# EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

## Congressman Anderson, Former Skipper of the "Nautilus," Speaks for Nuclear Power Development

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
**HON. JOE L. EVINS**
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Monday, January 18, 1965*

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, in an address delivered on January 13 at the "Salute to the Nuclear Navy" program in Washington, our new colleague, the gentleman from Tennessee, WILLIAM R. ANDERSON, discusses our country's nuclear power development policy with particular reference to the part played by the Congress.

Congressman ANDERSON, is, as you know, the former captain of the nuclear-powered submarine *Nautilus* and was its commander on the historic first journey under the polar ice. He comes to this House from the Sixth Congressional District of Tennessee following his election last November.

As we welcome our distinguished new colleague from Tennessee, we have occasion to congratulate both him and the House leadership on his assignment to the Committee on Science and Astronautics, a congressional specialty closely related to his specialty as a famous Navy officer.

In this connection, Mr. Speaker, I include Congressman ANDERSON'S remarks on the subject of nuclear propulsion's development in the RECORD.

The address follows:

ADDRESS OF REPRESENTATIVE WILLIAM R. ANDERSON, OF TENNESSEE, AT "SALUTE TO THE NUCLEAR NAVY," WILLARD HOTEL, WASHINGTON, JANUARY 13, 1965

I am very glad to be here and I appreciate the forbearance of all of you who must realize that I am a bit late to be a qualified Navy spokesman and considerably early to be a congressional expert.

My problem doesn't stop here. Despite all my efforts to acquire the image of lawmaker and statesman, I find I'm still more closely identified with the North Pole than with Capitol Hill. I assure you, it is twice as hard and much more dangerous to reach Congress.

I want to express my warm appreciation to the Washington Naval Reserve Public Relations Co. for conceiving and arranging this event. Having spent my last 3 years of Navy duty here in Washington, I am well aware of your versatility, your fine traditions and the great contributions your unit has made toward a more effective and better understood Navy.

The last 10 years of our nuclear Navy have been eventful and bright with performance and potential. It is certain that the next 10 years can be years of progress, achievement and consolidation.

The joint Navy-Atomic Energy Commission program has always been blessed with champions to serve the cause of nuclear propulsion.

Its number one champion originally stood almost alone. Tomorrow, that man, small in physical stature but gigantic in the breadth and depth of his character, intellect, and devotion, will leave his austere office to go to the White House to receive the Enrico Fermi Award from President Lyndon B. Johnson.

The Navy and the Nation are indeed fortunate that Adm. H. G. Rickover is willing to continue in his demanding assignment in the second decade of nuclear power.

There are also many champions of the nuclear Navy on both sides of Capitol Hill. I do not intend to diminish the credit due the Navy, but history will record that Congress, particularly during the early days, gave nuclear propulsion better attention, better service, and greater push than did the Navy itself.

We are most fortunate that two Capitol Hill champions of nuclear power have now moved to powerful positions. I refer to Congressman MENDEL RIVERS, chairman of the House Armed Services Committee, and Congressman CHET HOLIFIELD, chairman of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy. The outlook for the next 10 years is brighter because of the judgment, vision, and leadership of these statesmen.

With the support and leadership of men of this type, the Navy now stands on the threshold of a historic changeover. The *Nautilus* and her successors and the dramatically powerful Polaris-firing submarines are a tremendous force in being. Nuclear task force 1, after its circumnavigation of the globe appears to be the prototype for the ships that will make our Navy the most powerful and adaptable the world has ever seen.

With more and more efficient nuclear propulsion systems being developed, the key question to a policy for the second decade of the nuclear Navy would seem to be how best to proceed with construction of nuclear surface ships.

The reason for our past timidity in this matter has, of course, been costs. In opening a discussion on nuclear surface ships, I want to make it clear that my purpose is not to criticize the decisions of the past but to make some suggestions bearing on future policy.

First of all, I think that in deciding whether to adopt an aggressive program of nuclear ship construction we should make sure all factors are considered.

It's important, first of all, that the figures on which we base decisions be true, complete costs of ship construction and operation, amortized over the useful life of the ship—development, construction, outfitting, operation, repairs, refueling.

Viewed on this basis, the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy has estimated that a nuclear carrier is just 3 percent more expensive in the long run than a conventional carrier. It is also, of course, much more effective than a conventional carrier. There are few Americans who would not be willing to invest this additional 3 percent in order to avoid dependence on obsolete, second-best ships for the defense of this country and the security of the free world.

Let us also remember the spin-offs, the side benefits and returned dividends that have and will come from the development of nuclear propulsion.

Take the Shippingport reactor, this country's first full-sized commercial atomic generating plant. Shippingport is really a larger version of the *Nautilus* powerplant. Eventually, I believe we will realize that if the only result of the *Nautilus* development program had been a safe, satisfactory situation at Shippingport, the money would have been well spent.

While our needs for commercial atomic power may not press us today, we must prepare for the time when they press in on us rapidly—as, indeed, they are pressing in already on many nations hard up for conventional energy sources.

Let us not forget, either, that the Stars and Stripes, flying from modern, swift, far-ranging nuclear ships comprises one of our most dramatic symbols of the success of the United States in harnessing the atom for practical, peaceful purposes—dramatic proof of this Nation's firm determination that the atom shall be used for mankind's good, rather than his destruction.

These considerations are difficult, I think, to place on the scale of cost accounting. But they must be included in our thinking. We cannot afford to deprive ourselves of our full potential power merely because it appears today to be a little more expensive, because what slide rule can measure the value of life and liberty?

So, as a new administration, with a sparkling mandate from the people, prepares to open new and ambitious vistas toward the fulfillment of the American dream, I think we must visualize ourselves as at a new departure, beyond which a wise nation will not only build fleets powered by the atom, but will embrace every opportunity to harness this elemental force for the benefit of all men, everywhere.

## The 20th Anniversary of Art Linkletter's "House Party"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
**HON. ALPHONZO BELL**
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Monday, January 18, 1965*

Mr. BELL. Mr. Speaker, on January 15, 1965, Art Linkletter's award-winning show "House Party" celebrated its 20th anniversary of broadcasting on radio and television.

Art is a good friend of mine and I know that I can speak for the many thousands of his friends and fans in congratulating him for the outstanding contribution he has made not only to entertainment but also to humanitarian endeavors he has actively supported during his remarkable career.

I am therefore asking unanimous consent that the text of a joint resolution I introduced today be printed in the RECORD.

The resolution follows:

H.J. RES. 212

Joint resolution honoring Art Linkletter for unique services rendered to his country and to the world

Whereas on January 15, 1965, Art Linkletter celebrated his twentieth anniversary of broadcasting "House Party" on radio and television; and

Whereas "House Party" has for twenty years contributed to the wholesome entertainment and education of millions of listeners and viewers and has maintained a high standard of excellence; and

Whereas Art Linkletter has given unstintingly of time, talent, and energy to the welfare of children and to a rich variety of humanitarian causes throughout the world; and

Whereas Art Linkletter has been honored by a host of American organizations for his

selfless devotion to charitable causes: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That the President is authorized to present in the name of the people of America a parchment of appropriate design to Art Linkletter in recognition of the aforesaid services to his country and to the world, such parchment to include a suitably engrossed copy of this joint resolution.

## Local Public Works Act of 1965

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

### HON. KENNETH J. GRAY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, January 18, 1965*

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Speaker, two of the most urgent problems with which this Congress must come to grips are the need to help our towns and cities to grow and prosper and the need to maintain our economic expansion and thereby reduce the present intolerably high level of unemployment. An important step in achieving these aims is Federal aid for local public works. The success of this approach was most recently proven by the accelerated public works program. Because of this I was greatly pleased that our distinguished colleague, Congressman JOHN A. BLATNIK, Democrat, of Minnesota, introduced the Local Public Works Act of 1965 (H.R. 2170) which I have the honor of cosponsoring (H.R. 2425). I hope that we can act on this legislation promptly because the need for it is urgent. This need was clearly spelled out by Congressman BLATNIK in his speech last week to a luncheon meeting of the AFL–CIO legislative conference. I hope that all of my colleagues will read his speech carefully and I request that it be reprinted here:

FEDERAL AID TO LOCAL PUBLIC WORKS: THE NEED FOR A CONTINUING PROGRAM

(An address by Congressman JOHN A. BLATNIK, to the AFL–CIO Legislative Conference)

The 89th Congress is scarcely 1 week old but it is already evident that this will be a hard-working and productive session. The House has made highly important changes in its rules to overcome obstacles which in the past have repeatedly thwarted the will of the majority. The benefits of these changes will be reflected in the sound and constructive record which I am confident that this Congress will achieve.

President Johnson's state of the Union message, one of the most notable ever given, has set the tone. Those who expected cautious generalizations must have been very much surprised. It was hard hitting, specific, and showed the President's determination to move ahead rapidly toward the realization of his Great Society. I was particularly pleased with the several references in the President's speech which recognized the importance of public works and the need for prompt action in this field. While details of administration proposals have to await specific messages, I believe that they will recognize the urgent need for increased public investment and the fact that only Federal grants have the power to provide the stimulation required.

At no time in the past 20 years has the setting been as favorable for the enactment of legislation designed to give a substantial and continuing boost to public works construction. The critical need for the many benefits of increased public works investment has created broad-based support for vigorous Federal action. The AFL–CIO has long been in the forefront of those who recognize that this aid is needed and are willing to fight for it. The resolution adopted by your executive committee in November is a strong reaffirmation of your traditional support and will carry tremendous weight with all of us in public office. This kind of Federal aid also carries the all-out support of the mayors of our towns and cities who know firsthand the extent of the need and the problems of State and local government in meeting it. Just last month the National Association of Home Builders, I believe for the first time, endorsed Federal grant assistance for local public works because they know from their own experience that the lack of adequate community facilities has resulted in inflated land prices and excessive real estate taxes which in effect have priced middle-income families out of the market for new housing in many areas. Undoubtedly other groups will add their support to proposals for stronger Federal aid to meet this problem.

In his message, President Johnson said, "I propose we launch a national effort to make the American city a better and more stimulating place to live." I am sure that all of us here share the President's desire and determination, and inevitably a vital element in that effort will be greater investment in all of the many public facilities essential to modern urban living. Perhaps many of these things seem unexciting and are too often taken for granted, but a city cannot exist and cannot be prosperous or satisfying without substantial investment in water and sewer facilities, public buildings, parks and playgrounds, streets, hospitals, community centers, and so forth. When these facilities are antiquated or inadequate, the quality of life in the community suffers and its ability to expand and attract new job-producing investment is severely limited.

We have a bold and vigorous program of urban renewal which is clearing the worst of our cities' slums and blighted areas and to which the Federal Government has already committed $4 billion in grants, and undoubtedly this Congress will be called upon to provide additional billions for this vital program which is doing so much to revitalize our cities. We have provided billions of dollars in grants for our long-term highway program much of which will be built within urban areas, and last year we took the first step toward providing grants for local mass transit systems. Meanwhile, there has been a growing need to supplement these efforts by providing grant assistance for a broad range of local public works which the city or other local government unit must build to meet the requirements of its citizens.

The fact is that we have not kept pace with the growing needs of our people for local public works. Today the backlog of needed improvements and additions to our supply of community facilities runs into billions of dollars. Our inventory of local public works is less adequate today than it was in 1940 when we had the benefit of the intensive building programs of the 1930's. This is reflected in the growing problem of water pollution, in traffic congestion, overcrowded public facilities, and in many other problems of daily life ranging from nuisances to outright threats to health and safety.

State and local governments are making heroic efforts to meet their responsibilities, but the fact is that their limited revenue resources simply cannot carry the whole burden. Rightly or wrongly, the Federal Government has preempted the most important and the strongest source of revenues through its corporate and personal income taxes. Where a State or city is limited by the prosperity and diversity of industries within its jurisdiction and the danger of driving investment elsewhere, the Federal tax structure is based on the entire American economy, the strongest and richest the world has ever known.

I believe that Federal assistance for local problems is not only justified but is an obligation on those of us who have the honor to serve in the Congress. The taxes which support the Federal Government come largely from the people who live in our towns and cities, our urban population, and it is only right that the Federal Government reinvest that money at the local level where it is most needed.

Increased investment in public works is not only needed for the growth and livability of our towns and cities but also for its broad economic benefits. We must not forget for one minute the plight of those millions of American men and women who are out of work today, who will be displaced by automation and other economic changes, or who will be entering the labor force in the coming year. No one knows better than you in this room what an awesome task it will be to provide employment opportunities for these millions. This would be true under the best of circumstances, but as we enter 1965 there is growing concern about the economic outlook. Most economists seem baffled that our present expansion has lasted as long as it has, for over 40 months. I believe that the reason is clear—the expansionist policies of the Kennedy-Johnson administrations have been making up for the preceding 8 years of restriction. I believe, however, that the economists are correct in their concern for the coming year. I cannot help but be perturbed when these doubts are expressed in some of the stanchest business quarters. For example, Fortune magazine, hardly a foe of business confidence, felt compelled to open the economic analysis in its January report with this statement, "A new period of subnormal growth is now in prospect for the U.S. economy after this quarter. Following 4 years of rapid gains in output * * * this means a real change in trend. As Roundup remarked 6 months ago, 'The really difficult task for the economy lies not behind us but ahead, i.e., after the spring of 1965.' This outlook is now more definite."

