

technologies as they become available, and space will be provided for this. Some \$167 million is requested for the two DDG's in fiscal year 1968.

In addition, we are continuing the SAM improvement program, under which the Standard missile is now being procured to replace both Tartar and Terrier.

Last year I mentioned that we were studying the feasibility of providing a "close-in" or "point" air defense capability for other types of combat ships. We now propose to procure and install a basic point defense surface missile system (PDSMS) on ships which are not likely to encounter the more sophisticated forms of air attack and which do not generally operate in the company of regular SAM ships—e.g., amphibious assault ships and destroyer types operating independently near hostile land areas. This system makes use of existing hardware (e.g., Sparrow III missiles) and can be installed on existing gun mount foundations.

About \$14 million has been included in fiscal year 1968 budget for the first procurement.

Other combatant ships

At end fiscal year 1967, there will be 23 ships in the small patrol category. These ships are used for coastal surveillance and patrol boats (PTF's) costing \$17 million have been added to the fiscal year 1967 program.

The primary mission of fire support ships, also included in this category, is to provide a heavy concentration of ship-to-shore fire during amphibious assaults. The Navy is presently studying the feasibility of a new type of landing force support ship which would combine the fire support capabilities of the cruiser's heavy guns and the rocket ship's saturation fire.

Amphibious assault ships

Last year I informed the committee that while our objectives of achieving a modernized (20-knot) amphibious lift for one and a half Marine Expeditionary Forces (MEF, of division/wing teams) and sufficient older ships to provide a slower lift for another half of a MEF remained the same, further study of the competition of the force had convinced us that some modification of the future construction program was desirable. I also noted that the Navy was investigating the possibility of designing a multipurpose ship which could combine the features of several different types of amphibious ships and that one of the reasons we had rescheduled the program was to provide time to develop a design for this new ship.

Unfortunately, experience has shown that our current LPD's are too small to be truly effective as a multipurpose amphibious ship in the assault role and they cannot by themselves serve as a replacement for a variety of specialized ships. For this purpose we need a bigger assault ship capable of landing, either by air or by sea, a much larger and more balanced land force than is now possible with any existing amphibious vessel, and this was the type of ship I mentioned last year.

Our further study of this problem indicates that the development of such a ship is not only feasible but highly desirable. On the basis of the Navy's preliminary design work, this amphibious assault ship,