.

The Coast Guard icebreaker *Northwind*, in spite of well-trained and unusually dedicated crew, could not complete the escort of the tanker *Manhattan* through the Northwest Passage last summer because a portion of her engineering plant failed and she could not attain full power. This vessel is typical of our fleet of polar icebreakers now representing the United States.

With the certainty of increased tempo of polar operations in the next decade and continued deterioration of our present fleet it is manifestly clear that this replacement program is urgent.

The proposed ship will ultimately replace one and one-half of our "Wind" class icebreakers and it will perform tasks already required. We have not yet fully determined what icebreaker requirements will arise from marine transportation in the Northwest Passage, but we can expect increased activity as soon as commercial interests expand their operations in the area.

The replacement icebreaker will employ a concept which is new in this class of ships. We are considering conventional diesel engines for normal cruising and gas turbines for maximum power situations. They will drive generators producing a common source of AC power. The main propulsion motors will draw off power through rectifiers, permitting absolute flexibility in delivery of power from alternate sources.

Further, the use of controllable pitch propellers on each of three shafts will permit maneuvering in heavy ice without the usual risk to propeller blades occasioned by stopping the shaft while going from ahead to astern. The pitch can also be varied for maximum efficiency in a cruising situation.

The icebreaking capability with diesel power alone will exceed that of *Glacier* and approach that of the Russian *Moscow* class and the Canadian *St. Laurent*. With the gas turbines in operation the available shaft horsepower should exceed that of any icebreaker afloat including Russia's nuclear power *Lenin*. The continuous icebreaking capability may well exceed that of the *Manhattan* tanker as configured for the 1969 test.

Modernization of our 327-foot high-endurance cutters through better habitability and operational improvements continues a program previously begun. Habitability improvements on certain buoy tenders and the *Storis*, a vessel used for general duties in Alaska, are also included.

Six more medium-range recovery aircraft are included this year to continue replacing overage fixed-wing aircraft, permit redeployment of short-range recovery aircraft and also support the overhaul line. This replacement of aircraft is an implementation of our overall aviation plan.

Special replacement of wing beams on seven of our C-130 long-range search aircraft are necessary because of extensive corrosion and structural repair problems associated with fatigue cracking. We have joined the Air Force repair program for economy as they contract to correct the identical problems with their C-130 fleet. This item completes a program begun in fiscal year 1970.

The fiscal year 1971 program for shore units includes completion of the fiscal year 1970 project of replacement or relocation of existing facilities at San Francisco, Calif., where we are moving our radio station to a new site in a program to attain an integrated command and control system throughout the Pacific maritime region. This new radio station and the integrated system will afford significantly improved communications, replacement of obsolescent equipment and permit closing of both the old San Francisco station and the Westport, Wash., radio station.

Modest expansion of high and medium frequency capability in Port Angeles, Wash., and Astoria, Oreg., will balance the latter change locally.

Our fiscal year 1971 request also includes the first phase of a project to consolidate and replace an assortment of obsolete facilities in Portsmouth, Va. The first phase consists of site development, dredging, bulkheading, a pier and utilities.

Two search and rescue stations come next in our effort to improve our shore stations. At Neah Bay, Wash., where a heavy concentration of boaters is often threatened by sudden and severe changes of weather, we need to rehabilitate the station building, boat building, and pier.

Our station at Barnegat, N.J., is one of our busiest, having made 505 rescues last year. We need to construct a new barracks, mess, and station building there.

We also need improve our air station at Barbers Point, Hawaii, by completion of new construction started in 1968. The proposed work will include installation of helicopter hangar doors, a fire protection system, and outfitting and communications equipment.

At Governors Island, N.Y., an improved electrical system is necessary to bring system capacity up to a level which will meet the power requirements of the new high-endurance cutters.

In our project to make more effective use of men and facilities in western Long Island Sound we need to complete our station at New Haven, Conn., repair the pier at Fort Totten, N.J., and make renovations at Eaton's Neck, N.Y. We expect considerable benefit from this rearrangement.

At the Coast Guard yard in Baltimore we plan to continue modernization and replacement of equipment and utilities. Included is the correction of a serious pollution problem.

Another major effort in control of pollution is the air-transportable pump and storage container system we have programed this year. Once pollutant spills are in open seas we are somewhat at the mercy of wind and tide in controlling the damage they do. We hope by this system to prevent endangered cargoes from ever becoming spills onto the shore environment.

Under this heading of aids to navigation are waterway aids, light-house automation and replacement of obsolete equipment, and the rehabilitation of certain Loran stations in Alaska.

Under our family housing, survey and design and engineering and logistic expenses, our requirements for public family housing, design and administrative expenses round out our fiscal year 1971 authorization program.

Mr. Chairman, since about 60 percent of the total 1971 program is for one single line item, the first of our long overdue "Wind" class replacements, our authorization request this year presents a different picture than the balanced program we usually try to present.

Faced with what we consider an urgent requirement to build a first replacement icebreaker we had no choice but to postpone once again some very important construction projects ashore. What is left is important and we will appreciate your continued support.

I will be happy to discuss any specific item in greater detail if you wish.

Thank you.

Senator LONG. When is the last time you had an icebreaker delivered to you?

Admiral SMITH. The last icebreaker to join our present fleet was built in 1954. This is the icebreaker *Glacier*. She was built for the Navy, but she was transferred to the Coast Guard when the Navy icebreakers were transferred some years ago.

Senator LONG. That one would then be 16 years old. About how long a life would you project for an icebreaker before you traded it in for a newer model?

Admiral SMITH. Mr. Chairman, this depends somewhat on the condition of the ship and its associated equipment. Except for the *Glacier* our other icebreakers are about 25 years old, and 25 years or perhaps a little bit more would be a time when you would begin to think of replacement for any ship in your inventory. Some of them a little earlier, some perhaps could last a little longer.

Senator LONG. You have one that is 16 years old that you got from the Navy. That is the *Glacier*. Now, what is your next most modern one?

Admiral SMITH. The other icebreakers, there are six in number, are all the same class, the "*Wind*" class icebreaker, and they were all built in the forties, between 1944 and 1947.

Senator LONG. All in about the same period. Those apparently then were built during World War II?

Admiral SMITH. Yes, sir; these were built during World War II.

Senator LONG. Were they built to be icebreakers?

Admiral SMITH. They were built as icebreakers; yes, sir.

Senator LONG. How many of those do you have?

Admiral SMITH. We have six of those.

Senator LONG. So what you are now doing is replacing some of them?

Admiral LONG. Yes, sir; that is correct. We are starting a replacement program for these older ships.

Senator LONG. Where did you get that 1½ ratio you made reference to?

Admiral SMITH. Mr. Chairman, as we look forward to the use of our icebreakers, we feel that four more able ships can take the place of the six "*Wind*" class ships we have at present. So this is where we arrived at this 1½ replacement.

Senator LONG. Do you estimate that is going to be the volume of traffic that you will have for employing icebreakers during the years ahead?

Admiral SMITH. This is our best estimate at the present time, Mr. Chairman. I think we are looking at the type of work we are doing in the Arctic and the Antarctic, and I am sure marine transportation on the North Slope of Alaska may cause us within the next few years to reexamine this. But we really are not sure enough just exactly what is going to happen here to make this forecast now.

Senator LONG. It seems to me that at all levels we ought to be doing some planning. It may be a dirty word in some sources, but I would think usually things that have not been planned don't work out very well and are not very efficient. We need to be looking ahead and seeing what the problems are going to be when the time comes; otherwise, we get into all sorts of trouble. For example, you have some people projecting ahead the use of more disposable containers for beer, soft drinks, and things of that sort, and I regret to say only in recent years has anybody started projecting ahead that we would have to pick up all those things off the highways when people threw them out of automobile windows. Those of us trying to think about the public interest ought to be thinking ahead in terms of what the needs are going to be.

There is a great deal of oil in Alaska which is American oil. It is under our jurisdiction and control. We don't have to worry about whether Alaska is going to be on our side or on the enemy's side in the event we are forced into warfare. You have to be thinking in terms of delivering that oil to the ports in this country.

Is that your estimate of what you are going to need in terms of icebreakers, which apparently will be approximately the same as what you have had in terms of capacity in previous years?

Admiral SMITH. Mr. Chairman, we feel that this plan may have to be modified depending on what happens with respect to this marine transportation of oil. As you probably know, no final decision has been made on whether the oil companies will try to use ships to move the oil. There are other possibilities, the pipeline concept. So, we are awaiting to become more sure of their decisions before we project this program ahead further.

We feel, though, that in light of what may happen, that it is important for us to start now with the replacement, and we are talking about the first ship now in the series.

Senator LONG. Let me ask you about the icebreaker that you sent along with the *Manhattan*. Was that icebreaker simply going on to accompany the *Manhattan* or was it supposed to help clear the way?

Admiral SMITH. The icebreaker was not supposed to clear the way. The *Manhattan*, of course, a much larger vessel, could get through ice where the United States and Canadian icebreakers would have a great deal of difficulty. Because it was a pioneer voyage and because there were some safety problems that might develop, and it was also a voyage in which we wanted to learn more about the ice conditions, the United States and Canada each sent one icebreaker with the *Manhattan*. They did help her a number of times when she became beset in ice, not to clear a path for her but to break some of the ice along her side so that she could back out and move on again. So, the *Northwind* was sent on that journey with her for this purpose.

Senator LONG. The way it worked out it sounded as though the *Manhattan* was breaking for the *Northwind* rather than the *Northwind* breaking for the *Manhattan* before they got through, according to what you have here in your statement.

Did the *Northwind* break down?

Admiral SMITH. We had a problem with the *Northwind*. She transited from the Pacific over into the eastern Arctic, across the top of

the world, and during the transit she had serious damage to one of her diesel engines, and although she had a little time in Greenland before she had to start the return voyage with the *Manhattan*, we sent parts up and the crew did their very best to repair this engine, but it was not possible to do in Greenland, so she left on the return voyage with only partial power. This was her real problem. She was short of the power that she would ordinarily be able to develop.

Senator LONG. Was that in part because it was an old engine to begin with?

Admiral SMITH. These engines are old engines, but through periodic overhauls they are still very useful. This was a casualty that was somewhat unusual but you could have the same kind of trouble with a diesel engine wherever you used it. Our problem was there was no place in the Arctic where you could quickly make these repairs.

Senator LONG. How will our icebreaker fleet compare with that of the Soviets when you have this new icebreaker you are asking for?

Admiral SMITH. Of course, the Soviets have a good many more icebreakers than we have, and they have a class of icebreaker that would be roughly tonnage-wise the same size as the one we propose to build. Our ship would have more power than the present Soviet icebreakers. We do understand they are planning new and bigger ships also, but this ship would compare favorably to the icebreakers that they are presently using.

Senator LONG. Insofar as their fleet is concerned, how does it stand in terms of modernization, their fleet compared to ours?

Admiral SMITH. They have many newer ships than we do, Mr. Chairman. They have been building icebreakers over the past 10 years, quite a large number of them. They also have some old ships in their fleet, but they have many new ones.

Senator LONG. Do you have available here at your elbow the number of modern icebreakers the Soviet Union has at the present time?

Admiral SMITH. We could furnish for the record what has been published and what our knowledge is of the type and size of their present fleet.

(The following information was subsequently received for the record:)

*Status of U.S.S.R. icebreaker fleet*

Ships built since 1955-----	17
Includes <i>Lenin</i> (nuclear) and the 5 in the <i>Moscow</i> class (largest diesel electric icebreakers in the world today).	
Ships built between 1909 and 1943-----	15
Ships projected to be built-----	5
Four nuclear, 1 conventional, including the 2 mentioned in the Times article Feb. 15, 1970.	

Source: Jane's Fighting Ships, 1968-69 ed. pp. 504, 505.

Senator LONG. I have a number of questions I am going to submit for the record. I would like to ask a few, and the rest of them I would appreciate if Secretary Beggs or you, Admiral Smith, would provide the answers to them.

I would like to ask of you, Mr. Secretary, what percentage of the Coast Guard's original acquisition and construction improvement request was approved by the Department.

Mr. BEGGS. This year, Mr. Chairman, of a submission of \$201 million, which includes \$10 million for alteration of bridges, the Department submitted \$170,600,000 to the Bureau of the Budget.