In the same vein, U.S. News & World Report began its recent economic summary with this statement, "Almost a chorus of prediction now is heard that the business upturn can slow or end in second half, 1965, that today's good times may face trouble."

I do not need to tell you that an actual downturn is not our only danger. With our growing labor force, even a leveling off of the economy poses a major menace. Again in the U.S. News & World Report had this to say, "The pattern of business activity that seems to be indicated promises little improvement in the problem of unemployment. It appears likely that total employment will expand by some 850,000 by this time next year. But that expansion will not be enough to absorb the indicated increase in the labor force. The result may be that by fourth quarter, 1965, unemployment may be nearly 1 million higher than now."

A phrase being used with increasing frequency by economists is "fiscal drag." This refers to the fact that Federal revenues under any given tax structure rise as the economy expands. In fact, because of the progressive nature of income taxes, these revenues rise faster than total national income. On the other hand, the rate of increase in Federal spending has slackened off over the past year or year and a half and although it is still going up, it is not rising as fast as the Government is taking money out of the economy. Whether or not this would be made up by an accelerated expansion in the

private sector of the economy is debatable. We hear contradictory estimates of the outlook for business spending on new plant and equipment, but the best estimates at this time do not indicate enough of a rise to stimulate the economy to the extent needed. In the case of consumer spending there seems to be general agreement that people have spent the higher take-home pay from last year's tax cut somewhat more quickly than anticipated and the further rise from this source will not be great enough to give the economy the lift it needs. We all know the critical impact that follows the closing of a defense base or the cancellation of a defense contract. Though the effects are more subtle and harder to pin down, the same thing happens throughout the economy from a relative reduction in Federal spending—relative to tax revenues and to our economic needs.

We have made great gains in economic sophistication in the past few years. The Kennedy-Johnson tax cuts at a time when the Government was running a substantial deficit is clear evidence of this. We have also launched a long-term effort to get at the roots of unemployment, of low income, through the poverty and retraining programs. However, we cannot say to the unemployed worker and his family that he should be patient and wait for general overall improvement. He needs a job now and it is our responsibility to do whatever we can to provide full employment. Recognition of this fact was recently given by the National Planning Association, an organization of some of America's leading businessmen as well as labor leaders. In their latest report they state, "We endorse both tax reduction and training and retraining as useful and desirable first steps toward modernizing our economy. But we do not believe that they will create the very large number of additional job opportunities which will be needed to absorb present open and hidden unemployment and the large influx to the urban labor market from schools and farms in the years ahead, during which we obviously cannot forever resort to one large-scale tax reduction after another." I concur wholeheartedly with those views.

In these circumstances it is particularly timely that you should make public works the theme of your luncheon. Increased public works construction has proved its value both in improving our cities and in meeting the problem of unemployment through its direct impact in on-site jobs, materials consumption and transportation, and through its multiplier effect as this money is spent and respent for the whole range of consumer and business, goods and services. The academicians are fond of saying that they appreciate the impact which stepped up public works activity can have on the economy but that the leadtime required to get projects underway limits their usefulness. I hope that this time the economists will get behind us and support the effort to inaugurate a major public works program now, without waiting until the last minute. I would also say to them that they should study the experience under the accelerated public works program which proved to me that the money can be put to work promptly creating jobs and creating needed community facilities. The truth is that there is a substantial "shelf" of plans already completed or well advanced for local public works which can be started in a very short time. There are hundreds of millions of dollars worth of projects in applications pending under the APW program for which no Federal assistance is available, and undoubtedly an even larger amount of planning exists outside that limited program.

To meet the twin problems of needed local public works and increased employment opportunities, I have introduced H.R. 2170, the Local Public Works Act of 1965. This bill is designed to provide a large and continuing program of Federal grants for virtually the whole range of local public works. It would authorize $2 billion annually in Federal grants to cover two-thirds of the cost of sewer and water facilities, public buildings, streets, and road improvement, and other kinds of local facilities. These grants could be made to local public bodies without limitations on population size. Also there would be no employment criteria for eligibility but it includes the further provision that depressed areas, in view of their special needs and limited resources, could receive grants up to 75 percent of cost. I believe that this legislation could spark a sharp increase in public works construction, one which is particularly needed since the exhaustion of APW funds and the end of the boost which that gave to such construction might otherwise actually lead to a slackening in this vital part of our economy.

I am confident that the basic support for this kind of a proposal is there if only those who believe in the need for it will give it their determined support. Major legislation must have grassroots backing to make its way through the complex route it must follow here in Washington. I hope that all of you, while you are here in Washington and when you return to your homes, will keep this in mind. Certainly this bill is among my highest legislative priorities this year and I hope it will be among yours.



## The 10th Anniversary of the U.S. Nuclear Navy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

### HON. CHET HOLIFIELD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, January 18, 1965*

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, on January 14 the President awarded the Enrico Fermi Award to Admiral Rickover. It is most appropriate that this award was made as we are observing the 10th anniversary of the U.S. Nuclear Navy.

When the Atomic Energy Commission announced the selection of Adm. H. G. Rickover as the recipient of the Enrico Fermi Award on November 21, 1964, in a public statement, I indicated my great pleasure at the receipt of this news. I said:

In my opinion, Admiral Rickover has done more to further the development and uses of atomic energy than most of the prior recipients of this award. I believe his selection for the highest honor in the atomic energy field has been long overdue.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to include in the RECORD at this point the President's remarks when he presented the award to Admiral Rickover and Admiral Rickover's response.

I would also like to include the Atomic Energy Commission's November 21, 1964, announcement of the selection of Admiral Rickover for this award. This announcement also contains a biographical sketch of Admiral Rickover which lists some of his outstanding accomplishments and a list of some of the honors which Admiral Rickover had earned and received previously:

REMARKS BY PRESIDENT LYNDON B. JOHNSON UPON PRESENTATION OF ENRICO FERMI AWARD FOR 1964 TO VICE ADM. H. G. RICKOVER, U.S. NAVY, THE WHITE HOUSE, JANUARY 14, 1965

Admiral Rickover, it is a gratifying pleasure to participate in this ceremony recognizing your contributions to our Nation's security—and to our peaceful economic growth in the future.

The citation of this eighth Enrico Fermi Award states:

"For engineering and administrative leadership in the development of safe and reliable nuclear power and its successful application to our national security and economic needs."

In just 3 days, we shall be celebrating the 10th anniversary of the first sea voyage of a nuclear-powered submarine—the *Nautilus*. The Nation is grateful for your courageous and dedicated role in that historic development.

Over the 10 years since, the *Nautilus* has been joined by more than 50 other nuclear-powered naval vessels. Today our nuclear fleet numbers 22 attack submarines, 29 Polaris submarines, and 3 surface ships. Together these nuclear-powered vessels have traveled a total of more than 4,300,000 miles on patrol for peace and freedom.

Your personal leadership has made an invaluable contribution to our national security—and to our capacity for keeping the peace.

Your personal dedication to excellence—your personal faith in the future—offer examples which this Nation must emulate if we are to fulfill the potential that is ours.

In no field is the promise—and the challenge—more exciting that the peaceful potential of nuclear power.

Beyond the present naval applications, perhaps there may be much broader horizons for nuclear power on the high seas. I hope the day will come when nuclear power will be so economical for our merchant ships that the American Maritime Fleet will once again become preeminent—with a new generation of swift long-range nuclear-powered vessels.

You were instrumental in the construction of the world's first large nuclear generating station at Shippingport, Pa., in 1957. From that beginning, we are now able to foresee the day—only 15 years away—when we shall have some 70 million kilowatts of installed capacity from nuclear power generation stations.

I look forward to the day when this great energy resource can be applied to desalting the sea, assuring us the additional fresh water needed for our growing population and expanding industries. In these important years you have played a role of first importance in helping us to understand and use more rationally the great force of nuclear energy. It is often overlooked that your many accomplishments and contributions have been made while in the service of your Government. Your achievements and your career should stand as an example to the many present and future Government personnel that there is a large job that can be done—and that a job well done is recognized.

For these significant contributions to our national security and growth, I am privileged to present to you—on behalf of the Atomic Energy Commission and the people of the United States—the Enrico Fermi Award for 1964.

REMARKS BY VICE ADM. H. G. RICKOVER, U.S. NAVY, THE ENRICO FERMI AWARD CEREMONY, THE WHITE HOUSE, JANUARY 14, 1965

Thank you, Mr. President. I had the privilege of knowing Enrico Fermi. I admired

him greatly for his scientific achievements and because he was a singularly warmhearted human being. To be a recipient of the award established in his name moves me deeply.

I have always felt that in honoring a person we must remember that all human achievement flows not only from individual effort but from associative effort as well. We, the living, are heirs to all the ideas and accomplishments of every human being who has ever lived. Nowhere is this more true than in the never-ending quest for new knowledge and for new ways to put this knowledge to practical use.

The developer of a new technology starts at the current technical level and seeks to raise it so as to profit from new scientific discoveries. By its very nature, this is a cooperative endeavor. Had our nuclear ship program not received the firm and constant support of the Congressional Joint Committee on Atomic Energy and of the Atomic Energy Commission, we would not today have a fleet of nuclear submarines and surface ships.

The naval reactors group which I am privileged to head designs the powerplants of these ships and supervises their construction and operation. This task is shared by all members of the group. The actual building of these plants is carried out by private industry working under close supervision and to the exacting standards necessitated by the nature of the atom.

In gratefully accepting this award I do so on behalf of the dedicated men and women in the laboratories, the factories, and the shipyards who build our ships, as well as the brave men who serve in them. All work long and hard to make it possible for the United States to have an effective and ready nuclear navy.

---

### Vice Adm. H. G. Rickover To Receive AEC's Enrico Fermi Award for 1964

The Atomic Energy Commission has selected Vice Adm. H. G. Rickover as recipient of the Enrico Fermi Award for 1964 in recognition of his outstanding engineering and administrative leadership in the development of safe and reliable nuclear power and its successful application to our national security and economic needs. The award consists of a gold medal, a citation, and $25,000.

Admiral Rickover is the first engineer-administrator and the eighth person to receive the award, named for the late Enrico Fermi, leader of the group of scientists who achieved the first sustained, controlled nuclear chain reaction on December 2, 1942, at Stagg Field, Chicago.

The selection of Admiral Rickover for the award was made by the Commission after consideration of recommendations from its statutory General Advisory Committee. The award will be presented at a ceremony in January 1965.

Admiral Rickover first achieved national recognition for his leadership in the design, development, construction, and operation of nuclear propulsion systems for submarines and other naval ships. As early as 1946, before the Atomic Energy Commission was established, Admiral Rickover was assigned responsibility for investigating the use of nuclear reactors for this purpose. He assembled a team of naval officers and civilians at Oak Ridge, Tenn., and early in 1948 he headed the joint AEC-Navy program to develop the first naval nuclear propulsion system.

Utilizing the fundamental research on reactor materials and conceptual systems developed by the Oak Ridge and the Argonne National Laboratories, Admiral Rickover's group made steady progress in compiling the information and perfecting the techniques necessary to build the first nuclear submarine. He made American industry a partner in this effort at the Bettis Atomic Power Laboratory near Pittsburgh, the Knolls Atomic Power Laboratory near Schenectady, and at the National Reactor Testing Station in Idaho. At these places the development of naval nuclear propulsion systems was carried out. A landmark in this effort was the initial operation on March 31, 1953, of the submarine thermal reactor, Mark I, the land-based prototype of the first nuclear submarine propulsion plant. This prototype plant performed a continuous full power run of 66 days duration. This was enough time to have carried a ship twice around the world without refueling and contrasts with the 4-hour full power run which is required for acceptance of new naval ships. This run served to highlight the virtually unlimited cruising range of the *Nautilus*, even at high speed. On June 14, 1952, the keel of the *Nautilus*, the world's first nuclear submarine, was laid by President Truman at Groton, Conn. She was launched by Mrs. Eisenhower on January 21, 1954, and went to sea on January 17, 1955.

This event was the beginning of a revolution in naval strategy and tactics. For the first time a true submarine was possible—one that could steam long distances almost indefinitely at high speeds. In February 1957, the *Nautilus* completed operation on its first nuclear core, having traveled 62,500 miles in more than 2 years without refueling. The arctic region was accessible to the nuclear submarine, as demonstrated by the voyages of the *Nautilus* and the *Skate* under the North Pole icecap. A new record was established in naval history by the *Triton*, the first submarine to circumnavigate the world underwater, completely independent of the earth's atmosphere. The impact of the development of nuclear power on the Navy's surface fleet was recently demonstrated by the round-the-world cruise of the nuclear ships *Enterprise*, *Long Beach*, and *Bainbridge* without replenishment of supplies or fuel.

