

*U.S. Congress*

UNITED STATES



OF AMERICA

# Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 89<sup>th</sup> CONGRESS  
SECOND SESSION

VOLUME 112—PART 3

FEBRUARY 10, 1966, TO FEBRUARY 26, 1966

(PAGES 2817 TO 4180)

vital weapons we run the risk that in time of emergency they may not be available. We put ourselves in the hands of foreign countries and foreign governments which, friendly as they may be, cannot be guaranteed as to their reliability for the reason that they must look first to their own needs. This is the philosophy behind the entire concept of having a domestic mobilization base for the production of weapons, as well as one of the principles behind our arsenal system. I doubt if any other country purchases weapons abroad that it can, within the limits of its economy and technology, manufacture at home.

The Army has embarked upon a dangerous business—one that raises many questions which the Senate should explore:

The first and fundamental question is why the Army let a situation develop in its own arsenal system and in private industry in which no research and development was done on a gun which the Army states is now urgently needed? Was this need foreseen? If so, why was nothing done to develop a domestic production source?

Second, what new development work is being done now, in the arsenal system, leading to the anticipation of future needs and the development of new items in the small arms field?

Third, why, in view of this failure, is the Army continuing to reduce its inhouse research and development capability, as evidenced by the closing of the research and development facility at the Springfield Armory and the breaking up of the Springfield research and development team?

As regards this procurement, it was listed as urgently required by the Army over 14 months ago. If the reasons for this delay in filling our need has to do with the testing and verification of the weapon, why did we not take advantage of this time period to negotiate purchase of the proprietary rights for the weapon for manufacture in our own country? Had this been done in time, the 20 millimeter gun could be in production in the United States today.

Finally, if we have been able to wait 14 months for this "urgently needed" item, could we not wait several months longer until such rights are purchased so that production could still begin in the United States?

These are the questions that should be answered and the issues that should be explored. The Preparedness Subcommittee will soon begin hearings on the Army's policy toward small arms research, development, and procurement, especially as it relates to the justification for maintaining the Springfield Armory. I would hope this hearing would seek as well answers to these questions. And I would hope that the contract negotiations with the German producers might be held up until the questions were answered to the satisfaction of the Congress, with whose appropriations the weapon is being purchased.

For this is an issue that goes beyond any one weapon or any one facility. It goes to the entire rationale of the arsenal system. One of its main functions in recent years has been to look at future needs and develop prototypes of the kind of weapons that private industry would not be included to develop. The dismantling of our armory system, facility by facility, and the stripping of its traditional functions of research, engineering, technological data processing, and pilot line production point to a future in which this case may not be an isolated incident. We may be faced consistently with urgent needs for weapons for which we have no domestic capabilities because we have given up that capability by reducing the functions of our armories. This would be a sorry situation for the Army and for the country. The time to take preventive meas-

ures is now. I hope the Preparedness Subcommittee can begin the effort in that direction.

### THE SOCIAL SECURITY PROGRAM, MEDICARE, AND THE PROPOSED RESTORATION OF CUTS IN CERTAIN EXCISE TAXES

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, a great many people in my own State of New Hampshire have come to realize that the social security program—including its new stepchild, medicare—is not all that it could or should be. I rather suspect that this same awakening is taking place among thoughtful people throughout the country. In this regard, I desire to bring to the attention of the Senate a short, but pointed editorial observation contained in the Coos County Democrat for Wednesday, February 2, published in Lancaster, N.H., and ask that it be printed at this point in my remarks.

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

#### IN OUR OPINION

Finally people are beginning to realize that social security and medicare programs giving benefits neither in relation to need or to amounts paid in are unfair. Can they understand yet that Goldwater wasn't out to end social security but to strengthen it? That wasn't indifferent to needs of elderly but more concerned that they be well met rather than deceiving people by false promises. It's the politicians who have done the latter, not the social security personnel.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, this same editorial column turns to another subject of equal interest to the Senate, that of the proposed restoration of excise taxes on automobiles and telephones, and I ask that this, too, be printed in the RECORD. As the writer points out, automobile use and telephone service are necessities and anything but luxuries to a huge segment of our population. I most certainly concur in the opinion that every effort should be made to find other means of obtaining revenue in lieu of these onerous and unfair taxes.

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

Some of the excise taxes were imposed during the war because of shortages or to discourage luxury buying. Now the President proposes restoring cut in excise taxes on toll calls and automobiles that became effective just last month.

Cars are getting to be more and more a necessity and there is no shortage of them.

Toll calls are a business necessity, and often a personal necessity. The telephone industry has never been better equipped to handle them.

We believe that these taxes should have been entirely eliminated long ago and that any need for new revenue should be met from some other source.

#### CAREFUL CANVASS

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, the Washington Post believes that President Johnson's latest appointments "reflect the careful canvass of available candidates and the energetic search for talent that has become standard in the personnel policies of the administration."

The Post editorially commended the appointment of Elmer B. Staats to Comptroller General; Lee C. White to become Federal Power Commission Chairman; Harry C. McPherson as Special Counsel, and Robert H. Fleming and Dixon Donnelley in the field of press relations.

The appointments "seem to indicate a disposition on the part of this administration, greater than that in recent governments, to seek appointees at higher levels from within the establishment," the Post said.

This is a trend of which we can all be proud, and with the consent of my colleagues I offer the editorial to be made a part of the RECORD.

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

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Feb. 13, 1966]

#### PRESIDENTIAL APPOINTMENTS

The Federal appointments announced by President Johnson Friday elevate to new positions several remarkable career public servants who have demonstrated ability in previous posts in this and other administrations. They seem to indicate a disposition on the part of this administration, greater than that in recent governments, to seek appointees at higher levels from within the establishment. Such a policy, long pursued, no doubt would endow the Federal service with a more professional complexion. It would, at the same time, put a premium on the recruitment of the best young men at the opening of their careers. And it ought to be accompanied, at the same time, by refreshment from nongovernmental life on occasion.

The high caliber of the men the President has named commends his choice, these general principles apart. Elmer B. Staats, because of his long and distinguished career in the Budget Bureau, probably knows as much about the whole Federal establishment as any individual in the country. It is doubtful that the President could have found a man better qualified by training, experience, and understanding to carry out the kind of post-audit that is the Comptroller General's responsibility.

Lee C. White's appointment ends the long search for a qualified successor to the retiring chairman of the Federal Power Commission, Joseph Swidler. He seems to satisfy the President's anxiety to find a man with Swidler's consumer orientation and with the same facility for persuading the industry that what is good for the public is good for it.

Harry C. McPherson's governmental experience and legal training alike fit him ideally for the post of Special Counsel to the President. He has the Chief Executive's confidence gained in legislative work and he has demonstrated his usefulness on the White House staff and in the Defense Establishment and the State Department.

The changes in press appointments advance men well known and long known in their fields. Robert H. Fleming has a good background in all media and possesses the confidence of his colleagues. Dixon Donnelley succeeds an extremely able and well qualified professional, James L. Greenfield, as Assistant Secretary of State for Public Affairs. His experience in government and knowledge of the gallery will help him on his new job.

Johnson appointments, in these cases, reflect the careful canvass of available candidates and the energetic search for talent that has become standard in the personnel policies of the administration.