Senator LONG. What amount was approved by the Bureau of the Budget?

Mr. BEGGS. \$100 million, sir.

Senator LONG. How much did you say the bridge repair budget was?

Mr. BEGGS. It was \$10,704,000. That was taken out of the request at a subsequent date.

Senator LONG. What impact do you anticipate that the phaseout of the Selected Reserve will have?

Mr. BEGGS. Well, sir, as we are currently studying this with the Coast Guard, and we have requested the Department of the Navy to advise us from their point of view what impact it is going to have. So far we see several things as possible replacements or substitutions for the Selected Reserve elements. There are several problems associated with this. Most particularly we have an obligation to some of these reservists who have commitments to serve a specific length of time, and that is going to have to be worked out. We expect to come forward with legislation on that subject.

Insofar as the Coast Guard's duties in the event of an emergency, we feel that they can be adequately taken care of from the standby units as well as by a number of trained personnel who come off active duty with a remaining commitment to the Reserve.

So, we feel for port security and this sort of thing we will have an adequate force. But a more detailed analysis has not yet been made, and we are in the process of doing that.

Senator LONG. Where did the proposal to phase out the Selected Reserve originate? Was this in the Coast Guard, the Department of Transportation, or the Bureau of the Budget?

Mr. BEGGS. While it originated in the Bureau of the Budget, the Department did go along with it and support it. The Reserve has not been called in some 20 years, and this was one of the prime motivations for reexamining the necessity for maintaining it.

Senator LONG. I would like to ask a question or two of Admiral Smith.

How accurate were your ship improvement cost estimates for the last few years?

Admiral SMITH. Mr. Chairman, are you speaking to ship construction or improvements?

Senator LONG. Both.

Admiral SMITH. We have had only one problem. As you recall, we did not build an oceanographic ship that was authorized because the cost of this ship went beyond our appropriations, beyond our esti-

mates. Other than this experience, our estimates of costs for both construction and repairs have been very close; we haven't had any serious problems with cost increases.

Senator LONG. At A.C. & I. No. 15 you describe the 327-foot-high endurance cutters as having been built in 1936.

Were all of them built in 1936?

Admiral SMITH. They were spread over a period of about 2 years, but they were all built about the same time.

Senator LONG. You state that the amortized cost to extend the service life of these cutters for 10 years or more is about 27 percent of the cost of building new cutters.

Does that calculation take into account the increased capability and productivity of the new cutters?

Admiral SMITH. No, sir, Mr. Chairman. Really what we are saying here is that this is about what it costs us to keep these ships operating with a slightly improved capability, but basically their present capability to do the jobs they have to do.

Senator LONG. You have been authorized medium-range recovery aircraft each fiscal year since 1966. How many of these do you need and what is the anticipated life of these aircraft?

Admiral SMITH. Mr. Chairman, with respect first to their anticipated life, we haven't had enough experience with the turbine-powered helicopters to have a very good feeling for this. I would hate to express a number in years until we do know a little bit more about the machine. We anticipate that it will be a very durable machine and will serve us for a good many years.

With respect to the replacement program, 28 of these have been funded, and we have, of course, six in this year's budget. Under our present projection for our aviation plan, to continue our replacement program we need 22 additional ones in the future years.

Senator LONG. In the past, the committee has often requested and received for the record the original request for acquisition, construction, and improvement funds submitted by the Coast Guard to the Department of Transportation, and the request submitted from the Department to the Bureau of the Budget. This has been useful to the committee in fulfilling its obligation to review these matters.

Admiral Smith, do you have any objection to submitting the Coast Guard's original request for the record?

Admiral SMITH. No, sir. We could provide that for the record.

Senator LONG. Mr. Beggs, do you have any objection to submitting the Department's request?

Mr. BEGGS. No, sir.

Senator LONG. I think it might be helpful for us to know what you requested and what the Bureau permitted you to come up here and testify for.

(The following information was subsequently received for the record:)

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION—U.S. COAST GUARD—ACQUISITION, CONSTRUCTION, AND IMPROVEMENTS,  
FISCAL YEAR 1971 PROGRAM

[In thousands of dollars]

Item	Fiscal year 1971 preview estimates	Department request to Bureau of Budget (specific projects determined by Coast Guard)	President's budget (specific projects deter- mined by Coast Guard)
<b>A. Vessels:</b>			
1. Replacement:			
(a) Construct replacement polar icebreaker.....	55,000	55,000	59,000
(b) Construct high-endurance cutters to replace 3 overage cutters.....	148,000	151,000	-----
Subtotal.....	103,000	106,000	59,000
2. Modernization:			
(a) High-endurance cutters, complete improve- ments to 327-foot class.....	1,500	1,500	2,150
(b) Buoy tenders, habitability improvements on 4 tenders.....	720	842	820
(c) USCGC STORIS habitability improvements....	180	180	175
(d) Repair icebreakers.....	250	250	-----
(e) Improve habitability and operational capa- bility of reserve training vessels.....	186	125	-----
(f) Procure refueling equipment (High Drink)....	256	256	-----
(g) Improve habitability and operational capa- bility of 1 icebreaker.....	750	-----	-----
Subtotal.....	3,842	3,153	3,145
<b>B. Aircraft:</b>			
1. Replacement and modification:			
(a) Procure medium-range helicopters.....	15,400	12,200	12,050
(b) Modify center wing section on 7 C-130 aircraft.	865	865	815
(c) Procure polar and subarctic oceanographic research aircraft.....	3,800	-----	-----
Subtotal.....	20,065	13,065	12,865
<b>C. Shore units:</b>			
1. Replace or relocate existing facilities:			
(a) San Francisco, Calif., relocate radio station, phase II.....	478	833	780
(b) Western area communications improvements...	180	230	230
(c) Portsmouth, Va., construct new base, phase I...	5,500	5,500	4,600
(d) Neah Bay, Wash., construct new facilities at station.....	793	884	750
(e) Barnegat, N.J., construct new facilities at station.....	735	735	500
(f) Portland, Oreg., construct permanent station...	2,149	1,737	-----
(g) Alameda, Calif., construct mooring facility, training/supply center.....	2,500	2,500	-----
(h) Gloucester, Mass., construct new facilities at station.....	1,278	1,278	-----
(i) Traverse City, Mich., construct new facilities at air station.....	1,700	-----	-----
(j) Boston, Mass., construct new base, phase II...	2,000	-----	-----
(k) Clarkson, Wash., construct new station.....	360	-----	-----
(l) Washington, D.C., construct new enlisted barracks at radio station.....	1,041	-----	-----
Subtotal.....	18,714	13,697	6,860
2. Improve capability:			
(a) Barbers Point, Hawaii, improve hangar at air station.....	150	228	215
(b) Governors Island, NY, improve electrical sys- tem, phase I.....	206	206	190
(c) Western Long Island Sound development, phase II.....	350	350	410
(d) Curtis Bay, Md., modernize and replace equip- ment at yard.....	1,523	1,523	1,400
(e) Kodiak, Alaska, modify hangar at air station...	180	180	-----
(f) Cape May, N.J., construct boathouse/shop building.....	116	116	-----
(g) Omaha, Neb., improve facilities at moorings...	320	326	-----
(h) Guam, Marianas Islands, improve facilities at depot.....	476	476	-----
(i) Grand Isle, La., install protective revetment...	250	-----	-----
(j) Juneau, Alaska improve mooring facilities....	325	-----	-----
Subtotal.....	3,896	3,405	2,215

See footnotes at end of table, p. 14.

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION—U.S. COAST GUARD—ACQUISITION, CONSTRUCTION, AND IMPROVEMENTS,  
FISCAL YEAR 1971 PROGRAM—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Item	Fiscal year 1971 preview estimates	Department request to Bureau of Budget (specific projects determined by Coast Guard)	President's budget (specific projects deter- mined by Coast Guard)
<b>C. Shore units—Continued</b>			
3. Procurement of major equipment:			
(a) Pollution control, transportable pumping and storage system.....	\$ 3,000	\$ 1,500	\$ 1,390
<b>D. Aids to navigation:</b>			
1. Waterway aids to navigation projects.....	2,000	2,300	1,760
2. Lighthouse automation and modernization (Lamp).....	500	700	615
3. Loran-C stations, replace obsolete equipment, phase I.....	5,000	2,275	2,275
4. Loran-A stations, replace obsolete equipment, phase I.....	4,084	4,084	2,375
5. Gulf of Alaska, improve and rehabilitate 4 Loran stations.....	1,020	920	900
6. French Frigate Shoals, Hawaii, modernize and improve Loran-A station.....	1,300	1,300	-----
7. Gulf of Maine, expand Loran-A coverage, construct 1 new station.....	950	-----	-----
Subtotal.....	14,854	11,579	7,925
<b>E. Training:</b>			
1. New London, Conn., Coast Guard Academy:			
(a) Construct science building.....	3,262	3,500	-----
(b) Modify training craft (5 65-foot boats).....	480	400	-----
2. Alameda, Calif., construct recruit classroom building at training/supply center.....	1,300	1,300	-----
3. Governors Island, N.Y., construct additions to barracks and classrooms, training center.....	2,000	2,000	-----
4. Yorktown, Va., reserve training center:			
(a) Construct classroom building and convert maintenance shop.....	2,090	2,270	-----
(b) Construct 250-man barracks.....	1,500	-----	-----
Subtotal.....	10,632	9,470	-----
F. Public family quarters.....	7,800	6,000	2,750
<b>G. Property acquisition, design and administration:</b>			
1. Survey and design of facilities.....	4,993	2,731	1,000
2. Engineering and logistics, support for construction projects.....	(c)	(c)	2,850
Subtotal.....	4,993	2,731	3,850
Grand total.....	7190,796	7170,600	100,000

<sup>1</sup> 13 each.

<sup>2</sup> 8 each.

<sup>3</sup> 6 each.

<sup>4</sup> 2 each.

<sup>5</sup> 1 each.

<sup>6</sup> In preview estimates and Department request "Engineering and Logistic Support for Construction projects" is included in each project's cost estimate.

<sup>7</sup> Grand totals of preview estimate and Department request were \$201,500,000 and \$176,700,000, respectively. These totals included \$10,704,000 and \$6,100,000, respectively, for the alteration of obstructive bridges over navigable waterways, which is now to be funded through a separate appropriation.

Senator LONG. I have a number of additional questions. I think I will only ask one or two now and then I will submit the rest.

Would you tell us what the latest situation is with regard to that spill in Tampa Harbor? I think you had a problem trying to clean that up.

Admiral SMITH. Yes, sir.

Mr. Chairman, just to review for a moment, you recall that this vessel grounded on last Friday, and when she went aground she spilled about 6,000 gallons of oil as a result of a rupture in her side. We became aware of that within a period of about 2 hours. The ship was floated and moved on to a final berth, and further oil spill was prevented there by a combination of booms and off-loading the ship.

The oil that had spilled in the water drifted over to the St. Petersburg beaches. It had spread out too much in the bay to be able to do any effective job of containment out in the open bay.

So, our captain of the Port of Tampa enlisted the support of the local people and the city of St. Petersburg, and they responded very vigorously, so that right now they are completing some final cleanup of the beaches. The oil spill itself has dissipated and moved offshore, and for all practical purposes it has disappeared.

There are still a few pockets of oil here and there that have been contained and will be recovered and picked up. We haven't received any assessment as far as damages that have resulted from this spill. We know there were a number of birds that were caught in the oil, and we know that it did get on the beaches, but not in great quantities.

Senator LONG. Some of these things that occur you can't do much about. I know in our part of the country we are moving a lot of oil around, and from time to time you are going to have a spill, and you just have to do the best you can under the circumstances.

Goodness knows, I have spent some days in the amphibious force, and this thing of hitting something that you didn't intend to hit is a calculated risk when you are out at sea. Nobody intended that Navy ship to knock down that bridge from Norfolk across the bay there, did they? Whose ship was that?

Admiral SMITH. That was a Navy ship, a Navy cargo ship.

Senator LONG. That didn't take any private enterprise; the Government succeeded in doing that all by itself.

I understand how those kinds of things can happen. Every now and then down our way we have some fellow who gets sleepy at the controls and knocks down one of the supports in the causeway. It is a parallel problem, but it doesn't have the same magnitude when it happens to us.