In addition to his contributions to the development of the nuclear Navy, Admiral Rickover also led the scientific, technical, and industrial team which developed and constructed the Shippingport Pressurized Water Reactor (PWR) at Shippingport, Pa. This project has served as the basic laboratory for much of the reactor technology which has gone into the Nation's atomic powerplants. The Shippingport power station has supplied more than 1.7 billion kilowatt-hours of electricity to users in the Pittsburgh area since its initial startup in late 1957.

Two of the most important contributions of the Shippingport (PWR) project have been in the fields of reactor physics and reactor fuel technology. The PWR, with its "seed and blanket" design, demonstrated that it is feasible to obtain large amounts of power from a blanket of natural uranium surrounding a "seed" of highly enriched uranium core which serves as the driving element in a reactor which is cooled and moderated with ordinary water. While producing power the seed-and-blanket design has the additional advantage of making possible the breeding of fissionable material from the very abundant element thorium in the blanket. As a result of Admiral Rickover's achievements in this program, the State of California has submitted a proposal for cooperative construction of a large thorium seed-blanket reactor which the Commission now has under consideration.

In the field of fuel metallurgy the Shippingport PWR project team, led by Admiral Rickover, has been responsible for the development of uranium oxide as a fuel material for large power reactors. Engineering studies of the PWR also produced many design improvements which have extended the life of reactor fuel elements and thus have contributed to the reduction in nuclear power costs. The first PWR core, placed in the reactor in late 1957, operated until February 1964, more than three times its original design life.

To extend the knowledge of basic reactor technology both in the United States and abroad, Admiral Rickover was also instrumental in establishing a school for reactor operators at Shippingport in which personnel from the United States and foreign utility companies are training as atomic powerplant operators. Admiral Rickover also established and maintains the Navy's program for the nuclear training of all officers and enlisted personnel involved in the operation of the Navy's nuclear powerplants.

In developing components and materials for naval propulsion and civilian power reactor systems, Admiral Rickover and those working with him soon discovered that the standards of reliability and safety established for conventional power systems were by no means sufficient for nuclear powerplants. The result has been the development of technical standards and specifications in the nuclear industry which would have been inconceivable a few years ago, and the formulation of realistic and comprehensive safety standards for propulsion and power reactors. So rigorous have been the standards for fabrication and operation of nuclear systems that they have surpassed conventional equipment in safety and reliability.

For his many achievements, Admiral Rickover has been awarded, among others, the following honors and awards:

American Legion of Merit for performance of duties as head of the electrical section, Bureau of Ships, 1946.

Made commander, Order of the British Empire, 1946.

Awarded Gold Star in lieu of Second Legion of Merit for performance of duty in development of nuclear ship propulsion program, 1952.

Awarded the Christopher Columbus Prize at the Fifth International Meeting of Communications in Genoa, Italy, October 1957.

Awarded Congressional Gold Medal for his accomplishments in successfully directing the development and construction of the world's first nuclear-powered ships and the first large-scale nuclear powerplant devoted exclusively to the production of electricity, 1959.

Presented the Distinguished Service Medal, for exceptionally meritorious service from January 17, 1955, to January 17, 1961, while in charge of the naval nuclear propulsion program in the Department of the Navy and in the U.S. Atomic Energy Commission, January 1961.

Awarded Gold Star in lieu of the Second Distinguished Service Medal, for exceptionally meritorious service from January 1961 to January 1964 as manager, naval reactors, Division of Reactor Development, U.S. Atomic Energy Commission and as assistant chief of the Bureau of Ships for Nuclear Propulsion, February 1964.

He has also been awarded numerous degrees by universities.

In addition to numerous articles, he has written three books and made two reports to the House Appropriations Committee (issued as separate publications):

"Education and Freedom (1959)," E. P. Dutton & Co.

"Swiss Schools and Ours: Why Theirs Are Better (1962)," Little, Brown & Co. (under auspices Council for Basic Education).

"American Education—A National Failure (1963)," E. P. Dutton & Co.

"Report on Russia (1959)," Committee on Appropriations, House of Representatives.

"Education for All Children: What We Can Learn From England (1962)," Committee on Appropriations, House of Representatives.

The first recipient of an award under the provisions of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 was the late Dr. Enrico Fermi, who was

granted a $25,000 award on November 16, 1954.

The Commission decided that subsequent awards should bear his name. The seven previous Fermi Award winners are:

Year 1956: The late Dr. John von Neumann, noted scientist and mathematician and member of the Atomic Energy Commission, "for his contributions to the theory, design, and construction of fast computers and to the role of computers in the control and use of atomic energy."

Year 1957: The late Dr. Ernest O. Lawrence, director of the Radiation Laboratory, University of California, which bears his name, "for his invention and development of the cyclotron and for his many contributions in nuclear physics and atomic energy."

Year 1958: Dr. Eugene Wigner, professor of mathematical physics, Princeton University, for "contributions to nuclear and theoretical physics, to nuclear reactor development and to practical applications of atomic energy."

Year 1959: Dr. Glenn T. Seaborg, Chairman of the U.S. Atomic Energy Commission, who was chancellor of the University of California when he received the award "for discoveries of plutonium and several additional elements and for leadership in development of nuclear chemistry and atomic energy."

Year 1961: Dr. Hans A. Bethe, professor of physics at Cornell University "for contributions to nuclear and theoretical physics, to peaceful uses of atomic energy and to the security of the United States."

Year 1962: Dr. Edward Teller, associate director of the E. O. Lawrence Radiation Laboratory at Berkeley, Calif., "for contributions to chemical and nuclear physics, for his leadership in thermonuclear research, and for efforts to strengthen national security."

Year 1963: Dr. J. Robert Oppenheimer, director of the Institute for Advanced Study at Princeton University, "for contributions to theoretical physics as a teacher and originator of ideas, and for leadership of the Los Alamos Laboratory and the Atomic Energy program during critical years."

The award citation for Admiral Rickover is as follows:

"For engineering and administrative leadership in the development of safe and reliable nuclear power and its successful application to our national security and economic needs."

The Enrico Fermi Award, authorized in section 157(b)(3) of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, is international in scope, and may not be granted more often than once annually. Section 157(b)(3) reads in part:

"The Commission may also, upon recommendation of the General Advisory Committee, and with the approval of the President, grant an award for any especially meritorious contribution to the development, use, or control of atomic energy."

In 1964, the Commission reviewed the history of the Fermi Award and decided it would be desirable to extend the award criteria to recognize not only scientific achievement but also contributions to engineering and technical management in the development of atomic energy. The Commission also decided it would be consistent with the intent of the award if the monetary amount were returned to the level of $25,000 as awarded Dr. Fermi in 1954.

---

H. G. RICKOVER: BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH

Vice Adm. H. G. Rickover was born in 1900. After graduating from the U.S. Naval Academy in 1922 he served in various seagoing duties and became a qualified submariner in 1930. He then requested and was assigned to engineering duty in 1937. He studied electrical engineering at the U.S. Naval Postgraduate School and completed the course at Columbia University, New York, N.Y., from which he received the degree of master of science in electrical engineering. During World War II he directed the electrical section of the Bureau of Ships and served briefly with the Manhattan district atom bomb project. After the war, he turned his attention to nuclear ship propulsion.

In 1946, he was assigned to the atomic submarine project, then under the Manhattan district, as assistant director of operations. Since 1947 he has worked in a dual capacity as manager, naval reactors, U.S. Atomic Energy Commission and as assistant chief for nuclear propulsion, Bureau of Ships, Department of the Navy.

Admiral Rickover first achieved national recognition for his leadership in the design, development, construction, and operation of nuclear propulsion systems for submarines and other naval ships. As early as 1946, before the Atomic Energy Commission was established, Admiral Rickover was assigned responsibility for investigating the use of nuclear reactors for this purpose. He assembled a team of naval officers and civilians at Oak Ridge, Tenn., and early in 1948 was made head of the joint AEC-Navy program to develop the first naval propulsion system.

Later, in collaboration with the outstanding scientists and engineers of the Oak Ridge and the Argonne National Laboratories, basic data on the nuclear properties of reactor materials were compiled and conceptual design systems for nuclear propulsion of ships were developed.

Admiral Rickover also brought industry into an active role, and at the Bettis Atomic Power Laboratory near Pittsburgh, Knolls Atomic Power Laboratory near Schenectady, and at the National Reactor Testing Station in Idaho the development of naval nuclear propulsion systems was carried out. A landmark in this effort was the initial operation on March 31, 1953, of the submarine thermal reactor, Mark I, the land-based prototype of the first nuclear submarine propulsion plant.

On June 14, 1952, the keel of the *Nautilus*, the world's first nuclear submarine, was laid by President Truman at Groton, Conn. The event marked the beginning of a revolution in the concepts of naval propulsion. In February 1957, the *Nautilus* completed operation on its first nuclear core, having traveled 62,500 nautical miles in more than 2 years. For the first time a true submarine has become possible. Nuclear submarines such as the *Nautilus* and the *Skate* voyaged under the North Pole icecap, demonstrating that the polar regions were no longer inaccessible to ships. The *Triton* became the first submarine to circumnavigate the world completely submerged, independent of the earth's atmosphere. A graphic demonstration of the scope of Admiral Rickover's efforts and the value of nuclear propulsion to the surface fleet was recently provided when the aircraft carrier *Enterprise*, the guided missile cruiser *Long Beach* and the destroyer *Bainbridge* cruised around the world without refueling. From operating experience at sea, and from land prototypes, the effort to further develop nuclear propulsion has continued with great success.

Comparably important, but not so well known, is his direction and leadership of the Shippingport pressurized water reactor (PWR) project near Pittsburgh, Pa., from which came not only most of the basic technology for submarine and surface ship reactors but also a large part of the reactor technology used in our present day water-cooled and water-moderated nuclear power plants.

The Shippingport project was established in 1953 as an important national goal. It was the first large-scale central station atomic powerplant in the world and has served as the technical foundation for other reactor plants both private and Government owned. This plant has supplied more than 1.7 billion kilowatt-hours of electricity to users in the Pittsburgh area since its initial startup in late 1957 and has clearly demonstrated that nuclear fission can reliably and safely supply electricity to a utility network on a useful scale.

Notwithstanding its success and the production of electricity, the primary goal of the Shippingport project, under Admiral Rickover's direction, was advancement of the basic technology of water reactors. Some of the specific gains in reactor technology resulting from the Shippingport operation are in the fields of fuel and nuclear poison and technology; reactor physics; reactor control; reactor thermal, hydraulic, and mechanical design; basic heat transfer studies; fuel element failure detection systems; refueling procedures; primary coolant water radiochemistry; and disposal of radioactive wastes.

Two of the most important contributions resulting from Admiral Rickover's direction of the Shippingport (PWR) project have been in the fields of reactor physics and reactor fuel technology. The PWR, with its "seed and blanket" design, demonstrated that it is feasible to obtain large amounts of power from a "blanket" of natural uranium surrounding a "seed" of highly enriched uranium which serves as the driving element in a reactor which is cooled and moderated with ordinary water. While producing power the seed-and-blanket design has the additional advantage of making possible the breeding of fissionable material from the very abundant element thorium in the blanket. As a result of Admiral Rickover's achievements in this program, the State of California has submitted a proposal for cooperative construction of a large thorium seed-blanket reactor which the Commission now has under consideration.

In the field of fuel metallurgy the Shippingport PWR project team, led by Admiral Rickover, has been responsible for the development of uranium oxide as a fuel material for large power reactors. Engineering studies of the PWR also produced many design improvements which have extended the life of reactor fuel elements and thus have contributed to the reduction in nuclear power costs. The first PWR core, placed in the reactor in late 1957, operated until February 1964, more than three times its original design life.

For his many achievements, Admiral Rickover has been awarded, among others, the following honors and awards:

Awarded Legion of Merit for performance of duties as head of the Electrical Section, Bureau of Ships, 1946.

Made commander, Order of British Empire, 1946.

Awarded Gold Star in lieu of second Legion of Merit for performance of duty in development of nuclear ship propulsion program, 1952.

Awarded the Christopher Columbus Prize at the Fifth International Meeting of Communications in Genoa, Italy, October 1957.

Awarded Congressional Gold Medal for his accomplishments in successfully directing the development and construction of the world's first nuclear-powered ships and the first large-scale nuclear powerplant devoted exclusively to the production of electricity, 1959.

Presented the Distinguished Service Medal, for exceptionally meritorious service from January 17, 1955, to January 17, 1961, while in charge of the naval nuclear propulsion program in the Department of the Navy and in the U.S. Atomic Energy Commission, January 1961.

Awarded a Gold Star in lieu of the second Distinguished Service Medal, for exceptionally meritorious service from January 1961, to January 1964, as manager, naval reactors, Division of Reactor Development, U.S. Atomic Energy Commission and as Assistant Chief of the Bureau of Ships for Nuclear Propulsion, February 1964.

He has also been awarded numerous degrees by universities.

Admiral Rickover is married to the former Ruth D. Masters and they have one son, Robert. The Rickovers reside at 4801 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

In addition to numerous articles, he has written three books and made two reports to the House Appropriations Committee (issued as separate publications):

"Education and Freedom (1959)," E. P. Dutton Co.

"Swiss Schools and Ours: Why Theirs Are Better (1962)," Little, Brown & Co. (under auspices Council for Basic Education).

"American Education—A National Failure (1963)," E. P. Dutton & Co.

"Report on Russia (1959)," Committee on Appropriations, House of Representatives.

"Education for All Children: What We Can Learn From England (1962)," Committee on Appropriations, House of Representatives.

## Security Measures of the House Strengthened

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. JOE L. EVINS
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Monday, January 18, 1965*

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, we are all concerned about security measures of the House and I am pleased to announce that security measures have been and are being improved and strengthened since the convening of the 89th Congress.

The House personnel and patronage committee, in cooperation with the House leadership, has acted to take every reasonable precaution against repetition of such untoward incidents as occurred in the Chamber of the House on the opening day of the present session.

This problem has been reviewed thoroughly at a conference with Speaker MCCORMACK and, as a result, a decision has been reached to add additional security officers for the House. These men have been recruited on the basis of their experience, training, ability, and demonstrated dependability in police work—without regard to patronage considerations.

Members of this enlarged security force have been stationed at the five entrances of the Chamber of the House of Representatives.

They are there to assist and reinforce the watch maintained by the doormen of the House, who are on duty at all times.

In addition, as you know, our Capitol Police and doormen are supported by a detail of uniformed Metropolitan Police and plainclothesmen.

We believe that proper and effective steps have been taken to protect the House against invasions by troublemakers or disturbances on the floor and in the gallery.

I was present on the floor of the House on March 1, 1954, and a witness of the violent attack staged by a band of Puerto Rican nationalists. The lesson of that experience is lasting.

I fully share the conviction of my colleagues that maximum security can and must be provided for the orderly and safe transaction of the business of this House without isolating this body from the American citizens who desire to come here and observe the proceedings of their Representatives.

## How Chicago District Changed From Republican to Democratic Stronghold

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. BARRATT O'HARA
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Monday, January 18, 1965*

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, few, if any, of the States of the Union are more equitably divided into congressional districts than is Illinois. There are 24 congressional districts in Illinois, and the population of each of 12 districts, according to the 1960 census, was between 350,000 and 400,000.

How closely population compares in districts both in Chicago and downstate is shown by the census figures from the downstate 21st District, represented by Congressman GRAY, with a population of 363,196, a bare 2,300 under the 365,525 population of the Chicago-based 2d District, which I have the honor to represent, and about 10,600 over the population of the downstate 22d District, represented by Congressman SPRINGER, and 24,000 over the population of the downstate 17th District, which is represented by the distinguished, and I might add the ageless and fadeless minority whip, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ARENDS].

Four only of the Illinois districts have populations exceeding 500,000—the 10th District, represented by Congressman COLLIER topping the list with 552,582.

#### CHICAGO A DEMOCRATIC STRONGHOLD

Chicago is strongly a Democratic city because the regular Democratic organization, headed by Mayor Richard J. Daley, functions on the principle that good and honest, efficient, and courteous service to the people is good politics. In the Second District, which I have represented in the administrations of four Presidents of the United States, and to the electors of which I am forever indebted and deeply and humbly grateful, are the University of Chicago, the Headquarters of the 5th U.S. Army, the great Museum of Science, Art, and Industry, the steel mills, and I have been told more churches and synagogues than any similar area in the world. Every ethnic segment of the American population is well and numerously represented in the Second District.

I know of no district in the United States that offers a more exciting and rewarding challenge to the student of American politics and the tides and trends that determine the fate of parties and the course of the Nation.

#### DISTRICT ONCE A GOP STRONGHOLD

In my young manhood the Second District of Illinois was one of the strongest Republican districts in the Nation, and in some elections topped them all in the size of its Republican majority. It is true that the district has been changed several times since then, but Hyde Park and most of Kenwood always have been in the Second District; and in the old days, Hyde Park and Kenwood were so Republican that it was hard to spot a Democrat. I think there were only two other Democrats in the precinct where I voted when I was Lieutenant Governor of Illinois and living on Everett Avenue in Hyde Park, near the present home of Democratic Ward Committeeman Korshak.

Hyde Park is in the present fifth ward; Kenwood is largely in the 28 precincts in the fourth ward that remain in the Second Congressional District. In 1964, the fifth ward voted 24,806 to 4,231 to retain a Democratic Congressman and the 28 Kenwood precincts in the fourth ward voted 10,972 to 1,546. Fifty years ago it might have been the other way around.

Here are the official figures of the 28 precincts in the fourth ward, the alderman and ward committeeman of which is the Honorable Claude W. B. Holman:

| | Precinct | Barratt O'Hara | William F. Scannell |
|---|---|---|---|
| Ward 4 | 16 | 400 | 15 |
| | 17 | 651 | 15 |
| | 20 | 414 | 7 |
| | 21 | 223 | 12 |
| | 22 | 306 | 32 |
| | 24 | 450 | 20 |
| | 25 | 496 | 10 |
| | 26 | 390 | 14 |
| | 29 | 244 | 196 |
| | 30 | 252 | 114 |
| | 31 | 424 | 85 |
| | 32 | 412 | 56 |
| | 33 | 330 | 73 |
| | 34 | 483 | 45 |
| | 35 | 442 | 34 |
| | 36 | 365 | 34 |
| | 37 | 345 | 16 |
| | 38 | 371 | 30 |
| | 39 | 400 | 42 |
| | 40 | 466 | 31 |
| | 43 | 342 | 41 |
| | 44 | 366 | 109 |
| | 48 | 307 | 120 |
| | 53 | 323 | 101 |
| | 55 | 288 | 2 |
| | 56 | 430 | 13 |
| | 59 | 503 | 15 |
| | 63 | 549 | 264 |
| Total | | 10,972 | 1,546 |

Please note that in the 55th precinct the vote was 288 to 2, which I would call almost a perfect score. How the two dissenters got away from that Democratic precinct captain, I have no explanation. Please note, too, that in the 20th precinct, with 414 voting the way that brought gladness to my heart, only 7 voted the other way. And 496 to 10 in the 25th precinct, 503 to 15 in the 59th precinct, 651 to 15 in the 17th precinct, 430 to 13 in the 56th precinct, and on and on and on in the march of democracy under Committeeman Holman and his 4th ward stalwarts.

The best Republican precincts were the 29th and 63d. The former gave me 244 votes and my Republican opponent 196. The latter gave me 549, my opponent 264.

#### FIFTH-WARD RETURNS

Committeeman of the fifth ward is Hon. Marshall Korshak, former State senator with an outstanding record,

present trustee of the santitary district and a topflight member of the Chicago bar. Here are the 1964 returns by precincts in the congressional election:

| | Precinct | Barratt O'Hara | William F. Scannell |
|---|---|---|---|
| Ward 5 | 1 | 362 | 10 |
| | 2 | 286 | 167 |
| | 3 | 469 | 30 |
| | 4 | 482 | 25 |
| | 5 | 424 | 15 |
| | 6 | 472 | 33 |
| | 7 | 407 | 51 |
| | 8 | 371 | 125 |
| | 9 | 418 | 121 |
| | 10 | 266 | 183 |
| | 11 | 319 | 144 |
| | 12 | 340 | 124 |
| | 13 | 228 | 101 |
| | 14 | 340 | 181 |
| | 15 | 359 | 138 |
| | 16 | 266 | 79 |
| | 17 | 348 | 53 |
| | 18 | 468 | 18 |
| | 19 | 361 | 12 |
| | 20 | 364 | 89 |
| | 21 | 360 | 14 |
| | 22 | 404 | 53 |
| | 23 | 541 | 22 |
| | 24 | 348 | 158 |
| | 25 | 283 | 35 |
| | 26 | 372 | 78 |
| | 27 | 365 | 102 |
| | 28 | 375 | 16 |
| | 29 | 296 | 10 |
| | 30 | 413 | 137 |
| | 31 | 405 | 16 |
| | 32 | 333 | 25 |
| | 33 | 376 | 115 |
| | 34 | 512 | 24 |
| | 35 | 183 | 125 |
| | 36 | 568 | 21 |
| | 37 | 302 | 131 |
| | 38 | 312 | 157 |
| | 39 | 121 | 235 |
| | 40 | 233 | 113 |
| | 41 | 255 | 117 |
| | 42 | 375 | 110 |
| | 43 | 318 | 136 |
| | 44 | 497 | 17 |
| | 45 | 530 | 52 |
| | 46 | 394 | 9 |
| | 47 | 360 | 66 |
| | 48 | 417 | 28 |
| | 49 | 427 | 16 |
| | 50 | 441 | 14 |
| | 51 | 416 | 42 |
| | 52 | 390 | 55 |
| | 53 | 425 | 16 |
| | 54 | 527 | 21 |
| | 55 | 543 | 25 |
| | 56 | 484 | 10 |
| | 57 | 531 | 17 |
| | 58 | 497 | 13 |
| | 59 | 349 | 104 |
| | 60 | 473 | 10 |
| | 61 | 456 | 15 |
| | 62 | 420 | 14 |
| | 63 | 342 | 29 |
| | 64 | 487 | 9 |
| Total | | 24,806 | 4,231 |

Please note, as I have with pride and appreciation, that 487 to 9 in the 64th precinct, that 484 to 10 in the 56th precinct, that 362 to 10 in the 1st precinct, 424 to 15 in the 5th precinct, 441 to 14 in the 50th precinct, 568 to 21 in the 36th precinct, and on and on and on in the march of democracy under Committeeman Korshak and the precinct stalwarts of the 5th ward.

There are 64 precincts in the 5th ward. One of the 64, the 39th precinct, went for my Republican opponent by a vote of 121 to 235. The next best Republican precinct was the 10th precinct, in which the Republican nominee received 183 to my 266.

SEVENTH-WARD RETURNS

Democratic committeeman of the seventh ward is the Honorable James A. Ronan, Democratic State chairman, member of Governor Kerner's cabinet, and one of the Democratic leaders in Illinois. This has been the ward of my residence for close to half a century. When I started running for Congress, the seventh ward was concededly Republican territory, but more and more came over to the Democratic side, the Democratic vote in 1964 setting the Democratic high water mark. Here are the returns by precincts in the 1964 congressional election:

| | Precinct | Barratt O'Hara | William F. Scannell |
|---|---|---|---|
| Ward 7 | 1 | 462 | 28 |
| | 2 | 420 | 18 |
| | 3 | 529 | 33 |
| | 4 | 276 | 81 |
| | 5 | 231 | 131 |
| | 6 | 225 | 157 |
| | 7 | 305 | 114 |
| | 8 | 401 | 56 |
| | 9 | 397 | 96 |
| | 10 | 263 | 120 |
| | 11 | 246 | 133 |
| | 12 | 229 | 222 |
| | 13 | 264 | 284 |
| | 14 | 177 | 151 |
| | 15 | 157 | 154 |
| | 16 | 237 | 166 |
| | 17 | 340 | 159 |
| | 18 | 341 | 106 |
| | 19 | 210 | 194 |
| | 20 | 206 | 161 |
| | 21 | 401 | 78 |
| | 22 | 483 | 33 |
| | 23 | 180 | 190 |
| | 24 | 139 | 175 |
| | 25 | 479 | 110 |
| | 26 | 380 | 97 |
| | 27 | 250 | 112 |
| | 28 | 359 | 141 |
| | 29 | 248 | 164 |
| | 30 | 233 | 159 |
| | 31 | 274 | 261 |
| | 32 | 276 | 119 |
| | 33 | 187 | 365 |
| | 34 | 226 | 233 |
| | 35 | 211 | 277 |
| | 36 | 176 | 191 |
| | 37 | 226 | 232 |
| | 38 | 296 | 201 |
| | 39 | 204 | 185 |
| | 40 | 298 | 172 |
| | 41 | 255 | 154 |
| | 42 | 263 | 173 |
| | 43 | 418 | 116 |
| | 44 | 260 | 222 |
| | 45 | 296 | 113 |
| | 46 | 212 | 157 |
| | 47 | 315 | 188 |
| | 48 | 256 | 143 |
| | 49 | 202 | 181 |
| | 50 | 183 | 189 |
| | 51 | 312 | 180 |
| | 52 | 172 | 192 |
| | 53 | 274 | 235 |
| | 54 | 246 | 295 |
| | 55 | 258 | 243 |
| | 56 | 218 | 337 |
| | 57 | 153 | 204 |
| | 58 | 140 | 176 |
| | 59 | 163 | 198 |
| | 60 | 365 | 155 |
| | 61 | 310 | 123 |
| | 62 | 298 | 123 |
| | 63 | 243 | 108 |
| | 64 | 244 | 170 |
| | 65 | 339 | 88 |
| | 66 | 207 | 206 |
| | 67 | 351 | 151 |
| | 68 | 225 | 119 |
| | 69 | 191 | 209 |
| | 70 | 368 | 133 |
| | 71 | 213 | 274 |
| | 72 | 272 | 157 |
| | 73 | 185 | 127 |
| | 74 | 342 | 143 |
| | 75 | 248 | 180 |
| | 76 | 305 | 209 |
| | 77 | 297 | 140 |
| | 78 | 299 | 89 |
| | 79 | 288 | 93 |
| | 80 | 204 | 125 |
| | 81 | 226 | 207 |
| | 82 | 269 | 167 |
| | 83 | 306 | 87 |
| | 84 | 276 | 313 |
| | 85 | 190 | 213 |
| | 86 | 263 | 187 |
| | 87 | 295 | 321 |
| | 88 | 175 | 218 |
| | 89 | 161 | 215 |
| | 90 | 352 | 85 |
| | 91 | 257 | 145 |
| | 92 | 482 | 89 |
| | 93 | 382 | 27 |
| Total | | 25,466 | 15,151 |

Please note with me the 420 to 18 in the 2d precinct, the 462 to 28 in the 1st precinct, the 529 to 33 in the 3d precinct, the 392 to 27 in the 93d precinct, and on and on and on in the march of democracy under Committeeman Ronan and the precinct stalwarts of the 7th ward.