Also, in spite of the best we can do about it, there are occasions when somebody runs one of his barges into the piers across the Mississippi River. Fortunately, we haven't had a bridge knocked in, but we have had a causeway put out of service occasionally by someone smashing into it. Those kinds of things will happen from time to time despite your best efforts to prevent it, will they not?

Admiral SMITH. Yes; they will, Mr. Chairman, but a good deal of our effort is devoted to trying to find ways to reduce the possibility of collisions or accidents to the lowest number that we can.

As you are fully aware, many of our programs in merchant marine safety and in aids to navigation and in port safety matters are designed to move this traffic without accident and the safest way it can be done. We certainly realize, even with the best efforts, occasionally you are going to have accidents.

Senator LONG. I want to commend you for selecting that Mississippi test site for some of your development and research work. I think if someone will help carry the housekeeping cost of it, you are planning to use that and the computer center down in Slidell, La., to help you develop some of your new buoy tenders and safety programs on the open seas.

Isn't that according to your present planning if it is available?

Admiral SMITH. Yes, Mr. Chairman. This is part of our national data buoy program. If the facilities are available, we are planning to move a sizable part of our operation down to the Mississippi test site facility.

Senator LONG. Thank you very much.

(The following written questions were submitted by Senator Long so that they may be answered for the record:)

QUESTIONS FOR UNDER SECRETARY BEGGS, ADMIRAL SMITH, AND THE COAST GUARD FOR THE RECORD

ICEBREAKERS

*Question. On your AC&I sheet No. 14(b), you show a possible plan for replacement of icebreakers. What will be the effect of the estimated reduction of over 200 available ship-days fiscal years 1973 through 1975?*

Answer. When we make our operating schedules, we assign priorities to the requests for icebreaker time. Since we already have requests for more ship time than is available something will have to give. Judging from our present experience we would probably be unable to support some of the lesser scientific projects for which we will undoubtedly have requests.

*Question. Will the icebreaker replacement plan be adequate to fulfill all your responsibilities?*

Answer. I will speak only of icebreaking responsibilities in polar areas, for that is where these ships will operate. Our present responsibilities in polar areas are:

1. DOD logistic support in Canada, Greenland, and Antarctic.
2. Classified DOD support.
3. DOD oceanographic research.
4. SAR assistance along the Alaskan coast.
5. Support to science, for such as NSF, ONR, NAVOCEANO, universities, state agencies, and even museums like the Smithsonian.

As I mentioned earlier we cannot meet, even today, all the requests being made of us. Some of the requests *must* be met, some are of relatively minor significance in the sense of national priorities.

*Question. How do you determine estimated costs of shipbuilding and improvement, by competitive bidding?*

Answer. The estimated bid price is the sum of weight group costs and non-repetitive costs. Weights are classified by "groups" because of large cost variances between such weight groups as hull steel, and machinery. They are calculated from preliminary design studies. Cost of any weight group is taken from previously experienced cost per unit weight statistics. Then all costs (labor and material) are updated according to labor and material price indices, to account for changes since the cost experience. Non-repetitive costs (e.g., design) are then added as a percentage of the total labor and material cost.

*Question. What sort of adjustments to your icebreaker replacement plan do you anticipate as a result of Northwest Passage developments?*

Answer. I do not now expect any changes in the timing of the replacement plan if industry decides to go forward with tanker traffic to the North Slope. The plan is phased now to provide replacement ships at as early a date as is reasonably practicable. It may have to be modified to provide different numbers or types of ships, but that decision will depend on the form and magnitude of shipping developments and the extent to which our presently planned replacement ships can meet the demand for their time.

HIGH ENDURANCE CUTTERS

*Question. What is the present status of your replacement program for these over age cutters?*

Answer. The replacement program for fifteen, 311-ft. cutters now stand at:

In commission	-----	9
Being built	-----	3
To be funded in the future	-----	3
Total	-----	15

We do not plan to replace the 327-ft. class for several years.

*Question. Once you begin replacing them, how long will it take to complete each ship?*

*Answer.* Our experience with the present program to replace the 311-ft. cutters is that it takes about 2½ years to build an HEC.

*Question. Did the original AC&I request submitted by the DOT to BOB have a provision for a replacement program for these cutters?*

*Answer.* Yes, it did. The submission to the Bureau of the Budget requested three replacement high endurance cutters in FY 1971.

*Question. In your statement you said two High Endurance Cutters are being given to Vietnam. Are they in the 327-foot class? What are their home ports and how will you replace them in their home port?*

*Answer.* The two high endurance cutters being given to Vietnam are the 311-foot class that is being replaced by our new cutters. *Bering Strait* is home ported in Honolulu and the *Yakutat* is home ported in New Bedford. Ships being decommissioned are not necessarily going to be replaced in their home ports. We have not yet firmed up plans regarding replacement of these two ships.

#### BUOY TENDERS

*Question. At AC&I No. 17, you state that the Coast Guard is operating 38 sea-going and 12 coastal buoy tenders which are beyond their normal service life, but which cannot be replaced until future requirements and preliminary designs are established. What sort of study are you conducting?*

*Answer.* We are conducting an extensive study of the entire Aids to Navigation system. This Maintenance Force Mix Study, 18 months in duration, is in three parts:

- (a) Plastic vs. Metal Buoys.
- (b) Buoys vs. Fixed lights.
- (c) Service-Force Mix required to maintain the system.

Concurrently we are investigating the design of future families of buoys and techniques for handling and servicing them. These two aspects will bear heavily on replacement tender design. One of the final outputs of the study will be a recommended combination of floating and shore-based support facilities that will include initial operating parameters for the floating units.

*Question. If these tenders are already overage, why wasn't such a study conducted earlier?*

*Answer.* The National Navigation Planning Staff, charged with the study supervision, was formed in 1968. Preliminary investigation and analysis was required to define the problem of overage tenders as it interfaces with the total AtoN system. NNP Staff prepared the study requirements that led to contract award in July 1969. Final results, anticipated early in 1971 will be evaluated and incorporated into R&D efforts which should produce an operational prototype replacement vessel in FY 74-75. At that time the overage buoy tenders will be in service an average of 32 years. Operational replacement is planned to begin in FY 1978.

#### AIRPLANES

*Question. You have requested six additional HH3F medium range helicopters. Have those that you have already acquired lived up to your full expectations?*

*Answer.* Yes. They meet or exceed the performance we expect of a medium range recovery aircraft. They can—

- (1) Proceed at reasonable speed for 100 nautical miles—search for 5 hours and return.
- (2) Proceed 300 nautical miles—hover for 20 minutes, pick up 6 survivors and return.
- (3) Capable of all-weather flight operations.
- (4) Maintain level flight of sea level on half the installed engines.

*Question. If funds are authorized and appropriated for these aircraft, when would you expect to take delivery?*

*Answer.* Delivery would begin after January of 1972.

*Question. Was six the number of additional aircraft that the Coast Guard initially requested, or was the number reduced by the Department of Transportation or Bureau of the Budget? Which agency?*

*Answer.* We originally requested eight aircraft. This number was reduced to six during deliberations between the CG and DOT to accommodate ceilings imposed by BOB.

*Question. Where and for what purpose did you plan to use the two additional aircraft?*

Answer. Like the six remaining in the budget, the two additional aircraft were planned as replacements for our aging HU16's.

*Question. On AC&I No. 19, you state that if repairs to the 13 C-130 aircraft are completed, they should fulfill their planned service life of 20 years. What is the age of those planes now?*

Answer. We obtained: four in 1960; two in 1961; four in 1962; two in 1963; and one in 1966.

#### CONSTRUCTION

*Question. On AC&I No. 20, you indicate that you plan to acquire 334.8 acres for the communications station at San Francisco. That is a great deal of land. What sort of facilities are you planning to build?*

Answer. It is planned to locate the receiving operations building and antenna field on a 266 acre site in Pt. Reyes. The transmitting operations building and antenna field will be located on a 75.5 acre site in Bolinas. Technical standards for minimum separation of antennas requires the use of large parcels of land at both sites as outlined in the Engineering Design Study conducted by Granger Associates.

*Question. Last year your AC&I appropriation was \$73.2 million. How much of that was tied up by the President's moratorium on new construction?*

Answer.

#### *U.S. Coast Guard projects included in construction deferral*

Projects:	Dollar amounts related to construction placed in reserve
Cape May, N.J., helicopter pad.....	\$114, 000
Panama City, Fla., station.....	100, 000
Mobile, Ala., base.....	100, 000
New London, Conn., station.....	1, 387, 000
Port Aransas, Tex., station.....	90, 000
Port Angeles, Wash., fuel facility.....	55, 000
Miscellaneous urgent and selected aids.....	73, 000
Alteration of bridges (Cape Fear River).....	985, 000
Military family housing.....	2, 730, 000
Lighthouse automation.....	292, 000
San Francisco, Calif., radio station.....	1, 004, 000
St. Petersburg, Fla., Air Station helicopter support.....	179, 000
Cape Charles, Va., station.....	431, 000
Houston, Tex., station.....	1, 884, 000
Boston, Mass., base.....	1, 300, 000
San Francisco (Yerba Buena Island), Calif., base.....	53, 000
Mayport, Fla., base.....	242, 000
Curtis Bay, Md., Coast Guard yard.....	687, 000
New London, Conn., Coast Guard Academy library.....	2, 080, 000
Yorktown, Va., fire station.....	382, 000
Mobile, Ala., synthetic flight trainer building.....	194, 000
<b>Total .....</b>	<b>14, 362, 000</b>

*Question. On behalf of the Chairman of the full committee, who could not be with us this morning, I would like to ask for some more details on the closure of the Westport, Washington, radio station described at AC&I No. 21. Will you close only the radio station or the entire facility? How many men are involved? What will happen to the property?*

Answer. We will close only the radio station, keeping Grays Harbor Station in operation. We will keep the property but dispose of all buildings except the lighthouse, two family quarters and the station operations building. The 26 billets will be prorated between the new San Francisco Radio Station and augmented radio operations at Astoria, Oregon, and Port Angeles, Washington.

*Question. You have an item of nearly \$1.4 million for a system to rapidly offload cargo from a damaged ship. How has that system proved out in tests?*

*Answer.* The first full scale test of the experimental prototype air-deliverable transfer pumping and storage system was completed on 5 February 1970. This was a calm water test; additional tests will be made under calm water conditions followed by tests under more severe conditions.

All components were air dropped, without damage, to the near vicinity of a test barge where they were retrieved and placed in operation using fresh water rather than a pollution liquid. Some minor technical problems which must be corrected before further full scale testing were revealed. However, from an overall point of view the test was considered successful.

*Question. Does the Coast Guard have clear authority to conduct such operations both in domestic and international waters? From what source does that authority emanate?*

*Answer.* An analysis of the Coast Guard's authority requires consideration of two factors:

(1) Whether the owner of the vessel/cargo consents (either expressly or implicitly) or objects to the conduct of such operations, and

(2) Whether the operation is conducted within the navigable waters of the United States or on the high seas.

Where the vessel/cargo owner consents to the operation, the authority of the Coast Guard may be found within the Coast Guard's general authority to save life and property (Title 14, U.S. Code, Section 88) which empowers the Coast Guard, among other measures, to render aid to distressed vessels and to perform any and all acts necessary to protect and save property on the high seas, in the navigable waters of the United States and elsewhere. Further authority is contained in the Oil Pollution Act, 1924, which includes an express provision allowing the government to undertake pollution abatement measures in the navigable waters of the United States. This authority is vested in the Secretary of Interior. However, it is clear from the National Contingency Plan (relating to multi-agency measures to control pollution by oil and hazardous materials) that the Coast Guard will be the operating agency exercising these measures in the coastal waters and major harbors of the United States.