Best Republican precinct was the home precinct of the Republican nominee, the 33d, which gave him 365 votes to my 187. There are 93 precincts in the fifth ward. They divided 73 Democratic, 20 Republican.

EIGHTH-WARD RETURNS

Until the last reapportionment, all the eighth ward was in the Second Congressional District and when I was first elected to the Congress, it was the strongest Republican ward of the district. Later, it became Democratic. The 31 precincts that remained in the Second District after the 1960 reapportionment, however, were inclined to go Republican. In 1962, I carried them by about 25 votes, 1 of 2 Democratic nominees who cleared the hurdle. In 1964, I was thankful to carry 24 of the precincts and to come close in the remaining 7. Here are the official figures:

| | Precinct | Barratt O'Hara | William F. Scannell |
|---|---|---|---|
| Ward 8 | 2 | 207 | 144 |
| | 3 | 178 | 247 |
| | 4 | 187 | 165 |
| | 7 | 236 | 226 |
| | 13 | 198 | 173 |
| | 14 | 183 | 242 |
| | 19 | 152 | 240 |
| | 20 | 342 | 112 |
| | 21 | 276 | 207 |
| | 22 | 362 | 103 |
| | 23 | 249 | 233 |
| | 24 | 220 | 175 |
| | 25 | 186 | 139 |
| | 26 | 326 | 140 |
| | 27 | 369 | 89 |
| | 30 | 223 | 243 |
| | 33 | 201 | 155 |
| | 46 | 302 | 254 |
| | 48 | 141 | 180 |
| | 49 | 233 | 266 |
| | 50 | 301 | 212 |
| | 51 | 258 | 278 |
| | 57 | 285 | 160 |
| | 67 | 207 | 265 |
| | 68 | 202 | 143 |
| | 70 | 261 | 191 |
| | 72 | 236 | 194 |
| | 73 | 252 | 206 |
| | 77 | 256 | 226 |
| | 85 | 179 | 296 |
| | 88 | 217 | 155 |
| Total | | 7,425 | 6,059 |

Please note the 369 to 89 in the 27th precinct, the 362 to 103 in the 22d precinct, the 342 to 112 in the 20th precinct. Best Republican precinct was the 85th, which gave my opponent 296 to my 179.

Russell O'Brien is the Democratic committeeman of the eighth ward, one of my longtime friends, as is his predecessor, James Sullivan, who as one of the then governing group sponsored my congressional candidacy in 1948 and earlier, in 1912, had rung doorbells for me as a candidate for Lieutenant Governor.

Hon. James Condon, former associate of mine in the office of the corporation counsel of Chicago, is the alderman of the eighth ward. Russell DeBow, formerly associated with me in the representation of the Second District, and now on the staff of Mayor Daley, is an important member of the eighth-ward team.

NINTH-WARD RETURNS

Ward committeeman of the ninth ward is the Honorable Leslie V. Beck, clerk of the appellate court. He is one of my oldest and dearest friends. Alderman of the ward is the Honorable Dominic J. Lupo, who has established an enduring record by his hard work and his willingness to give a tireless and helping hand on all worthy occasions. The Honorable Michael Hinko, onetime Democratic nominee for Congress and presently my personal representative, is a resident of the ninth ward.

Here are the returns by precincts from the ninth ward:

| | Precinct | Barratt O'Hara | William F. Scannell |
|---|---|---|---|
| Ward 9 | 1 | 273 | 116 |
| | 2 | 173 | 254 |
| | 3 | 212 | 278 |
| | 4 | 189 | 217 |
| | 5 | 233 | 95 |
| | 6 | 268 | 153 |
| | 7 | 234 | 96 |
| | 8 | 295 | 168 |
| | 9 | 123 | 302 |
| | 10 | 259 | 139 |
| | 11 | 277 | 190 |
| | 12 | 162 | 297 |
| | 13 | 194 | 262 |
| | 14 | 216 | 238 |
| | 15 | 244 | 221 |
| | 16 | 286 | 153 |
| | 17 | 199 | 238 |
| | 18 | 194 | 268 |
| | 19 | 255 | 200 |
| | 20 | 179 | 272 |
| | 21 | 290 | 214 |
| | 22 | 251 | 207 |
| | 23 | 222 | 186 |
| | 24 | 463 | 15 |
| | 25 | 269 | 151 |
| | 26 | 169 | 179 |
| | 27 | 345 | 7 |
| | 28 | 406 | 11 |
| | 29 | 179 | 183 |
| | 30 | 251 | 218 |
| | 31 | 200 | 118 |
| | 32 | 217 | 261 |
| | 33 | 350 | 10 |
| | 34 | 187 | 176 |
| | 35 | 171 | 230 |
| | 36 | 205 | 219 |
| | 37 | 291 | 138 |
| | 38 | 222 | 204 |
| | 39 | 180 | 250 |
| | 40 | 196 | 219 |
| | 41 | 235 | 225 |
| | 42 | 493 | 12 |
| | 43 | 220 | 289 |
| | 44 | 234 | 198 |
| | 45 | 210 | 173 |
| | 46 | 193 | 169 |
| | 47 | 275 | 170 |
| | 48 | 250 | 120 |
| | 49 | 258 | 130 |
| | 50 | 331 | 63 |
| | 51 | 329 | 9 |
| | 52 | 210 | 261 |
| | 53 | 214 | 217 |
| | 54 | 208 | 218 |
| | 55 | 288 | 166 |
| | 56 | 238 | 172 |
| | 57 | 249 | 135 |
| | 58 | 174 | 188 |
| | 59 | 260 | 305 |
| | 60 | 218 | 290 |
| | 61 | 262 | 189 |
| | 62 | 225 | 261 |
| | 63 | 267 | 291 |
| | 64 | 183 | 287 |
| | 65 | 293 | 150 |
| | 66 | 262 | 192 |
| | 67 | 231 | 182 |
| | 68 | 177 | 200 |
| | 69 | 260 | 228 |
| | 70 | 351 | 94 |
| | 71 | 243 | 218 |
| | 72 | 227 | 159 |
| | 73 | 170 | 263 |
| | 74 | 279 | 165 |
| | 75 | 141 | 240 |
| Total | | 18,187 | 13,982 |

Please note, as certainly have I, the 463 to 15 in the 24th precinct, the 345 to 7 in the 27th precinct, the 406 to 11 in the 28th precinct, the 350 to 10 in the 33d precinct, the 493 to 12 in the 42d precinct, the 329 to 9 in the 51st precinct, and on and on and on in the march of democracy under Committeeman Beck and the precinct stalwarts of the 9th ward.

TENTH-WARD RETURNS

Stanley Zima is the new ward committeeman of the 10th ward, succeeding the late Emil Pacini. It is no exaggeration to say that no party leader ever made a better showing in his first major campaign. He mapped and sparked the campaign that carried the 10th ward by a close to 2-to-1 majority. There are 70 precincts in the 10th ward and all but 6 went Democratic. Here are the figures of the congressional election by precincts:

| | Precinct | Barratt O'Hara | William F. Scannell |
|---|---|---|---|
| Ward 10 | 1 | 369 | 183 |
| | 2 | 224 | 124 |
| | 3 | 280 | 103 |
| | 4 | 307 | 206 |
| | 5 | 254 | 144 |
| | 6 | 228 | 118 |
| | 7 | 237 | 186 |
| | 8 | 283 | 89 |
| | 9 | 314 | 185 |
| | 10 | 315 | 203 |
| | 11 | 400 | 166 |
| | 12 | 293 | 258 |
| | 13 | 339 | 212 |
| | 14 | 350 | 180 |
| | 15 | 295 | 159 |
| | 16 | 291 | 81 |
| | 17 | 275 | 68 |
| | 18 | 309 | 92 |
| | 19 | 286 | 219 |
| | 20 | 432 | 31 |
| | 21 | 334 | 170 |
| | 22 | 261 | 70 |
| | 23 | 246 | 106 |
| | 24 | 241 | 118 |
| | 25 | 327 | 148 |
| | 26 | 297 | 160 |
| | 27 | 282 | 147 |
| | 28 | 373 | 165 |
| | 29 | 287 | 211 |
| | 30 | 248 | 104 |
| | 31 | 414 | 139 |
| | 32 | 161 | 215 |
| | 33 | 183 | 180 |
| | 34 | 251 | 224 |
| | 35 | 202 | 201 |
| | 36 | 180 | 279 |
| | 37 | 238 | 219 |
| | 38 | 226 | 267 |
| | 39 | 300 | 195 |
| | 40 | 370 | 101 |
| | 41 | 283 | 201 |
| | 42 | 296 | 218 |
| | 43 | 433 | 28 |
| | 44 | 242 | 65 |
| | 45 | 304 | 130 |
| | 46 | 225 | 117 |
| | 47 | 236 | 84 |
| | 48 | 329 | 142 |
| | 49 | 341 | 184 |
| | 50 | 181 | 161 |
| | 51 | 307 | 172 |
| | 52 | 314 | 144 |
| | 53 | 369 | 9 |
| | 54 | 378 | 170 |
| | 55 | 337 | 184 |
| | 56 | 301 | 131 |
| | 57 | 236 | 293 |
| | 58 | 234 | 201 |
| | 59 | 455 | 168 |
| | 60 | 356 | 161 |
| | 61 | 459 | 158 |
| | 62 | 398 | 140 |
| | 63 | 238 | 320 |
| | 64 | 366 | 121 |
| | 65 | 312 | 255 |
| | 66 | 268 | 281 |
| | 67 | 206 | 52 |
| | 68 | 345 | 188 |
| | 69 | 373 | 267 |
| | 70 | 315 | 276 |
| Total | | 20,939 | 11,447 |

Please note the 369 to 9 in the 53d precinct, the 433 to 28 in the 43d precinct, the 432 to 31 in the 20th precinct, and on and on and on in the march of democracy under Committeeman Zima and the precinct stalwarts of the 10th ward, not forgetting the great and invincible State legislative team of Daniel Dougherty, Nick Svalina, and Henry Leonard, and the steelworkers who have never been found wanting. My deepest thanks again to them, one and all, and to Joe LaMotte and Al Towers, who worked day and night with tireless dedication, and all the others this expression of a gratitude that will never fade.

TIDES AND TRENDS IN POLITICS

Mr. Speaker, in our high schools and colleges there is a healthy growth in political interest. The civic studies in our high schools and the courses in political science in our colleges have an ever-widening appeal to our youth. What makes our democracy click? What are the forces that bring changes to the status quo, how are they aroused, and concentrated into voter action? What is the how, when, and where of politics? I sincerely hope that the story of the Second District in Illinois, a district that in the span of my lifetime has changed from a Republican to a Democratic stronghold will make some contribution to better understanding of American politics and the tides and trends that determine the fate of parties and the course of the ship of state.

## Ukrainian Americans Contribute to the American Way of Life

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, January 18, 1965*

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, for 2 short years, from 1918 to 1920, the Ukrainian people had independence.

Since that time they have been swallowed up as part of the Soviet Union. Americans who have long held high the principle of self-determination of peoples pay special tribute to these wonderful people of Eastern Europe during this month, the 47th anniversary of the proclamation of the Ukrainian National Republic.