Where the vessel/cargo owner objects to the operation, and the incident is in the navigable waters of the United States, there is available, in addition to the authority contained in the Oil Pollution Act of 1924, the authority of Executive Order, 10173, promulgated under the authority of the Magnuson Act, which empowers the Coast Guard to take full or partial control of any vessel to protect various U.S. interests including other vessels, harbor facilities and the waters as well. This authority is, of course, dependent upon the continued existence of a state of national emergency. Permanent legislation would be preferable—and is being developed by the Coast Guard. Where the vessel/cargo owner objects to the operation, and the incident occurs on the high seas, the Coast Guard's authority is not so plain. Within the contiguous zone, as defined by the Convention on the Territorial Seas and the Contiguous Zone, Geneva, 1958, the coastal state is entitled to exercise "... control necessary to prevent infringement of its . . . sanitary regulations within the territory or territorial seas . . ." In our opinion this authority affords a substantial basis for action since the Oil Pollution Act, 1924, certainly is a "sanitary regulation." What is not clear is the extent of the action that can be undertaken without the concurrence of the flag state. Beyond the contiguous zone, there is no present authority to act over the objection of the owner. However, the 1969 Brussels Convention Relating to Intervention on the High Seas in case of Oil Pollution Casualties, which is now open for ratification, would clearly spell out authority for a coastal state to take measures such as offloading oil from stricken vessels on the high seas.

Finally, it should be noted that both S. 7 and H.R. 4148, bills currently pending before the Congress, contain extensions of the authority of the Oil Pollution Act, 1924, which would substantially reinforce the position stated above concerning domestic waters and the contiguous zone.

In our opinion, the Coast Guard would have unquestionable authority to use or require the use of the equipment in a significant proportion of the incidents which will pose the type of threat in which it would be useful so as to justify the expenditure proposed in the current bill as well as significant additional procurement of this type of equipment.

## WATERWAY AIDS

*Question. Have your Waterway Aids and LAMP programs been cut back because of the construction moratorium?*

Answer. Work has been delayed on about 12 Selected Aids to Navigation projects and essentially all FY 1970 LAMP has been postponed due to the construction deferral.

## HOUSING

*Question. You are proposing less family housing this year than you did last year. Why?*

Answer. We are negotiating with DOD for 160 units of surplus housing. This, coupled with carryover of deferral work from FY 70 will keep us moving forward at a satisfactory rate and at a level which we can manage.

## RESERVE

*Question. What will the impact be if you lose your Selected Reserve? How will Reservists with obligated service fulfill their obligation if the Selected Reserve is dropped?*

Answer. Reflecting the decision contained in the 1971 budget the Coast Guard is proceeding with plans for phasing out the Coast Guard Selected Reserve Training Program by 30 June 1971. The impact of discontinuing this program is as follows:

- (a) Reserve recruiting has been discontinued.
- (b) Reserve training during the current fiscal year is being phased down.
- (c) Impact on training units is being analyzed.
- (d) Alternatives for handling Reservists with obligated service are being weighed.
- (e) A program to provide for Reservists with retirement credits is under consideration.
- (f) Alternatives for meeting mobilization tasks are being evaluated.
- (g) Legal implications of phasing out the Selected Reserve are being identified.
- (h) Financial implications for other Coast Guard appropriations and programs are being evaluated.

## RECRUITING

Recruiting for Reserve programs is integrated into 62 recruiting stations spread throughout the country. Of the 251 total recruiters 57 are supported through the Reserve Training Appropriation; this number of recruiters is being removed from the recruiting effort. This action will have some impact on the remaining recruiting capacity for our regular programs.

## TRAINING

Reserve training is conducted at our Reserve Training Center at Yorktown, Virginia, and on three dedicated training ships. Additionally, basic training for Reserve recruits is integrated into our Regular training station program at Cape May and Alameda.

## IMPACT ON RESERVE TRAINING FACILITIES

Removal of Reserve training workload, approximately 30%, from Cape May and Alameda affects programming and financial support at these facilities.

About 50% of the training workload at Yorktown is for Reservists. The remaining workload at Yorktown is for regular Coast Guard programs, including our officers candidate school which is an important source of our commissioned officers, and an Engineman school for petty officers.

The training ships, *Unimak* and *Courier*, are home-ported at Yorktown and the third ship, *Tanager*, is based at Alameda. These three ships will be decommissioned, unless they are found to be suitable replacements for ships in our regular program.

We have an ad hoc group visiting Cape May, Alameda and Yorktown looking into capacity and utilization in relation to our identifiable training requirements for the foreseeable future. A possible need to close or consolidate training stations is also being considered as a part of this study.

## OBLIGATED SERVICE

Recognizing that the phasing out of the Coast Guard Selected Reserve involves military service obligations, we are considering the following alternatives for obligors:

- (a) Voluntary transfer to other Reserve components
- (b) Voluntary extended active duty in the Coast Guard to fulfill any other service obligation
- (c) Voluntary discharge from the Coast Guard Reserve for the convenience of the government
- (d) Transfer to the Ready Reserve in a no-training status

## RESERVISTS WITH RETIREMENT CREDITS

We contemplate maintaining a program to preserve and continue retirement entitlements for those Ready and Standby Reservists who desire. Primarily, this will involve recordkeeping, as well as an offering of correspondence courses through the Coast Guard Institute at Oklahoma City.

## MOBILIZATION CAPABILITY

A decision to forego the Coast Guard Selected Reserve training program was an economic one, a value judgment balancing the cost of maintaining this immediate response capability against the probability of needing it and alternative uses of the dollars involved.

With respect to the possibility of the Reserve being called, we note that the several callups made since WWII have not included the Coast Guard. Alternative resources with which we expect to be able to meet at least some of our mobilization requirements, should they arise, are:

- (a) Redeployment of Regular U.S. Coast Guard forces already on active duty (includes early graduation of Academy first classmen, recruits, and basic petty officer trainees).
- (b) Call-up of Ready and Standby Reserve personnel.
- (c) Recall of physically qualified retired personnel.
- (d) Veteran volunteers (from civilian areas).
- (e) Expansion of outputs from recruit training centers and basic petty officer schools subsequent to mobilization.
- (f) Possible use of the Coast Guard Auxiliary for selected mobilization tasks on a voluntary basis in the manner the Coast Guard Temporary Reserve was utilized in WWII.
- (g) Use of Selective Service inductees.

We recognize that these alternatives provide haphazardly for skills, geographic distribution and control. Developing these resources offers a real challenge.

## LEGISLATIVE IMPLICATIONS

Legislative considerations take into account Section 6 of Public Law 90-168 which relates to the annual authorization by the Congress of the personnel strength of the Selected Reserve of each component of the Armed Forces and also provide that the absence of a Selected Reserve in the Coast Guard shall not preclude the appropriation and expenditure of funds for pay and allowances of members of the Coast Guard Reserve on active duty other than for training.

## FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

The phase out of the Coast Guard Selected Reserve Training program will result in the discontinuance of the Reserve Training Appropriation after fiscal year 1971. Ten million dollars is provided under that appropriation heading for an orderly phase out during fiscal year 1971.

There are a number of financial implications of the phase out on other programs in the Coast Guard, such as recruiting, training, utilization of facilities, and capital improvement programs. We are presently attempting to identify these and, where appropriate, will make provision in our 1972 budget request.

Senator LONG. Senator Hollings?

Senator HOLLINGS. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

The Admiral and I met yesterday relating to his budget. What we are trying to do in the Congress is to upgrade the Coast Guard, and we are having a little bit of a difficulty within the Coast Guard itself. We found out yesterday that the Admiral went to the Coast Guard Academy 37 years ago to get into transportation. I just can't imagine that, but that is what the testimony was.

Admiral, the Secretary yesterday testified that he took over the Department of Transportation and got to those things of importance and immediate need: the aviation problem, the pollution problem, the mass transportation problem. And it wasn't until June that he got around to the Coast Guard. That has been the experience of the distinguished chairman and many others for many years. That is why they asked for the Stratton Commission Report. Everybody wanted to try to study, upgrade, and implement an oceanic program in this Government.

I can't understand why, if you would be the principal rather than the lesser portion of a new agency—where you would by way of personnel, budget and otherwise take over the greater influence and the newer concept—I can't understand why you would resist it. It seems to me you would welcome it and jump at the opportunity to finally get into marine affairs rather than just buoy markers.

Can you explain that for me?

Admiral SMITH. Senator, of course, we had some discussion of this yesterday.

Senator HOLLINGS. Yes, sir.

Admiral SMITH. And I think I would be repeating myself at least partly, but the Coast Guard's basic responsibility for as long as I have been in the Coast Guard has been related to maritime matters, principally safety and law enforcement. When the Department of Transportation was proposed in 1966, this matter was completely studied and there was a good deal of question in many people's minds that the Coast Guard should be moved from Treasury at that time, and a very thorough analysis was made in the Treasury Department and within our own service and within the task force that was working on that.

The decision was made, and I feel very correctly, that if the United States has a Department of Transportation, that this is the proper place for the Coast Guard to be located. I think that the work that we do is so important to the total concept of the Department of Transportation, that if the Department of Transportation is to operate effectively in having an input into all modes of transportation and putting together a national program that relates one of the transportation systems to the other, the marine, the air, and the land, the things that the Coast Guard performs must necessarily be a part of that Department.

I went over some of them yesterday. Our regulations with the merchant marine, merchant marine inspection and certification and licensing of their personnel, the port safety programs, the aids to navigation system, the supervision of the handling of hazardous materials—if you look at our pattern of participation in these programs, this is the bulk of the work we do. They are almost an exact parallel of what the FAA

does in the aviation program. We do for the marine transportation system almost all of the same things that the FAA does for the air transportation system.

Senator HOLLINGS. You talk of doing an effective job. You start in your budget with \$190 million request for acquisition, construction, and improvements. Are you satisfied with half of it, \$100 million?

Admiral SMITH. When we start a budget process, I think that we all know that we seldom end up with all of the money that we ask for.

Senator HOLLINGS. So in the \$190 million request, in contemplation of never getting the amount, you just put some things in that weren't necessarily needed for an effective operation of the Coast Guard. Is that right?

Admiral SMITH. No, sir. What I mean is some of the things we had originally included in our proposals must be delayed for another year or more. I think we got in our \$100 million the things that we immediately need and that we must get on with at the present time, and the ones that were not finally approved in the budget process will have to be reintroduced in future years' proposals.

Senator HOLLINGS. That is hard to reconcile when you are so far behind. You tell of the breakdown in the *Northwind*. You say this new icebreaker will approach that of the *Moscow* class. Will we actually have an icebreaker that will be the equivalent of it or just approach it?

Admiral SMITH. We think we will have an icebreaker that will be more capable than the *Moscow* icebreaker.

Senator HOLLINGS. You think so?

Admiral SMITH. Yes, sir.

Senator HOLLINGS. Would you elaborate on that for me?

Admiral SMITH. The icebreaker will have considerably more power than the *Moscow* class. We think we have found some new things about the design of the bow and the hull that will improve its icebreaking capability over a ship of comparable size that has been previously built.

The vessel will be approximately the same size as the *Moscow* class.

Senator HOLLINGS. But you won't have near the capability of the overall Russian capability. That is why you used the expression "approach," isn't it? They will have more icebreakers, they will have a greater capability.

Admiral SMITH. I think you are referring now to the total number of ships.

Senator HOLLINGS. Right.

Admiral SMITH. They have a larger fleet of icebreakers now.

Senator HOLLINGS. That is what you mean when you state in your statement, "approach an icebreaker capability." You are testifying in excess of and better than. I am trying to fix it in my mind.

Admiral SMITH. Yes, sir.

Senator HOLLINGS. Are we going to catch up with the Soviet? Are we going to surpass the Soviet, or are we going to pair off equally? Which would be more accurate?

Admiral SMITH. Going back to the statement, Senator, we said that it would approach the *Moscow* class under diesel power alone. Now, when we use the turbine power that we expect to put in this ves-

sel, it will exceed the icebreaking capability of the *Moscow* class. We haven't looked at this in the way of going into a program to build more icebreakers than are presently being operated by the Soviets. They have quite a different problem than we do. But we do want the finest ship we can get in this particular class, and this is what we think we are going to have.

Senator HOLLINGS. Going back to the answer you just gave that the principal role and mission of the Coast Guard is maritime, and again the question that we reviewed yesterday relative to the Department of Transportation, who at the policy level in the Department of Transportation has maritime experience or background? Obviously, Governor Volpe didn't. We get to the distinguished Under Secretary before us, Mr. Beggs. He graduated from Annapolis, but has a Westinghouse and NASA background, unless you want to correct me.

Mr. BEGGS. No, sir.