All of us here in Congress are well aware of the great contribution to American life made by the Ukrainian American immigrants, be they from the 19th century or among the 60,000 Ukrainian displaced persons who came to our shores and became a part of our national life after World War II. One of the best statements I have read about Americans of Ukrainian background was written by Joseph L. Dichten in "One America," edited by Brown & Roucek. I have unanimous consent to place part of that statement in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, at this point:

CONTRIBUTIONS TO AMERICAN LIFE

The Ukrainian American immigrant has done more than his share in the building of the Nation. He has worked in great numbers in factories and farms, railroads and mines, and his unremitting labors have helped to strengthen the vast and crucially important industrial power of the United States. He has strongly identified himself

with the cause of organized labor, and has zealously participated in the founding and growth of the American labor movement. The Ukrainian immigrant brought with him from the old country a love of his own home and his own piece of land; thus, the Ukrainian American family unit has always been a sturdy, stable entity.

Many areas of American culture have profited from the contributions of the Ukrainian immigrant. His music, songs, and folk dances have greatly influenced American composers and choreographers. George Gershwin used an old Ukrainian theme as a base for his "Don't Forget Me" from the operetta "Song of the Flame." The Ukrainian National and the United Ukrainian Folk choruses, composed mainly of young Ukrainian Americans born in the United States, have been acclaimed by critics as among the best ever heard in the United States. One reviewer described the Ukrainian National Chorus as "a human organ, an instrument of incomparable precision and incomparable expressiveness. It can rustle like leaves in the forest; it can be lyrical as a lark at dawn; it can be sonorous as thunder over mountains." These choral groups were created by Prof. Alexander Koshetz, a Ukrainian immigrant who lived in New York until his death in 1944. Professor Koshetz left behind him several notable compositions and arrangements of Ukrainian songs for American choruses.

Ukrainian dances are often considered among the most vivid and colorful of all folk dances by virtue of charm and expressiveness, and many of their basic steps have found their way into the American dance. The world-renowned sculptor, Alexander Archipenko, has made his contribution to modern American art. His sculptures, created in New York and California, can be found in many American museums. Movie stars John Hodiak and Anna Sten are of Ukrainian descent. Volodymyr Timoshenko, a recognized authority on the economy of the Ukraine and Russia, was a professor at Stanford University in California.

Many other individual contributions to American life by Ukrainians can be cited. Ukrainian American scientists, composers, singers, cartoonists, and athletes have gained positions of prominence and have contributed to the mainstream of American culture.

However, the greatest contribution to American life has been made by the Ukrainian group as a whole—by the hundreds and thousands of Ukrainian immigrants and their families. The Ukrainian churches, organizations, and press have become integral parts of the American culture, and are concrete examples of the best that can be attained through the realization of the concept of "cultural pluralism."

With best wishes.

Sincerely,

DONALD M. FRASER.

## The House Small Business Committee Reports to the Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

## HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, January 18, 1965*

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, the hearings, studies, and reports of the House Small Business Committee during the 88th Congress are summarized in the current issue of my weekly newsletter, Capitol Comments.

The reports contain many recommendations directed to the attention of the 89th Congress, in consonance with the declared policy of the Congress that our Federal Government should protect and promote the interests of American small business.

The newsletter summarizing the activities and recommendations of the House Select Committee on Small Business during the 88th Congress, on which I had the honor of serving as chairman, is included in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD under unanimous consent.

The newsletter article follows:

HOUSE SMALL BUSINESS COMMITTEE CALLS FOR ACTION ON WIDE RANGE OF PROBLEMS

Approximately 80 specific recommendations for actions dealing constructively with major problems of American small business are set forth in the House Small Business Committee's final report on its work during the 88th Congress.

The House Small Business Committee, on which your Representative serves as chairman, summarized in this report the comprehensive studies and investigations of the full committee and its subcommittees during the last Congress. This report (H. Rept. No. 1944) has been made public and is available in printed form upon request, along with five other new reports of the committee.

The other reports, which discuss in detail some of the matters summarized in the final report, include:

Small Business Administration, its organization and operation: Seventeen recommended steps to make this important Federal agency more helpful and effective are outlined in House Report No. 1935. Included is the recommendation that Congress promptly consider supplementary appropriations to the revolving fund in order that the SBA's financial assistance program not be curtailed.

The SBA has a revolving fund of $1.6 billion through which more than $2.5 billion in loans has been made available to small business firms since this program was established in 1953 by Congress. There are today more than 4.6 million small businesses in the United States representing better than 90 percent of American business.

Small business investment program: House Report No. 1934 makes numerous recommendations designed to strengthen this financial assistance program, under which privately owned, organized, and operated investment corporations make equity capital and long-term loans available to small business firms. More than 10,000 concerns have received over one-half billion dollars in such assistance since this program was established by Congress.

Dual distribution: House Report No. 1943 covers testimony received from small businessmen in 46 industries concerning the impact upon small business of dual distribution and vertical integration. This is one of the most comprehensive studies ever made of small business distributional problems.

Government procurement: House Report No. 1937 outlines 15 administrative actions which should be taken by various Government departments and agencies to insure that small business obtains a fair share of the Federal Government's procurement dollars.

Lumber standards: House Report No. 1936 is based on the subcommittee hearings that were held in response to complaints of small businessmen in the U.S. softwood lumber industry that new size standards would have harmful effects on their business. The subcommittee recommended that the Department of Commerce reconstitute the American Lumber Standards Committee so as to provide broader representation on this advisory panel.

Our committee's final report includes chapters on each of the subjects covered in the five separate reports, together with informative chapters on taxation, tax-exempt foundations, small business problems in urban areas, the economy and small business, corporate mergers, and the monopoly problem.

A chapter on small business and foreign trade, based on extensive hearings conducted in 1963, is another of the significant sections of our committee's final report. A chapter is devoted also to the Federal Trade Commission's advisory opinion on joint ads. This relates to our committee's work which resulted in the reversal of an adverse FTC decision on joint advertising by retailers—a reversal beneficial to druggists, hardwaremen, merchants, and other small business retailers.

In sum, the committee's reports for the 88th Congress make available a vast store of vital information to all who are concerned with the problems and the welfare of American small business. Copies of each of these reports are available without charge upon request to your Congressman or the House Small Business Committee, Washington 25, D.C.

## Washington Observance of 10th Anniversary of U.S. Nuclear Navy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

## HON. WILLIAM H. BATES

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, January 18, 1965*

Mr. BATES. Mr. Speaker, 10 years ago this past Sunday, January 17, these words signaled the successful launching of nuclear seapower by the U.S. Navy: "Underway on nuclear power."

In recognition of this important anniversary of the U.S. nuclear Navy, when the now Rear Adm. Eugene P. Wilkinson sent that message from the submarine *Nautilus,* ceremonies are taking place in various parts of the country. As a member of both the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy and the House Armed Services Committee, I was privileged to attend the principal public event in Washington last Wednesday night, under the sponsorship of Naval Reserve Public Relations Company 5–4 at the Hotel Willard.

Today, the U.S. Navy is the world's largest operator of nuclear reactors, and the uses to which these phenomenal powerplants are being put, and will be in the future, were extremely well recorded at the Washington salute to the 10th anniversary of the nuclear Navy.

The addresses were delivered by Admiral Wilkinson, first skipper of the *Nautilus;* newly seated Congressman WILLIAM R. ANDERSON of Tennessee, who was commanding officer of the *Nautilus* on her historic voyage under the North Pole, and Rear Adm. Bernard M. Strean, commander of the famed Nuclear Task Force 1 which recently completed Operation Sea Orbit by circumnavigating the world.

A similar message was delivered by Admiral Wilkinson in Boston today at a

10th anniversary luncheon cosponsored by the 1st Naval District and the Associated Industries of Massachusetts, which also is observing its 50th year of service to my home State. This is doubly appropriate in view of the fact that two of Admiral Stream's nuclear task force ships, the cruiser *Long Beach* and frigate *Bainbridge*, were built and commissioned in Massachusetts.

Mr. Speaker, our maritime nation has been underway on nuclear power for 10 years. The cause of freedom and security in the world demands that we continue on course into the future—at flank speed. It is with pleasure, therefore, that I join at this time with my colleagues, the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD] and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PRICE], in recognizing this great anniversary in our nuclear history. In that connection, I desire to enter into the RECORD at this point the informative Washington dinner messages of the three aforementioned distinguished pioneers of our nuclear Navy—with which it has also been my privilege to be closely affiliated since its inception, along with the stalwart father of nuclear seapower, Vice Adm. Hyman G. Rickover.

SIGNIFICANCE OF "UNDERWAY ON NUCLEAR POWER"

(Remarks of Rear Adm. Eugene P. Wilkinson, U.S. Navy, at the 10th anniversary of the nuclear Navy dinner, Willard Hotel, Washington, D.C., January 13, 1965)

Tonight we are saluting the 10th anniversary of the nuclear Navy, with zero time being 1100 hours, January 17, 1955, when Q.M.1c. Rayl, *Nautilus* quartermaster, sent a signal by flashing light to the U.S.S. *Sunbird* for further relay to commander submarine force, Atlantic Fleet—"underway on nuclear power."

Actually, 1100, January 17, 1955, wasn't the beginning at all. Just the opposite. That instant of time when *Nautilus* took in her No. 1 line and backed into the stream at Groton, Conn., marked the end of a job. A long, hard job that started with then Capt. H. G. Rickover and a select group of engineering duty officers at Oak Ridge National Laboratory in 1946. A job that, before it was through, involved a cross section of America, including Congress, the Atomic Energy Commission, the Navy, national laboratories, Federal bureaus, various colleges and universities, and a great segment of American industry. A job that included conception, controversy, congressional support, design, development, superior technical management, significant technological breakthroughs, construction, and test. A pioneering program that saw many frustrations and setbacks, redesign and retest, years of never-ending pressure, dedication, persistence, and at last consummation—*Nautilus* was ready to go to sea.

The dramatic end of this phase occurred only 17 days off a schedule made more than 6 years before; in 1948. A remarkable accomplishment for such a revolutionary development—and what a success. The ship worked perfectly from the first day. And then continued to do so, time after time, and every time thereafter.

The objective of the naval nuclear propulsion program is the design, development, production, and operation of nuclear propulsion plants having high reliability, maximum simplicity, and maximum fuel life for installation in ships ranging from small submarines to large combatant surface ships. This objective is being achieved. The tangible evidence of this is 92 nuclear-powered submarines and 4 nuclear-powered surface ships authorized to date. When completed this will be roughly 11 percent of our entire fleet numerically and about the same percent of the total tonnage. We should expect to see a similar, if not a greater, percentage increase in the next decade. The objective back in 1955 was simpler—just to get that one ship to sea. An inanimate mass of steel one day, the next a living ship that, those of us who were in her, will love all our lives.

Of the 96 nuclear ships authorized through fiscal year 1965, the surface ships: *Enterprise, Long Beach*, and *Bainbridge*—22 attack submarines, and 29 Polaris submarines have assumed their duties in the fleet. Others are operational, soon to report. In the more than 4½ million miles these ships have steamed, their accomplishments are legend. The Arctic explorations of Captain Anderson in *Nautilus*, followed by those of *Skate, Sargo*, and *Seadragon;* the submerged endurance runs of *Seawolf* and *Patrick Henry;* the speed and maneuverability of *Skipjack;* the first test firings of Polaris by *George Washington*; the increasing strength of the ever vigilant Polaris submarines on deterrent patrol; circumnavigation of the globe; first, submerged, by *Triton*, then, by Admiral Strean's Nuclear Task Force 1 in Operation Sea Orbit—all these exploits add in increasing tempo to naval history.

*Nautilus'* sailing marked the beginning of a new era in naval history—the age of nuclear naval power. The significance looms ever larger as our visions become realities in submersibles and ships with virtually unlimited range, endurance, and speed—making them some of the deadliest military weapons systems ever devised. The revolution in our Navy started by nuclear power has come a long way in the first 10 years, with greater possibilities ahead.

All of the combatant submarines being built or authorized will be nuclear powered. The advantages of nuclear propulsion are being carefully examined for their application to some of our future surface combatant ships. The Secretary of Defense has announced that a nuclear-powered aircraft carrier, using only two reactors instead of eight, is now practicable. This will stimulate further studies of the economics of surface ship nuclear propulsion. As reactor technology continues to advance, we in the Navy look to a future in which many of the new major combatant ships will be nuclear powered and these nuclear-powered ships will help keep our Navy modern and strong so that it can continue to fulfill its traditional role of assuring the freedom of the seas effectively.

---

NUCLEAR NAVY—ONE OF NATION'S GREATEST ASSETS

(Remarks by Congressman WILLIAM R. ANDERSON at the dinner celebrating the 10th anniversary of the nuclear Navy, Willard Hotel, Washington, D.C., January 13, 1965)

I am very glad to be here and I appreciate the forbearance of all of you who must realize that I am a bit late to be a qualified Navy spokesman and considerably early to be a congressional expert.

My problem doesn't stop here. Despite all my efforts to acquire the image of lawmaker and statesman, I find I'm still more closely identified with the North Pole than with Capitol Hill. I assure you, it is twice as hard and much more dangerous to reach Congress.

I want to express my warm appreciation to the Washington Naval Reserve Public Relations Company for conceiving and arranging this event. Having spent my last 3 years of Navy duty here in Washington, I am well aware of your versatility, your fine traditions, and the great contributions your unit has made toward a more effective and better understood Navy.

The last 10 years of our nuclear Navy have been eventful and bright with performance and potential. It is certain that the next 10 years can be years of progress, achievement, and consolidation.

The joint Navy-Atomic Energy Commission program has always been blessed with champions to serve the cause of nuclear propulsion.

Its number one champion originally stood almost alone. Tomorrow, that man, small in physical stature but gigantic in the breadth and depth of his character, intellect, and devotion, will leave his austere office to go to the White House to receive the Enrico Fermi Award from President Lyndon B. Johnson.

The Navy and the Nation are indeed fortunate that Adm. H. G. Rickover is willing to continue in his demanding assignment in the second decade of nuclear power.

There are also many champions of the nuclear Navy on both sides of Capitol Hill. I do not intend to diminish the credit due the Navy, but history will record that Congress, particularly during the early days, gave nuclear propulsion better attention, better service, and greater push than did the Navy itself.

We are most forunate that two Capitol Hill champions of nuclear power have now moved to powerful positions. I refer to Congressman MENDEL RIVERS, chairman of the House Armed Services Committee, and Congressman CHET HOLIFIELD, chairman of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy. The outlook for the next 10 years is brighter because of the judgment, vision, and leadership of these statesmen.

With the support and leadership of men of this type, the Navy now stands on the threshold of a historic changeover. The *Nautilus* and her successors and the dramatically powerful Polaris-firing submarines are a tremendous force in being. Nuclear Task Force 1, after its circumnavigation of the globe appears to be the prototype for the ships that will make our Navy the most powerful and adaptable the world has ever seen.

ENTER, THE SECOND DECADE

With more and more efficient nuclear propulsion systems being developed, the key question to a policy for the second decade of the nuclear Navy would seem to be how best to proceed with construction of nuclear surface ships.

The reason for our past timidity in this matter has, of course, been costs. In opening a discussion on nuclear surface ships, I want to make it clear that my purpose is not to criticize the decisions of the past but to make some suggestions bearing on future policy.

First of all, I think that in deciding whether to adopt an aggressive program of nuclear ship construction we should make sure all factors are considered.

It's important, first of all, that the figures on which we base decisions be true, complete costs of ship construction and operation, amortized over the useful life of the ship—development, construction, outfitting, operation, repairs, refueling.

Viewed on this basis, the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy has estimated that a nuclear carrier is just 3 percent more expensive in the long run than a conventional carrier. It is also, of course, much more effective than a conventional carrier. There are few Americans who would not be willing to invest this additional 3 percent in order to avoid dependence on obsolete, second-best ships for the defense of this country and the security of the free world.

Let us also remember the "spinoffs," the side benefits and returned dividends that have and will come from the development of nuclear propulsion.

Take the Shippingport reactor, this country's first full-size commercial atomic generating plant. Shippingport is really a larger

version of the *Nautilus* powerplant. Eventually, I believe we will realize that if the only result of the *Nautilus* development program had been a safe, satisfactory situation at Shippingport the money would have been well spent.

While our needs for commercial atomic power may not press us today, we must prepare for the time when they press in on us rapidly—as, indeed, they are pressing in already on many nations hard up for conventional energy sources.

FOR GOOD OF MANKIND

Let us not forget, either, that the Stars and Stripes, flying from modern, swift, far-ranging nuclear ships comprises one of our most dramatic symbols of the success of the United States in harnessing the atom for practical, peaceful purposes—dramatic proof of this Nation's firm determination that the atom shall be used for mankind's good, rather than his destruction.

These considerations are difficult, I think, to place on the scale of cost accounting. But they must be included in our thinking. We cannot afford to deprive ourselves of our full potential power merely because it appears today to be a little more expensive, because what slide rule can measure the value of life and liberty?

So, as a new administration, with a sparkling mandate from the people, prepares to open new and ambitious vistas toward the fulfillment of the American dream, I think we must visualize ourselves as at a new departure, beyond which a wise nation will not only build fleets powered by the atom, but will embrace every opportunity to harness this elemental force for the benefit of all men, everywhere.

---

TASK FORCE 1—AND LOOKING AHEAD

(Remarks of Rear Adm. B. M. Strean, U.S. Navy, in commemoration of the 10th anniversary of the nuclear Navy, Willard Hotel, Washington, D.C., January 13, 1965)

I am most happy to participate in this observance of that day in 1955 when Admiral Wilkinson signaled "Underway on nuclear power." I think it becomes increasingly clear that when the *Nautilus* got underway on the atom, the Navy got underway on the atom. In the intervening 10 years, much has been accomplished, and it was a great honor for me, this past year, to lead the surface manifestation of the progress we celebrate on a round-the-world cruise. I refer, of course, to all-nuclear Task Force 1—the aircraft carrier *Enterprise,* the cruiser *Long Beach,* and the frigate *Bainbridge,* and Operation Sea Orbit. It is this voyage and its implications for all of us that draws me here tonight.

As you know, Task Force 1 left Gibraltar at the end of July on a west to east track, rounded Africa, crossed the Indian Ocean, turned south to Australia, crossed the southern Pacific and rounded Cape Horn to proceed up the east coast of South America and thence to Norfolk, arriving on October 3. This nuclear circumnavigation of the globe took 57 steaming days plus 7 days in port on good-will visits, transiting approximately 31,000 miles. It was made on the absolute ground rule that there would be no stops for refueling or replenishment of any kind. The three ports visited were for good will and crew morale purposes.

To begin at the beginning, Sea Orbit probably would not have come about had it not been for the tireless insistence of the late Adm. Claude Vernon Ricketts. Word came from him to study such a round-the-world voyage of our three nuclear surface ships. When the completed study pointed out the many obstacles in the way, the answer from Vice Commander of Nuclear Operations Ricketts was typical: "Take out the obstacles and study the project again." Such was the man. His determination and foresight will prove to be correctly placed, I think, again and again.

The objectives of Sea Orbit were several. Among them:

We wanted to test the capability of nuclear-powered ships to maintain high speeds for indefinite periods of time and distance in all possible weather and sea states without refueling or replenishment of any kind.

We wanted to show these powerful modern ships and their potent airpower to peoples in distant areas of the world and thus enhance the political and military image of the United States.

We wanted to demonstrate the strategic mobility and the strategic utility of this new element of U.S. power.

And we wanted to demonstrate our ability to quickly reinforce U.S. power in remote areas of the world.

I think we accomplished these things and more. Time does not permit a full discussion here, but there are salient points which inevitably will leave a lasting and deep imprint upon the already illustrious nuclear progress we observe here tonight.

ACCOMPLISHMENTS

On the technological side, Sea Orbit erased any lingering doubts about the reliability of these ships and their ability to take it. In all the voyage, the engineering plants suffered no casualties nor incidents of any kind. I seriously doubt that conventionally powered ships could have given such trouble-free performance.

All the advantages of nuclear power had not been apparent to us when operating in conjunction with conventionally powered ships. It's the old story that the complexion of your force may be set by the slowest ship in it or those which need refueling most often. Sea Orbit gave us the opportunity to test the nuclear ships by themselves. I can tell you that the ships of Task Force 1 exceeded all expectations.

A thing brought into focus for me was the complete independence of seaborne or short logistic support. This will be an enormous advantage in any future conflict because logistic support will be far more difficult and hazardous to provide than in World War II. Oddly enough, there is an analogy in the old sailing ships as related to the nuclear force; using the winds for movement, they, too, were limited in operations only by the provisioning and endurance of the crew.

When we left Gibraltar, we knew we would buy no supplies or use any facilities along the way. There was no need of any. All the ships carry 4 months' food supply, they carry a 6 months' supply of ship and aircraft spare parts, and they have onboard a full load of ammunition and aviation fuel together with a virtually unlimited supply of ship's fuel in the reactors. An all-nuclear force can go anywhere on the seas of the globe, remain on station with 100 percent readiness for all operations, deliver their combat load and return—all without logistic support.

The other side of the coin is speed and instant readiness. The nuclear force is underway minutes after the word "go," not hours or days. As a matter of fact, there was no special preparation for Sea Orbit at all as far as the ships were concerned. We could have shoved off on the world cruise with little or no advance notice. The tactical and strategic advantages of such instant readiness need no belaboring here. Our speed of advance around the world was set at a modest 22 knots. This to allow for into-the-wind flight operations and the severe weather near the Antarctic. I only wish I were at liberty to tell you how much faster that rate could have been had we really wanted to press these ships.

What I have been saying here adds up to this: In addition to the many advantages of nuclear power, I know of no disadvantages except the much publicized one of somewhat higher initial cost. In this, I understand, there may be relief in sight through advances in reactor design and construction. I, for one, most fervently hope it is true. For as I mentioned earlier, a mixture of the conventional and the nuclear only inhibits the performance of the nuclear. I agree with those who say that any firstline warship in the future which does not have nuclear power is doomed to an early obsolescence where global combat operations are concerned.

As I stated, both a mission and an accomplishment of Sea Orbit was to show our nuclear wares to nations which were both friendly and remote—remote in the sense that the U.S. Navy does not normally frequent these areas. Along our track, top-ranking foreign government and military people were flown out to the *Enterprise* for an operational show. The demonstrations included the launching of aircraft, the firing of live ordnance, the recovery of planes, and extensive tours of the ship. This only reached a chosen few. For populaces on the beach at larger cities, our pilots did their stuff in aerobatics and flyovers. These were underway visits exclusive of a few port calls, and thousands of people and hundreds of influential leaders were exposed to modern nuclear seapower for peace, courtesy of the U.S. Navy.

"ON THE SIDE OF PEACE"

It will take me many a day to understand and appreciate completely the many and varied reactions of these people to Task Force 1. For one thing, I perceived three distinct comments on the broad plans from three different parts of the world. The gist if not the exact words of what the Africans said to us was "Thank God all this power is on the side of peace." Our English speaking friends said, "Thank God you are on our side." And our South American allies said, "Thank God this tremendous power is on the side of the free world." I must leave to the ethnologists and the demographers the unraveling of subtleties in these shadings of meaning.

All were impressed, if not dumbfounded, at the modernity of the ships and aircraft. They were amazed at the split-second timing of operations and they appreciated the teamwork of the crews. Invariably, they expressed wonder at the youth of our men, and that a 24-year-old could be the master of the Phantom II fighter aircraft. A ranking official from an African country probably spoke for all the underdeveloped countries when he said:

"My personal responsibility in my government is the training of our youth. I only wish that they all could have been here to see young Americans, to see what work really is and to see the faith and responsibility invested in 24-year-old pilots. It would have erased from their minds certain ideologies which are alien to economic development."

One of the most important dignitaries we met from "down under" was straight and to the point: "This is fantastic. I had to see it to believe it—but I can only comprehend what I have seen in retrospect."

On one of the thoughts that has come to me because of Sea Orbit, I, too, will need some time for contemplation. It is that other peoples in other lands just may have a sharper appreciation of mobile nuclear seapower than do we here at home.

I was amused at a question asked during one of our large press conferences, but I quickly sensed that the man's fellow correspondents saw no humor nor naivete in the question. It was: "Admiral, would you ever be ordered to destroy a whole continent?" Of course I put the nuclear fleet in perspective. But the point is that here was a pretty good understanding of the capabilities in the presence of powerful, modern, nuclear naval forces. Not only that, but I felt almost

everywhere a good understanding of the uses of potent and flexible forces on the high seas to express or enforce the national intent. I also felt an appreciation that the intent of the United States was in the cause of free men. I refer again to the voices heard round the world saying, "Thank God all this power is on the side of peace."

I feel most privileged to have been invited here for this occasion. I think we can say that Sea Orbit actually began 10 years ago at Groton, Conn., with Admiral Wilkinson, and was helped further along the way by Congressman ANDERSON. Certainly it would not have been possible at all without the fine and astute hand of Admiral Rickover. In this sense, tonight is a time to pay tribute to the countless numbers of dedicated people within both Government and American industry who took the nuclear age to sea.

THE KEEL IS LAID

But tonight also is a time to look forward. Although nuclear submarines and surface ships hold a high degree of modernity, these might be considered as the laying of the keel for the true nuclear Navy to come.

The facts of life in the world of international politics and the peculiar relationship between the oceans and the affairs of men will combine to make the Navy of tomorrow an even greater contributor to the well-being of our country and our allies. May the spirit and the determination which brought forth the *Nautilus*, 10 years ago again prevail. I think we should face the days of our future with the most modern seagoing forces our technology can provide—nuclear ships. Thank you.