Senator HOLLINGS. The Deputy Under Secretary, Charles D. Baker—there was some testimony yesterday—does he have a maritime experience and background?

Admiral SMITH. Yes, he has.

Senator HOLLINGS. In what regard?

Admiral SMITH. Through working principally in the economics of the maritime industry as a consultant with Harbridge House. He has had very broad experience both in ocean shipping and also in domestic shipping in dealing with marine transportation problems.

I think Under Secretary Beggs underestimates his own experience, because I think that his own marine experience certainly makes him more knowledgeable about marine problems.

Senator HOLLINGS. What marine experience is that?

Admiral SMITH. Duty with the U.S. Navy.

Senator HOLLINGS. During the war?

Mr. BEGGS. During and after the war, yes, sir. I had about 10 years with the Navy. But I must agree with you, sir, that in the civilian maritime side I have very little experience.

Senator HOLLINGS. Mr. Baker worked with a management consultant firm and he handled all problems as I would as a lawyer handles all types of clients. But he has no broad or lengthy experience in marine affairs, does he?

Admiral SMITH. I suppose, Senator, it depends on what you are looking for here. I think he has the kind of experience and expertise that is very important to our Department. It is true that he hasn't served directly in the marine industry in management positions.

Senator HOLLINGS. You keep describing yourself as being in transportation. I can't see other than an Admiral before me. I grew up next to a Coast Guard station, and all I can see is maritime and marine excellence when I see you as Admiral and Commandant of the Coast Guard. That is what I am talking about. How about Assistant Secretary for Policy and International Affairs, Paul W. Cherington? Does he have any background in maritime and marine affairs experience?

Admiral SMITH. Yes, sir, both in the field of education and as a consultant. I think you know as a member of the faculty of Harvard his field of professional competence was in transportation matters.

Senator HOLLINGS. I meant marine and maritime affairs. You are back over to transportation.

Admiral SMITH. It is my understanding that his duties are involved in both air and marine economic studies and considerations.

Senator HOLLINGS. Go down to Walter L. Mazan, the Assistant Secretary for Public Affairs, does he have such experience?

Mr. BEGGS. No, sir.

Senator HOLLINGS. I would like to hear Admiral Smith answer these questions.

Mr. BEGGS. I am sorry.

Senator HOLLINGS. There is no offense there, Mr. Secretary, but I would just like to hear the admiral describe marine and maritime excellence. Assistant Secretary for Environment and Urban Affairs, James D. Braman, how about him?

Admiral SMITH. No, sir.

Senator HOLLINGS. They got an Assistant Secretary for Environmental Problems, as the Secretary testified yesterday. It was new when he launched this new department, but they haven't got a policy man for your extensive Coast Guard role.

Assistant Secretary for Research and Technology, Secor Brown, does he have any background?

Admiral SMITH. Assistant Secretary Brown is now Chairman of the Civil Aeronautics Board, Senator, and Mr. Robert Cannon is our new Assistant Secretary. He has not reported to the Department as yet.

Senator LONG. Senator, just go right on ahead and interrogate the witness, I will uphold your right to ask any questions you want to ask and get any answers you want to obtain. But I am going to suggest to my colleague here you are asking the admiral to discuss the qualifications of his bosses, and I think to be entirely fair to the admiral you ought to let those bosses explain their own qualifications, because if the admiral fails to do justice to them, he might be in a very bad light with the people for whom he works. I think that is part of the problem you are exploring.

Senator HOLLINGS. I don't think that is part of the problem at all. I think the admiral is too modest in the description of his own talent, his own background in marine affairs and maritime excellence, and I am not trying to ask him whether they are good, bad, or anything else; I am just trying to get the background, because he has to consult with these gentlemen at the policy level.

It seems with some 4,000 officers and personnel at the policy level of the Department there would have been somebody with marine affairs excellence with the charge and the responsibility that the Coast Guard has.

There are only a couple more: The General Counsel, James A. Washington, does he have any?

Admiral SMITH. To the best of my knowledge, Senator, he has not been involved specifically in marine affairs.

Senator HOLLINGS. The Assistant Secretary for Administration, Mr. Alan Dean?

Admiral SMITH. Assistant Secretary Dean I don't believe has any experience in marine affairs.

Senator HOLLINGS. To get with the program, when you get a problem for the Coast Guard, who do you talk to on the policy level?

Admiral SMITH. If I could take a moment, Senator, I think maybe this would help clear this a little bit when you talk about the basic organization of our Department. I think you know our assistant sec-

retaries are not line assistant secretaries. They are staff assistants to the Secretary and the Under Secretaries. The Administration deals directly with the Under Secretaries of the Department and the Secretary.

So, it is our prerogative and our responsibility to initiate and to carry through the programs that are given to our particular agency for administration and operation.

Senator HOLLINGS. Admiral Smith, are there one or two jet planes that the Coast Guard has?

Admiral SMITH. We have two Grumman aircraft, the Gulfstream 1 and the Gulfstream 2. One we have had for 8 years. This is a turbo-prop airplane, and we have a second one that we have had for a little less than a year which is the newer version, the turbine jet aircraft.

Senator HOLLINGS. When last have you flown on that?

Admiral SMITH. I am trying to remember the exact date.

Senator HOLLINGS. How many times in the last year?

Admiral SMITH. Oh, I would have a hard time counting that, Senator. I was in St. Louis about a week or two ago, this is the trip I was trying to recall.

Senator HOLLINGS. You know, Senator Cook pointed out, perhaps in the Stratton Commission Report they made a very thorough study, got themselves a new agency, and then looked around for hardware and equipment and then said, "Look, that Coast Guard crowd would be a good one to bring in because they could provide now the equipment for this new agency."

Some of my Coast Guard friends say these Coast Guard jet planes are used by the Secretaries and Assistant and Under Secretaries of Transportation and they hardly let Admiral Smith and Admiral Trimble use them. Do you find that you get good usage in the Coast Guard using this, or the Department of Transportation?

Admiral SMITH. If you have been told this, this has been misrepresented, because this simply is not true. It is absolutely true that the Secretary uses Coast Guard aircraft for a good deal of transportation which we are very pleased to be able to provide for him, but these two aircraft are used for general administrative flights where there are enough people who are going to make it worthwhile to use such an aircraft.

Except for the Secretary and the Under Secretary they are not used generally by other departmental officers without the specific authority of Mr. Beggs.

Senator LONG. Could I just interject and suggest this? I guess you have a log of the dates and passengers on the planes. Why don't you provide that to the subcommittee?

Senator HOLLINGS. Good.

Senator LONG. I think, since the matter came up, it is simpler to find out who was in these planes.

Admiral SMITH. I think we have previously furnished this information to other Members of Congress, and we have a record of the use of the planes.

Senator LONG. If you go back far enough, you will find I was on that plane as a guest of the Secretary of the Treasury.

Senator HOLLINGS. We don't have to go back that far. Just go back the last year.

Admiral Smith, on the inland operation—I don't know that this is an intelligent question in the sense of your being able to give an intelligent or accurate answer—but we talked yesterday about the function of the Coast Guard inland, and you have an inland station in Kentucky. How many others do you have?

Admiral SMITH. I would like to furnish this for the record, Senator, but let me say generally that we have stations on the Mississippi all the way from New Orleans to the head of navigation; we have stations on the Missouri, on the Arkansas, on the Ohio.

These stations and officers on these rivers accomplish a number of purposes. One, we are responsible to provide the aids to navigation systems.

Senator HOLLINGS. I don't question the purpose. I was trying to save time. I live on the Inland Waterway by a similar Coast Guard station. What I am trying to do is to get a sense of proportion to the endeavor of the Coast Guard. How many inland stations does the Coast Guard have in the United States?

Admiral SMITH. Are we including the Great Lakes, Senator?

Senator HOLLINGS. No.

Admiral SMITH. Only on the inland rivers?

Senator HOLLINGS. Yes, sir.

Admiral SMITH. I can't tell you the number offhand. Could I furnish it for the record?

Senator HOLLINGS. Yes, sir.

Admiral SMITH. Officers and stations?

Senator HOLLINGS. Officers and stations.

Admiral SMITH. Yes.

(The following information was subsequently received for the record:)

The Coast Guard has 52 stations and offices on the inland rivers. There are approximately 450 military and 165 civilian employees at these various stations and offices. In addition, 28 vessels with crews totaling about 420 military are also stationed on these rivers. These facilities and men are employed primarily in our Aids to Navigation, Search and Rescue and Law Enforcement programs.

This compares with a total of approximately 1300 shore stations and offices, and 315 vessels for the entire Coast Guard. The 870 military and 165 civilian employees stationed on the inland rivers compares with 37,250 military and 5,700 civilian employees for the entire Coast Guard.

Senator HOLLINGS. And the effort within the Coast Guard with respect to your buoy markers combined of course with your safety regulations and everything with those stations. What I am trying to do is to get a general picture inland.

The Stratton Commission never asked that the buoy marker functions and the safety responsibility of the inland waterways be forgotten at all. The fact of the matter is they pointed out that the services you described were well needed in the upper Ohio River. Can this new icebreaker you request here in the fiscal year 1971 budget be used on the Ohio?

Admiral SMITH. No, this is an ocean icebreaker. It is much too large and too deep draft to be used on the river.

Senator HOLLINGS. What about the ones we have for use in rivers, can you give us the number and general description with respect to vintage? How old are they?

Admiral SMITH. Yes, sir. We haven't any icebreakers as such on the river system.

Senator HOLLINGS. You do not?

Admiral SMITH. But we have some tenders, some buoy tenders that are used for icebreaking purposes. We do have one Amsterdam plow that is used in connection with the buoy tender. We have no icebreakers as such on the rivers.

Senator HOLLINGS. For the fiscal year 1969 the Congress authorized and appropriated moneys for an oceanographic vessel and that was never built. Why not?

Admiral SMITH. As I mentioned yesterday, Senator, our estimates for the construction of that ship were about \$14.5 million. When the money was appropriated and we came to the design of the ship and the estimates for the actual construction, this figure went up so far beyond our appropriated amount that we were very reluctantly forced to give up the construction of the ship at that time.

Senator HOLLINGS. What is the present plan now? Have you gotten the estimates more in line with what you think reasonable? Do we need more time, or do we need the oceanographic vessel?

Admiral SMITH. What we did, Senator, we had had a vessel that we were using for the international ice patrol and oceanographic work, but it had a very serious fire. We actually turned to and repaired this vessel and put it back in our fleet so that it continued to provide the international oceanographic service for the international ice patrols, which was to be one of the services the new ship was to provide.

At the present time we do not have a program to build an oceanographic ship. I don't think this means at all that we would not propose to do it in the future.

Senator HOLLINGS (presiding). How many oceanographic vessels do you have?

Admiral SMITH. We have only three ships that are dedicated to oceanography: a 180-foot converted tender which does our international ice patrol oceanographic work; the 311-foot converted small seaplane tender that is used for general oceanographic work in various parts of the ocean; and a 210-foot former salvage vessel we use on buoy research projects.

I will say in addition to this, of course, our ocean station vessels, of which we presently have about 33 in operation, are equipped to do a limited amount of oceanographic work, and they do this on their ocean stations.

This provides a great deal of useful data. They do it in connection with occupying the station and while sailing to the station and back. This has not been the primary reason for their being on the station, but this has become a more and more useful part of their occupying the station.

Senator HOLLINGS. The laboratory facilities of the Coast Guard for oceanographic research and technology, can you describe those? How many do we have?

Admiral SMITH. We have no laboratories as such for this purpose.

Senator HOLLINGS. Have none whatsoever?

Let me ask another thing relative to earlier testimony, too. Our distinguished senior Senator from New Hampshire on this committee is present. The other day in the testimony with other witnesses a question was raised relative to the Coast Guard capability in the sense of defense. Specifically, do you have any submarines?

Admiral SMITH. No, sir.

Senator HOLLINGS. The Coast Guard has none. He was talking about the Continental Shelf. The attention of the United States is all directed to ICBM and ABM defense systems, all in the stratosphere, whereas you could take a submarine, reduce it to a laboratory, reduce it further to a launching pad itself, put it beyond the 3-mile limit and just let it sit there and then lob a missile over, bam, some 3 or 9 miles into the United States while we are way up here. And the Navy has a defensive posture, with large vessels, aircraft carriers, submarines, and everything else, while the Coast Guard, which would be the proper agency to defend these coasts, is not oriented and is not equipped along that line.

Do you have any comment to make on this?

Admiral SMITH. No, sir; I have no comments on this, Senator. We have no specific defensive posture against the thing that you just described.

Senator HOLLINGS. Would you welcome the role if it were assigned to you?

Admiral SMITH. I think I would like to know a little more clearly just what the role is. I can't believe that the Navy hasn't taken this into consideration in their own military considerations and program.

Senator HOLLINGS. I would like to yield at this time to Senator Cotton because I know he is much busier than I am.

Senator Cotton, do you have any questions?

Senator CORRON. Thank you for your courtesy and your modesty. I don't think it is true that I am any busier than you are. Admiral Smith, I have two or three questions, which you may wish to answer now or furnish later for the record.

I have before me an article in the New York Times of February 15, "Soviet Plans Two More Atomic Icebreakers." It indicates the new ships will be twice as powerful as the Soviet Union's first nuclear icebreaker which completed its 10th season last year. They will be part of a new series. The article goes on to say, among other things, that the addition of two more icebreakers would make the Soviet Union the foremost country in nuclear-powered shipping. What are the implications as you view them of the announcement in this article in the New York Times that Russia is planning to build two more nuclear icebreakers by 1975? Would you care to comment?

Admiral SMITH. I would prefer to put a statement in the record. However, I would say this particular item, of course, was just called to our attention. It comes as no surprise. We had a feeling that they were proposing to continue to build some larger icebreakers. We hadn't heard an announcement before as to what type of power they were going to use, but the fact that they are building additional icebreakers and bigger ones does not surprise us. But I would like to find out a little bit more about this announcement before making any further comments.

(The following information was subsequently received for the record:)

Russian icebreaking requirements, because of their long coast on the Arctic Ocean and their need to rely heavily on cold water ports and polar routes for commercial shipping, are altogether different from ours. Our present request is based on foreseeable United States requirements in polar areas. Neither the

number of Russian icebreakers nor the particular type of propulsion they use affect our requirements. What we have is not really a competitive situation, but a matter of two countries with different geographical considerations which govern their national priorities.

This Russian action does show they have great confidence in their ability to use nuclear power effectively, for *Lenin* is known to have experienced considerable difficulty. Despite that, we see this decision to build these two with nearly double the power of *Lenin*. The sheer magnitude of the power is a little surprising. It may show Russian intention to build an icebreaker which can cruise the Arctic Ocean with impunity.

Senator COTTON. You may have answered this already, and I don't want to be repetitious, but what is our own situation with regard to icebreakers?

Admiral SMITH. With regard to icebreakers?

Senator COTTON. Yes.

Admiral SMITH. The United States is presently operating seven ocean icebreakers, Senator: the *Glacier* which was built in 1954 which has about 21,000 horsepower, 8,300 tons; six vessels of the "*Wind*" class which have 10,000 horsepower and they are about 5,300-ton ships. This is our total ocean icebreaker fleet at the present time.

Senator COTTON. None of those are nuclear powered?

Admiral SMITH. No, sir; none of them are nuclear powered.

Senator COTTON. We have talked about the importance of our capacity for icebreaking in relation to trying to get the oil from Alaska down into the Eastern United States. Is that likely to become a practical reality?

Admiral SMITH. This is a little hard for us to say at this time, Senator. We have been working very closely with Humble and with Esso in the plans in connection with the *Manhattan* voyage. We expect them to make some announcement in the very near future as to their intentions on marine transportation through the Arctic. We don't believe that they have arrived at their decision as yet.

However, I am not sure just how much of an impact this might have on our icebreaker plans, because there is not any proposal at the present time that these tankers would be escorted by icebreakers. It is the philosophy of the company, and I think very properly, that if they are to do this in a routine manner continuously and successfully that the tankers must be able to proceed to under their own power and independently. This is what they are thinking about. This doesn't mean that perhaps for some emergency purposes or safety purposes we would not have to at times go into the Arctic and work with these icebreakers, but we are not proposing at the present time that the Federal Government would provide icebreaker escorts for them.

Senator COTTON. I didn't have that in mind. Before the companies could know whether there was a real practical possibility of operating through the ice fields and getting down that way, they would be dependent on the exploratory icebreaking of your ships to find out the resistance and the depth of ice in the area, wouldn't they?

Admiral SMITH. Yes, sir. They accumulated ice information from every source that they could find, including our own Coast Guard experience, our U.S. Navy experience, the experience of other organizations both within and outside the United States, in order to help them arrive at an analysis of the problem.

Now, with respect to the actual test, the *Manhattan* was designed to furnish them the technical information on which they could base a

decision. It may well be that they will send the *Manhattan* back for a second voyage this spring. I know this is under consideration.

Senator COTTON. Are we in danger of losing out on the ability to operate in the Arctic?

Admiral SMITH. No sir; I don't think we are. I think if we can build this ship that we are proposing now and can continue to replace our old icebreakers that we will have a good capability of continuing our presence in the Arctic.

I would like to say with respect to the Soviet Union, their problem is a little different than ours because they have for their commercial operations across the top of Siberia probably right now a much greater need for more icebreakers than we have.

Senator COTTON. Do you now have any personal opinion as to how the new icebreaker for which you are seeking funds may compare with the proposed new Russian icebreakers?

Admiral SMITH. I think we would have to know a little more about their ship. It appears on the surface that this ship would be a bigger ship and a more powerful ship than the ship we propose to build.

Senator COTTON. And nuclear powered?

Admiral SMITH. And nuclear powered.

Senator COTTON. You mentioned the Navy icebreakers. How many icebreakers approximately does the Navy have?

Admiral SMITH. The Navy does not operate any of our ocean icebreakers now. They did some years ago. We were operating a part of them and the Navy was operating a part of them. The fleet now has been placed entirely under the operational control of the Coast Guard. We operate all of them for the United States. When I mentioned the Navy data, they went to the Navy because the Navy had had this experience in the past.

Senator COTTON. Now that the Navy icebreakers are under your jurisdiction, how many does that give us?

Admiral SMITH. We have seven icebreakers in operation right now, Senator.

Senator COTTON. Were any of them built new for the Coast Guard, or did you inherit them from the Navy?

Admiral SMITH. The "*Wind*" ships originally were actually designed and built for the Coast Guard while we were under the Navy in World War II. These ships were built with the design assistance of our own engineers and for our use in operation. The *Glacier* was built by the Navy as a follow-on after the war for their use and then later transferred to the Coast Guard.

Senator COTTON. Now, assuming the Congress authorizes and appropriates the funds for this new icebreaker, approximately how long will it take to get the vessel and put it into service?

Admiral SMITH. We estimate it will be about 5 years before she will be in operation.

Senator COTTON. And it will cost how much?

Admiral SMITH. About \$60 million.

Senator COTTON. And that will be conventional power?

Admiral SMITH. This will be conventional power. It is a change from our previous concepts in power because we intend to use for the first time gas turbines in the ship.

Senator COTTON. Will such a propulsion plant give it considerable additional power?

Admiral SMITH. Yes.

Senator COTTON. As a practical matter, do your people feel that nuclear-powered icebreakers are worth the difference in the investment?

Admiral SMITH. We think that you have to analyze very carefully just how this icebreaker is going to be operated. Nuclear power has one very obvious advantage, and that is endurance. You are not dependent on periodic refueling. You can stay in the Arctic almost indefinitely. But staying in a place like the Arctic is not only dependent on the endurance of your ships, it is also dependent on the endurance of your people. So there is a compromise here someplace.

So far as power is concerned, we think with the use of gas turbines we can achieve the power that we desire in the ship without going to a nuclear plant. I think the big advantage of the nuclear power for an icebreaker is the sustained operation without having to have a source for fuel.

Senator COTTON. Let me just say one thing which is more or less a repetition of what I said here yesterday afternoon, as I remember it. This committee is in the corner of the Coast Guard. We are very proud of the Coast Guard. We have been the oversight committee dealing with the organization of the Coast Guard through the years. Those of us who have been on the committee a considerable number of years have grown to feel very strongly about it. I am positive that it is not the intention of anybody on this committee to let the Coast Guard be made anybody's orphan child.

I suppose that the Coast Guard's function in the field of transportation is involved in transportation about the same way as a traffic cop or the State police are involved in transportation on the highways. It is principally an enforcement agency as far as transportation is concerned. Is that a reasonable statement?

Admiral SMITH. This is part of it, Senator. I think we can say it is a law enforcement and safety function, that these are the two basic missions with respect to marine transportation.

Senator COTTON. Law enforcement and safety are both encompassed in the State police. I noticed when I am stopped going through Pennsylvania or Maryland, they looked to see if I have an inspection certificate. So it is a matter of safety as well as watching my speed and finding out whether I am capable of driving. Those two functions are in a sense inseparable.

Admiral SMITH. Yes, sir. They go hand and hand. I just wanted to emphasize the fact that marine safety is a matter of concern to us.

Senator COTTON. I won't ask you to make any declaration on this. I don't think it would be fair. I am positive that Secretary Volpe and these gentlemen here are loyal, staunch supporters of the Coast Guard. I think it is up to this committee and the Congress to make sure the Coast Guard is not swallowed up in any way. You would welcome that attitude, would you not?

Admiral SMITH. Yes, sir.

Senator COTTON. Let me ask you this—perhaps this is going too far and going to embarrass you, and, if so, don't answer it—are there any logical and compelling reasons why the Coast Guard should be under the same tent as the Maritime Commission is?

Admiral SMITH. Senator, I believe you refer to the Maritime Administration?

Senator COTTON. Administration, yes.

Admiral SMITH. You will recall that in the original version of the Department of Transportation bill that was submitted to the Congress the Maritime Administration was included in the bill, and it was removed in the process of hearings in the Congress. So, I think this, to me, is an evidence that this certainly had been studied and was considered the appropriate place for the Maritime Administration which has such an important place in marine transportation matters.

Senator COTTON. Of course there is still a question of what is going to happen to the Maritime Administration and where it may eventually be placed. The maritime people—those interested in the American flag merchant marine—are extremely desirous that the Maritime Administration be kept in a position where it is effective and has the opportunity for strong, independent action in dealing both with the Congress and with the Bureau of the Budget. That is essentially what you want for the Coast Guard, isn't it?

Admiral SMITH. Yes, sir.

Senator COTTON. Now, every year this committee has authorized the construction of certain vessels for the Coast Guard—and I suppose this Senator should not raise the point since I also am a member of the Appropriations Committee—but, as I recall we generally lose some of those authorized ships. Now, by reason of furnishing ships to Southeast Asia, has your number of ships decreased to a point where it is affecting your ability to fully and adequately perform your assigned duties?

Admiral SMITH. No, Senator. You recall the patrol boats that were deployed to Vietnam were replaced during the following years with the help of the congressional committees that consider our programs. The larger ships have somewhat reduced our capability in the United States, but we have been able to respond to all the calls on these ships for the functions that are important and necessary that they be performed, and it has been partly through increased tempo of operation. They are spending a longer time at sea now than they were prior to having deployed the ships to Southeast Asia.

Senator COTTON. In a sense then, whatever ships you have sent to Southeast Asia will not be entirely a loss, even if not returned, since it may serve to obtain necessary new, more modern and efficient craft for the Coast Guard. Is that correct?

Admiral SMITH. Yes, sir. The two ships that I mentioned in my statement, they are being transferred to the South Vietnamese, we already have ships building to replace these.

Senator COTTON. Did you say you are building ships to replace all that you have sent over there?

Admiral SMITH. The two large ships that I mentioned, Senator.

Senator COTTON. There were only two large ships?

Admiral SMITH. Yes, sir. Now, we have five deployed there, but there are only two that are scheduled to be turned over to the South Vietnamese for their operation.

Senator COTTON. Are you sure of that?

Admiral SMITH. This is—

Senator COTTON. I am not questioning the fact that you know what you are talking about as of now, but—

Admiral SMITH. As of now, right now.

Senator COTTON. Are you sure that situation may not change?

Admiral SMITH. That could possibly change, but this is all we know about right now.

Senator COTTON. And you have got two in the process of building?

Admiral SMITH. Yes, sir.