## Nuclear Navy Message by Representative Holifield at U.S.S. "Truxtun" Launching

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

## HON. MELVIN PRICE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, January 18, 1965*

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to include in the RECORD an important talk made by my esteemed colleague, Mr. CHET HOLIFIELD, at the launching of the Navy's newest nuclear-powered warship, the frigate, U.S.S. *Truxtun*. The *Truxtun* was launched on December 19, 1964. This is the only nuclear-propelled naval surface warship now under construction.

The Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, of which CHET HOLIFIELD is chairman and BILL BATES and I are members, delved into the question of nuclear propulsion for surface vessels of the Navy in hearings in October and November of 1963 and found that the military advantages of nuclear power is acknowledged by all. But still the Department of Defense is only building conventionally powered warships. Cost effectiveness comparisons are always cited by the Department of Defense to support the contention that the military advantages of nuclear power are not important. The erroneous assumptions in such comparisons were brought out in the Joint Committee report—Report of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, "Nuclear Propulsion for Naval Surface Vessels," December 1963.

Only 4 days after the launching of the nuclear-powered *Truxtun*, the newspapers reported that the Secretary of Defense had turned down the Navy's request to build a nuclear-powered destroyer leader in the fiscal year 1966 program. The news reports cited relative costs of nuclear and conventional destroyers that were substantially different from the relative costs given to the committee in our hearings. According to the news reports there are to be no surface warships, conventional or nuclear, in the fiscal year 1966 shipbuilding program—as was the case in the fiscal year 1964 and 1965 programs.

We will surely want to review any new studies of nuclear power for surface warships completed since our hearings in 1963 including the basis for the latest comparative cost estimates.

We in Congress are all aware of the part Congress played in overcoming the initial reluctance in the Department of Defense to building nuclear-powered submarines. It is evident that if we are to complete the transition from sail to coal to oil to nuclear power in our surface fleet, the Congress will have to play a similar active role to lead the way. I urge all of you to consider CHET HOLIFIELD's remarks carefully:

REMARKS BY CONGRESSMAN CHET HOLIFIELD AT THE LAUNCHING OF U.S.S. "TRUXTUN" (DLG(N)35), NEW YORK SHIPBUILDING CORP., CAMDEN, N.J., DECEMBER 19, 1964

It is a great honor to take part in this memorable ceremony. The launching of the *Truxtun* marks another major step in the building of the new nuclear Navy for the defense of the United States.

Almost two centuries ago, Thomas Jefferson said in his first message to Congress:

"We should at every session of Congress continue to amend the defects * * * in the laws for regulating the militia * * *" and "* * * until we can say we have done everything for the militia which we could do were an enemy at our door."

Referring to this passage, President Johnson recently added these words:

"We need and we want our most able men—of all grades—to make the military a profession. We want them to be able to know their service to Amercia's defense will not be a disservice to their families' dignity. We cannot promise—they do not ask—assurance of comfort. None can know what tomorrow may require of any of us or all of us. But we can promise—and our citizens in uniform may expect that we shall provide them with—the best and most modern arms in the world."

It was this same philosophy that led the Congress 3 years ago to take the initiative to authorize and appropriate the extra funds to change the U.S.S. *Truxtun* from an oil-fired frigate to be our fourth nuclear powered surface warship.

JOINT COMMITTEE SUPPORT

I have been privileged to be a member of the Joint Congressional Committee on Atomic Energy since its inception. The Joint Committee is charged, by law, with the responsibility for making continuing studies of problems relating to the development, use, and control of atomic energy. The committee has historically played a creative role in fulfilling the declared statutory policy of the United States that the development, use, and control of atomic energy shall be directed so as to make the "* * * maximum contribution to the common defense and security."

In furtherance of this responsibility, the Joint Committee, from its inception, has been interested in and vigorously supported research and development in the field of naval nuclear propulsion; first, for submarines and then for surface ships. The history of the early years was marked by a reluctance within the Defense Department to use nuclear power for the propulsion of submarines.

Now that we have over 50 nuclear submarines at sea—now that our Polaris armed nuclear submarines stand their watchful guard hidden under the oceans of the world—few remember that it was the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy that arranged to buy the nuclear powerplants for our first two nuclear submarines, the *Nautilus* and *Seawolf*, with Atomic Energy Commission funds, because the then Capt. H. G. Rickover was not able to get the necessary support in the Department of Defense for his project in the early 1950's.

Let us beware that history does not repeat itself. The military advantages of nuclear propulsion for naval surface ships have been acknowledged by all. We must be alert to assure that our future capital naval surface ships incorporate the proven advantages of nuclear propulsion.

The operations of our first three nuclear surface warships, the aircraft carrier *Enterprise*, the cruiser *Long Beach*, and the frigate *Bainbridge*, have been an outstanding success. However, only one more nuclear-powered surface warship, the *Truxtun*, we are here to launch today, is currently under construction. In the interval between starting the nuclear frigates *Bainbridge* and *Truxtun*, nine conventional frigates have been laid down.

HEARINGS ABOARD "ENTERPRISE"

Three years ago the Joint Committee flew to Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, to hold hearings abroad the aircraft carrier *Enterprise* during her shakedown trials. Our report of that hearing emphasized:

"The United States must prosecute vigorously the conversion of the Navy to nuclear propulsion in the surface fleet as well as in the submarine fleet."

Just as in the last century when the issue was between sail and coal, and early in this century when the issue was between coal and oil, so today is the issue between oil and nuclear power—and today's issue is no less vital.

Nuclear propulsion has the fundamental advantage of permitting our warships to go anywhere in the world, to deliver their combat load, and to return, all without logistic support. Nuclear propulsion in combatant ships will free the striking forces of our Navy from the obvious restrictions of reliance on a worldwide propulsion fuel distribution system.

As the number of foreign nuclear submarines increases and as the air striking capabilities of our potential enemies increase, the difficulty of providing logistic support will surely increase. After only a few days steaming at high speed, oil-fired warships must use fuel from their combat reserves unless a tanker is immediately available at the scene. The basic reason for developing nuclear power for surface warships is to reduce this logistic support, support which will be most difficult, if not impossible, to provide in wartime.

Last year, the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy made an exhaustive study of the subject of nuclear propulsion for surface warships. Our committee concluded that each new warship the United States decides to build for our first-line naval striking force should be the best that our technology will allow and should, therefore, have nuclear propulsion, even if a somewhat higher cost is incurred to pay for the increase in military capability.

The committee was told by the Department of Defense that the choice we face is between a given number of conventional ships

and a smaller number of nuclear ships for the same total cost. In other words, to improve a weapon system, we must reduce the number of weapons to pay for it. I do not share this view.

DEFECTS IN ANALYSIS

Cost effectiveness comparisons were cited by the Defense Department to support the contention that the advantages of nuclear propulsion are not particularly significant. These studies, however, contain a fundamental weakness that negates their validity. The comparisons were based on the assumption that in wartime logistic support forces operate unhampered and without losses. The defect in this analysis is immediately apparent. We must plan for times of crisis. It is precisely in such situations that the superior mobility, maneuverability, and reliability of nuclear warships will give the United States an unequaled naval striking force.

Our potential enemies may not use the same cost effectiveness criteria and thus oppose us with the best weapons technology can provide them. This could create an intolerable peril to our national security.

Our committee printed for the public record a report of these hearings in December 1963. In releasing this report, our chairman, Senator PASTORE, said that "* * * the Joint Committee believes that cost cutting is important but it must eliminate the fat and not cut to the marrow. * * *

"It is my earnest hope that we will never again be forced to go to war, but if we do, I want our equipment to be second to none."

Just as men of vision in the past faced heavy opposition to bring about the change from sail to coal and the change from coal to oil, we who understand the great advantage of nuclear propulsion face an uphill struggle in obtaining support for its use in the surface fleet.

But we don't tire easily. We will undoubtedly look in on the studies which have been carried out in the past year since our hearing. I sincerely hope that the new studies will be more realistic in evaluating the advantages of nuclear power.

NUCLEAR MERCHANT SHIPS

In addition to the propulsion of firstline surface warships of the Navy, I believe it is time to consider nuclear propulsion for our firstline merchant ships. Nuclear propulsion could provide the revolutionary factor we need to strengthen our merchant fleet for peacetime and also provide vital military logistic support in times of emergency.

The views I have expressed are, of course, not in conflict with the advanced thinking of the new Navy. I know that the worth of nuclear propulsion under wartime conditions is known to many of you here. As you know, the advantages of nuclear power are most evident under wartime conditions and that is the basis under which systems of war should be evaluated.

There are encouraging signs that the true significance of the increased capability of nuclear propulsion is beginning to achieve recognition. The 30,000-mile cruise around the world of the first nuclear-powered task force was completed only 2 months ago. This cruise proved conclusively the feasibility of operating nuclear surface ships in the oceans of the world on a self-sustaining basis. It gave world leaders the opportunity to witness firsthand the capability of the U.S. Navy to operate nuclear-powered warships anywhere independent of support ships—a feat out of the question for conventionally powered ships. In the last 3 years, the *Enterprise*, *Long Beach*, and *Bainbridge* have proved their outstanding reliability during almost 500,000 miles of operation.

Further and even more encouraging is the recent decision announced by President Johnson to proceed with the development of a very high-powered, long-fuel-life nuclear reactor for application to a two-reactor nuclear-powered attack aircraft carrier. This carrier will require refueling only once during her life. The development of this reactor will be completed in time for it to be installed in the next carrier planned by the Navy.

In summary, if capital ships of the Navy are deemed necessary for the security of the Nation—and I believe they are—they should be nuclear propelled.

NUCLEAR POWER A "MUST"

The future is clear. Any capital ship in the future which does not have nuclear propulsion is doomed to obsolescence early in its expected life. The additional costs for nuclear propulsion are minor and, in fact, insignificant, when one considers how vitally important it is to the effectiveness of the ship as a weapons system.

As we celebrate today the launching of our latest nuclear warship, the *Truxtun*, I hope this event will mark the point in the history of the U.S. Navy where our Nation will accept the recommendation of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy "that the United States adopt a policy of using nuclear propulsion in all future major surface warships" thus adding another link to the inevitable chain from sail to coal, from coal to oil, and from oil to nuclear power.

Godspeed to all who will sail in *Truxtun*. Our freedom depends on the brave men who man such ships as this. The least we can do is provide them with the best that our technical resources will allow.

---

# SENATE

## TUESDAY, JANUARY 19, 1965

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, and was called to order by the President pro tempore.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, in whose fear is the beginning of wisdom: We come, conscious that our only greatness is that we can lose ourselves in Thee and in Thy other children, and that in all our imperfections we can become the healing channels for what Thou dost desire and will for our common humanity.

Recognition of our oneness in Thee makes vivid our realization of the oneness of the human family across all separating barriers of distance or race or birth. May our human loyalties and sympathies be as wide as the divine fatherhood. Make us wise enough to give ourselves to the greatest purposes. Make us good enough to surrender to the best that beckons.

We ask it in the spirit of man's best Man, who, because of His inner goodness, went about doing good to all men. Amen.

---

### THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Friday, January 15, 1965, was dispensed with.

### MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Ratchford, one of his secretaries.

---

### NATIONAL DEFENSE—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT (H. DOC. NO. 54)

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was referred to the Committee on Armed Services:

*To the Congress of the United States:*

One hundred and seventy-five years ago, in his first annual message, President Washington told the Congress:

Among the many interesting objects which will engage your attention that of providing for the common defense will merit particular regard. To be prepared for war is one of the most effectual means of preserving peace.

For the 89th Congress—as for the 1st Congress—those words of the first President remain a timely charge.

In the 20th year since the end of mankind's most tragic war you and I are beginning new terms of service. The danger of war remains ever with us. But if the hope of peace is sturdier than at any other time in these two decades, it is because we—and freemen everywhere—have proved preparedness to be "the most effectual means of preserving peace."

Arms alone cannot assure the security of any society or the preservation of any peace. The health and education of our people, the vitality of our economy, the equality of our justice, the vision and fulfillment of our aspirations are all factors in America's strength and well-being.

Today we can walk the road of peace because we have the strength we need. We have built that strength with courage. We have employed it with care. We have maintained it with conviction that the reward of our resolution will be peace and freedom.

We covet no territory, we seek no dominion, we fear no nation, we despise no people. With our arms we seek to shelter the peace of mankind.

In this spirit, then, I wish to consider with you the state of our defenses, the policies we pursue, and—as Commander in Chief—to offer recommendations on our course for the future.

I. THE STATE OF OUR DEFENSES

I am able to report to you that the United States today is stronger militarily than at any other time in our peacetime history.

Under our free and open society, the American people have succeeded in building a strength of arms greater than that ever assembled by any other nation and greater now than that of any combination of adversaries.

This strength is not the handiwork of any one administration. Our force in being and in place reflects the continuity and constancy of America's purpose under four administrations and eight Congresses—and this responsible conduct of