Senator COTTON. So, with those two being built, if it should be determined here and in the Appropriations Committee that you should get the requested icebreaker, will you be pretty well taken care of for the time being?

Admiral SMITH. Yes, sir. Actually we have three large ships under construction right now, Senator. Two of them will replace two of these that were transferred. The other one will replace an old ship that will be placed out of commission.

Senator COTTON. But we never got the oceanographic ship built?

Admiral SMITH. No, sir, we did not get the oceanographic ship built.

Senator COTTON. We have tried up here but we never got the thing done.

I just simply want to say I am not differing with my very dear friend from South Carolina, but I shall be greatly surprised if there is any indication that the Coast Guard planes have been used for civilian purposes in any greater proportion or nearly as great a proportion as planes of other branches of the service.

I seem to recall that I had one trip on a Coast Guard plane which will probably be uncovered in this investigation.

Senator HOLLINGS. We are only going back a year. It is the manifest for a year.

Senator COTTON. As I remember, I was taken up to Portsmouth, N.H., and had the pleasure of speaking at the commissioning of one of your new ships.

Admiral SMITH. Yes.

Senator COTTON. That is reasonably legitimate, because the ship certainly couldn't be commissioned without one politician present, could it?

Admiral SMITH. No, sir; I do not believe it could.

Senator COTTON. Let me say this and you may comment if you wish, Admiral Smith. I feel, as a member of this committee, that we must consider the authorization of appropriations for the Coast Guard completely on its own merits as of now, without taking into consideration whether the Coast Guard is going to be in the Department of Transportation forever or transferred to some other department at some future time.

I, therefore personally feel you need not have any apprehension that your request for authorization is going to be affected by any controversy that might arise within or without the Congress on where you are going to be or under whose jurisdiction. I think you can be reassured on that point.

Admiral SMITH. Thank you, Senator.

Senator COTTON. Thank you.

Senator HOLLINGS. I would agree, Senator, except the problem is he starts off with \$190 million and obviously through the Department of Transportation cuts—departmental cuts—his is cut in half, and yet the admiral appears enthusiastically endorsing a 50-percent cut—

Senator COTTON. He has to.

Senator HOLLINGS. Because he has to, and you say we want to get this without any relation to whether it stays here or goes otherwise.

I would like to say, as a member of this committee, I would like to consider that \$190 million request, because I am convinced they need it.

Senator COTTON. I agree with the Senator. I also am sure that the Senator will agree with me that we in the Congress are not so naive that we don't recognize that when somebody from downtown comes in and looks at us with a sweet smile and happy look on his face and says he is perfectly content with his reduced request, that such is not always voluntary. It is the result of loyalty and of legal requirements.

People come up from every department before our Appropriations Committee and endorse the recommendations of the Bureau of the Budget. Such witnesses aren't allowed to tell us they asked for more, but we ask them. Then, it turns out that they have been cut in half or cut by two-thirds.

I assume that you already have asked him what he really thinks the Coast Guard needs, haven't you?

Senator HOLLINGS. Yes, sir.

Senator COTTON. What did he say?

Senator HOLLINGS. He was sticking to the \$100 million. He is loyal.

Senator COTTON. Well, he is a good soldier. Excuse me, a good sailor.

Senator HOLLINGS. No; a good cop. He won't be a sailor. I have been trying to make him a sailor for 2 days. I think the White House is going to change this fellow's uniform.

Senator COTTON. Please don't talk about uniforms. It is a very painful subject.

Senator HOLLINGS. Being in transportation, he will have a bus driver's uniform.

I brought a copy of the Stratton Commission report over to you. On page 237, if you will open the book, down at the bottom left-hand corner, see if you do not find these percentages substantially correct, sir.

Their analysis of Coast Guard activity prepared for the commission indicates that in its program funding 70 percent is related to multipurpose search and rescue, navigation, port security, and enforcement activities; 13 percent to oceanography, meteorology, icebreaking, and other marine sciences; 13 percent to military preparedness activities; and 4 percent to merchant marine inspection and safety.

Is that substantially correct?

Admiral SMITH. First of all, Senator, we are talking, I presume, of operating expenses. I don't think this is too far away, but this was probably reasonably accurate when it was made.

Senator HOLLINGS. This was based on the 1969 fiscal year.

Admiral SMITH. Yes, sir.

Senator HOLLINGS. And I would understand there would be a slight modification, but isn't that a substantially correct reflection? If you would like to clarify it any way, I wish you would.

Admiral SMITH. I think it is reasonably accurate. The figures that we use now in our 1971 budget—there have been some slight adjustments here, it is about 74 percent for transportation-related activities and about 10 percent toward military readiness, and roughly 15 percent toward oceanography, meteorology, and polar icebreaking, and of that 15 percent about 7 percent are purely related to oceanographic.

Senator HOLLINGS. Relating, of course, to the transportation role of the Coast Guard; thus all or most of the Coast Guard activities relate to transportation. They are similarly related to other uses of the sea. Search and rescue functions, which require 35 percent of the total Coast Guard funding, are required most commonly in support of recreational boating.

Is that substantially accurate?

Admiral SMITH. I think the most number of cases are, but I don't think this describes our total program in search and rescue by any means, because this also provides for assistance to aircraft in distress, larger vessels that operate in the ocean, commercial as well as recreational boating.

Senator HOLLINGS. Would you change that percentage substantially?

Admiral SMITH. The 35 percent?

Senator HOLLINGS. Yes, sir.

Admiral SMITH. No, sir. This is still approximately right in the budget.

Senator HOLLINGS. Then provision of aids for navigation which requires 28 percent of the agency's budget is critical to the whole span of marine activities. The law enforcement activities—7 percent of the budget—include enforcement of fisheries and recreational boating laws, as well as port security—just what you were touching on a minute ago.

Only in merchant marine safety and inspection are tasks related solely to transportation.

Are the 28-percent figure there and the 7 percent substantially accurate?

Admiral SMITH. Yes, sir, reasonably. We show now for our aids to navigation 24 percent and for the law enforcement activities about 10 percent, but these figures are a reasonably accurate reflection.

Senator COTTON. Were you here with Secretary Volpe yesterday? A staff member has called my attention to the fact that Secretary Volpe's breakdown was 74 percent transportation, 19 percent military, 7 percent oceanographic.

Was that his testimony?

Admiral SMITH. Yes, sir. That is substantially correct. This agrees generally with these figures, because this partly is a matter of definition.

Senator HOLLINGS. Just like that one sentence says, it relates to transportation and it is similarly related to the seas. It is hard to separate it out and say this is solely either transportation or solely either maritime or marine affairs, isn't that correct?

Admiral SMITH. Yes, sir. We consider these as being directly in support of marine transportation activities, and this is why we relate them to transportation programs.

Senator COTTON. And that 74 percent is exactly what the Stratton Commission reported on that matter?

Admiral SMITH. They reported 70 percent. But I say this is a reasonably accurate reflection.

Senator COTTON. Another part of that was the 4 percent for merchant marine inspection and safety so as to add up to 74 percent.

Admiral SMITH. Yes, sir. This includes these various functions, the search and rescues, the aids to navigation, the merchant marine, and the law enforcement functions.

Senator COTTON. Still vague in my mind is what is referred to as military?

Admiral SMITH. We identify within our budget as nearly as we can that part of our budget that we devoted toward purely retaining our military capability. This is people that are required to man the armament on our ships, the antisubmarine warfare equipment, the sonar, the guns, the training that is directly related to maintaining military efficiency—these are the things that are included in that part of the budget.

Senator COTTON. Because of lack of appropriations or because of policy, you are abolishing or dispensing with a portion of the Coast Guard Reserve.

Admiral SMITH. Yes, sir, that is correct.

Senator COTTON. Not the Regular Reserve, but the Selected Reserve.

What is the meaning of Selected Reserve?

Admiral SMITH. The Selected Reserve is that part of our total Reserve Force which is required to participate in a regular training program, either a weekly drilling or a certain number of weeks of active duty for training each year. They have a military obligation to do this. This forms the major part of our Ready Reserve. There are other Ready Reserve components who are available for mobilization outside the Selected Reserve. But the Selected Reserve includes all those people who are required to participate in active duty for training and they meet the earliest mobilization requirements.

Senator COTTON. Now, the Regular Reserves are largely composed of personnel that either have had service in the Coast Guard or who have had training so they don't need further training, is that right?

Admiral SMITH. Yes, sir. They have completed the military obligation so they are not required to participate in any further training. Some of these Reserve people voluntarily have been participating in the Selected Reserve program as far as their training is concerned.

But the balance between our Selected Reserves and our total Ready Reserve is made up from people who have had experience in the Coast Guard and still have an obligation in case of mobilization.

Senator COTTON. Do you have the actual figures or a rough estimate of what proportion of all the Reserve components is being contemplated to be discontinued?

Admiral SMITH. Our present authorized strength of our Selected Reserve is 17,500. The Appropriations Committee this year further reduced that to figure of 15,000 at the end of this fiscal year.

Our total Ready Reserve Force is at about 24,000. So, the difference here is in the neighborhood, using Appropriations Committee figures, of 9,000, the difference between 15,000 and 24,000.

Senator COTTON. I guess I am poor on figures. I never made any "A's" in mathematics. I am trying to find out the proportion of all the Reserves that are expected to be discontinued. Putting the Selected and the Ready Reserves together, are you discontinuing all of the Selected Reserves?

Admiral SMITH. Yes, sir. These are to be phased out by the end of the next fiscal year.

Senator COTTON. And that would be what percentage of the combination of the two?

Admiral SMITH. I haven't made the calculation. It would be 15/24. Senator, I will speak just to our Ready Reserve.

Senator COTTON. It is more than half that is going to be taken out?

Admiral SMITH. It will be more than half of our Ready Reserve.

Senator COTTON. You have two groups. You have your Selected Reserves and you have your Ready Reserves.

Admiral SMITH. I didn't make myself clear, Senator. The Selected Reserve is a part of the total Ready Reserve group.

Senator COTTON. So, when you phase out all of the Selected Reserve, you are taking somewhat more than half of your Reserve?

Admiral SMITH. Our Ready Reserve.

Senator COTTON. Is that going to have any serious impact on the effectiveness and efficiency of the Coast Guard?

Admiral SMITH. Not directly; no, sir. The single important effect this has is the effect of reducing our ready response, our quick response in the event of mobilization. This is what we are talking about.

Senator COTTON. Yes. But if we stop spending this money on these Selected Reserves, who periodically go on duty for training, then if the time came when there was an emergency and you needed them, wouldn't your responsiveness be affected?

Admiral SMITH. We keep bringing new young men into this program, Senator. I think we have tried to keep a young organization; that is, after a man has completed a certain amount of obligation, he is removed from the rolls of the Selected Reserve.

Senator COTTON. Do you really approve or disapprove of this elimination of the Selected Reserve?

Admiral SMITH. Senator, we would like to study this matter a little further. What we are doing right now is making a careful evaluation of what impact this has on our ability to respond to those duties which fall upon our shoulders in the event of a mobilization.

So, it is a little hard for us to tell you right now just exactly what impact this would have on this particular responsibility, and this is the one that we have to consider.

Senator COTTON. Have you testified before the Appropriations Committee on this matter?

Admiral SMITH. We have not had our appropriations hearings yet, Senator. They come next week.

Senator COTTON. Is the decision to phase out the Reserves final?

Admiral SMITH. The decision has been made. It is included in the President's budget and in our budget.

Senator COTTON. And, because it is in the President's budget, the decision has been made in your opinion?

Admiral SMITH. Yes, sir.

Senator COTTON. Not because of any action of the Appropriations Committee?

Admiral SMITH. No, sir; not because of action of the Appropriations Committee.

Senator COTTON. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I didn't mean to take so much time.

Senator HOLLINGS. Thank you, Senator.

Admiral, what is the extent of participation in the data buoy program of the Coast Guard briefly, and the status of it?

Admiral SMITH. To go back for just a moment, Senator, you may recall a few years ago, I think it was 1967, there were a number of agencies who were moving in the direction of developing a data buoy system. The Navy had an on-going program, ESSA was working in this field, and I believe there were one or two other agencies who were working in this field, and after some suggestions in the Interagency Committee on Oceanography, they recommended that the management and the development of this system be turned over to the Coast Guard.

The first rather small steps were made in concern with the departments doing the funding. It has become a part of our budget, with a gradually increasing appropriation for this purpose.

This year we have about \$14 million in the budget to continue on with the program. We think we are making good progress, and we hope to have an array of usable buoys in the water by 1974-75.

Senator HOLLINGS. Will they be limited within the Continental Shelf limitations around our coast or around the world?

Admiral SMITH. They would not have to be limited. They would not have to be limited to the Continental Shelf, because it is possible now with the use of deep moorings to place these buoys in various parts of the ocean.

Senator HOLLINGS. Does the Coast Guard contemplate putting them worldwide in all the oceans?

Admiral SMITH. We haven't arrived that far in our considerations. Our first objective is to get some arrays off our own coast for our own purposes.

Senator HOLLINGS. What about our data buoy technology as compared to the Soviet, considering the Arabian Sea endeavor of the Soviet? Do you have any reports on that and its excellence in comparison to ours?

Admiral SMITH. No, sir; I do not. We have had some discussions with representatives of the Soviets on the ocean data acquisition system, but to the best of my knowledge, I don't believe our people have had any real insight to their technical development, at least we have not in the Coast Guard.

Senator HOLLINGS. What institutional or academic research is presently being funded by the Coast Guard?

Admiral SMITH. Senator, I don't believe we have any institutional research as such. We do use some of the institutional research activities for special projects.

Senator HOLLINGS. But the Coast Guard doesn't find any of them?

Admiral SMITH. No, sir.

Senator HOLLINGS. You are not a part of the industrial-military complex phenomenon that is running around the field?

Admiral SMITH. No, sir. We haven't gotten started with industry.

Senator HOLLINGS. Senator Cotton was stressing his concern and his admiration for the Coast Guard and our strong support of it, which I echo. He expressed concern that you would get swallowed up. I have a similar type of concern that you will be ignored, and what concerns me is that when you start in 1912 with oceanographic research and end up 60 years later with three refitted ships, broken down vessels. You start last year with an oceanographic research vessel, you find out it costs too much and you junk that idea and say here is one that has caught afire and let's paint it over. You have an Assistant Secretary for Research and Technology and you don't have a single laboratory within the Coast Guard. You get a budget that starts off with \$190 million which is cut to \$100 million, and the Secretary says he got around to you in June, these are the kinds of things that concern us.

Once again your testimony is that you would prefer that the Coast Guard remain in the Department of Transportation and not be in the oceanic agency, is that correct?

Admiral SMITH. Senator, that is correct. I feel very firmly that the proper place for the Coast Guard is in the Department of Transportation. I don't—

Senator HOLLINGS. Is this true generally of all of your officers? Do you know of anybody in the Coast Guard that wants to get into an oceanic agency? All of your officers and men as far as conversations, policy discussions and everything else that you have engaged in, they are all enthused and they like the Department of Transportation and they think they have finally found their niche and that is where they want to stay?

Admiral SMITH. I am sure I can't speak for every individual officer in the Coast Guard because I am sure as in any organization we have some diverse views.

Senator HOLLINGS. That is obvious.

Admiral SMITH. However, in my trip to our district offices, and I have visited most of them in the past year, since the Stratton Commission Report came out, I must say one of the greatest concerns expressed to me by our officers in the field from our district commanders down through the various grades was misgivings about the possibility of the Coast Guard being transferred to this organization. I don't know whether they were well prepared to reason this out or whether it was just the fear of change, but I must say there were strong feelings directed toward our remaining in the Department of Transportation.

Senator HOLLINGS. What was the misgiving premised upon?

Admiral SMITH. I think they recognized, I hope at least that they recognized, as I do, that with our mission and operating responsibilities that the Department of Transportation is the proper part of the Federal Government for our location.

Senator HOLLINGS. I guess we tend too quickly in the Congress to label, but as between a cop and a sailor, I can't see the captain of the Port of Charleston being piped aboard with a burglar alarm. That sort of decreases my morale.

But I understand your testimony.

I thank you, Admiral Smith, you, Admiral Trimble, Secretary Beggs and Mr. Prestemon for coming up and being with us today.

Do you wish to add anything further?

Admiral SMITH. I would like to add one little item.

When the Secretary mentioned the other day that he had these important problems when he took over duties as Secretary and hadn't gotten to the Coast Guard until June, I think what he was trying to say is that when he took over office he had two very serious programs facing him that really demanded his immediate and undivided attention. I don't think he was implying at all that he had neglected or denied the Coast Guard. I had access to him all the time. I think what he was saying was that our programs were running well enough that he didn't have to devote a great deal of close attention to solving the problems of the Coast Guard.

Senator HOLLINGS. Of course, we in Congress concerned with an oceanic program realize it is not being run well enough. As a nation we still do not have an oceanic program. There are still opportunities upon opportunities in the oceanic field, and it is not coordinated and there is no direction to it, and that is what is wrong. It is not a question of the Coast Guard being defunct or being inefficient, it is just a question of the Coast Guard missing a glorious opportunity for a coordinated effort with the other 21 agencies and departments so that we, somewhat like NASA in space, in oceanic science and atmospheric endeavor can work together and adopt a program and give it direction and give it dynamism, and that is not being done.

The Congress long before I had gotten here had spoken about this with many a research program. In 1965, again in 1967, and in this legislation, this 2 years' study, and you get the heads of the foundation, you get the Under Secretary of the Navy, Charles Baird, you get the best of brains and disciplines, and they all band together and they come out with a unanimous finding. And they go at length how they didn't jump to conclusions; they go at length about their concern for the Coast Guard because they didn't want to disrupt the good part that is going on—you don't want in order to adopt a new program to tear down the good.

Yet, all I can get is a suspicion, or a misgiving, or "I am happy where I am," but they don't give me these percentages that are wrong, they don't go to any part of the report and find the report wrong, they just say "We likes it where we is" and we are just going to stay there; and we are in transportation, and every other word is transportation, transportation, transportation, and I can't get you in the water or get you in the water in oceanic programs, get you research programs, and get you moving in that particular direction.

There is, for example, no civilian research endeavor in marine science, there is no civilian agency in the Government leading in marine affairs, and with your equipment and everything, helicopters and all, it could easily dovetail and fill this gap to help us keep apace with the Soviets and keep apace with our economy mostly in peacetime endeavors.

Secretary Beggs?

Mr. BEGGS. If I can add another dimension here. When you queried me before on the question of maritime and marine experience, I indicated that I have little direct experience in the civilian maritime field.

However, I do have about 6 years' experience in various capacities running a division of the Westinghouse Co. that was involved in all types of oceanography. I was involved with everything from engineering to the general management of that organization.

So, I do have some feel for the marine sciences side of this question. It seems to me—and I have read the Stratton report quite carefully—it seems to me that while it was a very thorough report and while they went into all the aspects of what the Coast Guard was doing, I think that one aspect of it that they missed or perhaps did not consider to a sufficient extent was the question of operating responsibilities versus doing good research and engineering. It seemed to me what they wanted to do in oceanography, and, based on my experience, I quite agreed with them, what is needed is a greatly enhanced endeavor in this Nation in the field of research and engineering in the oceans. I heartily support that.

I think that is a very good idea and a very necessary thing for the Nation. However, I don't agree with them when they say: "When you put this group together, it should have both very heavy operating responsibilities and very heavy responsibilities in research and engineering." I think our experience in NASA is 180 degrees in the other direction; that is, that there it became obvious quickly that it was necessary to shuck off the operating responsibilities in order to concentrate on the research and engineering in space.

Most large industrial corporations have had a similar experience. They do not burden their operating divisions with broad research and engineering responsibilities. As a matter of fact, I think the experience of all of our large industrial corporations is similar here; that is, at some point in their history, they set up a research laboratory which is divorced from the operating responsibilities of the corporation. This research laboratory is then responsible for pursuing research and engineering to support the future activities of the operation.

I submit that, while science and engineering is needed, a great preponderance of the Coast Guard's efforts have been involved primarily in the operating side, and I think in that operating side it is more closely related to transportation than it is to doing the kind of oceanographic work and ocean science work that is required to make this Nation preponderant in that field.

This is not to say, however, that if the Nation undertakes an oceanographic activity here, that the Coast Guard cannot support it. However, I don't believe that because the Coast Guard exists and has the capability to operate on the oceans, and that capability is being used, perhaps in a multifunctional way, that one should transfer it to an ocean agency. This is because I think there is the equal possibility that if the concentration goes to the oceanographic side, they might conceivably lower the transportation requirements, and these are very broad and very necessary.

Senator HOLLINGS. Mr. Beggs, going right back to your experience in corporate activity with Westinghouse, I have visited with Mr. Press of your Westinghouse marine research facility. The point is while it is separated, you don't put that necessarily in marketing, you don't put it in transportation, they are all within the corporation. Westinghouse wouldn't dare stay in business trying to contract out its research. Westinghouse wouldn't dare stay in business just to get a transportation company and not transport a good bit of it.

Your NASA role and activity was entirely different. You had to key into an exploratory research activity in order to get you there.

It begs the question that we are already not in business. We have got more than 55,000 people. We have got more than \$800 million being spent in the Government on marine and atmospheric programs. What we are trying to do is to get it all in the same corporation. It is just scattered all around. That is the whole point of it.

You would say, for example, that the Maritime Administration is good as a separate agency, you think it should stay there?

Mr. BEGGS. I think all logic points to bringing the Maritime Administration into the Department of Transportation.

Senator HOLLINGS. That has to do with maritime transportation, and you would suggest that the Maritime Administration be in the Department.

Suppose the President called you up and said Secretary Beggs, just forget about all these departments for a minute, what we want you to do is to get us an oceanic and marine affairs endeavor in this Government, we need a coordinated, directed effort, would you put it in the Department of Transportation?

Mr. BEGGS. I would give some consideration to how I would want to organize it. I think the studies that are being done are taking into consideration such things as the President's span of control, which I understand the Secretary spoke of yesterday. There already are a lot of independent agencies, and the President's span of control already is very broad, and I think there is some necessity to consider the overall organization of the government when you set something like this up.

As to a specific answer to your question, I believe it would depend on what my objectives were. If my objectives were for research and engineering, I think I would try to configure an organization that was related to research and engineering and did not have broad operating responsibilities.

Then I would decide where I wanted to put it. Whether it would be an independent agency or part of one of the existing executive departments I think is a question that has to be considered very carefully in terms of all the other factors relating to Federal organization.

Senator HOLLINGS. As to any endeavor in Government as far as you see the proper organizational approach, it is your testimony that the research and engineering phase of it never be confused with the operating phase of it?

Mr. BEGGS. I think that makes more sense from the research and engineering side.

Senator HOLLINGS. In Transportation, have you recommended that we do away with this Assistant Secretary for Research and Technology in the Department?

Mr. BEGGS. No, sir, but if you notice within our organization he has no operating responsibility.

Senator HOLLINGS. But he is in the organization?

Mr. BEGGS. Yes, sir, just as a research laboratory of an industrial corporation is in the corporation, but they have no operating responsibility.

Senator HOLLINGS. Now we are back around. You don't mind them getting into the same agency or department?

Mr. BEGGS. No sir.

Senator HOLLINGS. That is what we are talking about. You have got under your Department the Coast Guard. You want to hold on to it. You say the Maritime Administration ought to come under it.

What about this completing the picture here, which the Stratton Commission made a stab at? We don't say that is infallible. But how would you get an oceanic program for the U.S. Government? Do you think it ought to be under the Department of Transportation?

Mr. BEGGS. No, sir, I am not suggesting that. I have not studied in detail the organizational possibility for such an organization. My feeling is if you are going to reach the objectives that the Stratton Commission set up for such an organization that it should be built up around a laboratory structure and academy of engineers and scientists who are related to this field. I know of no such cadre in the Coast Guard nor do I know of any such cadre in ESSA, but I am sure if you looked around hard enough that in various places in the Federal structure there probably are such people. That is what I would organize around.

Senator HOLLINGS. Admiral Smith, do you have anything to add?

Admiral SMITH. No, sir, I have nothing to add.

Senator HOLLINGS. We thank you very much for your testimony this morning.

The committee is adjourned.

(Whereupon, at 12:10 p.m., the committee was adjourned.)

○