

U.S. Congress

UNITED STATES



OF AMERICA

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 91st CONGRESS
FIRST SESSION

VOLUME 115—PART 10

MAY 15, 1969, TO MAY 26, 1969

(PAGES 12645 TO 13880)

fuel oil, for use in a refinery and desulphurization facility to be constructed and operated by the Applicant, said allocation to remain in effect for a period of ten (10) years.

In the Summer of 1968, the Steuart Refining Company submitted an application to the Maryland Port Authority for a permit to establish a Foreign Trade Zone and an oil refinery at Piney Point, Maryland. The Maryland Port Authority would not issue said permit without the approval of the County Commissioners. After a very lengthy in-depth study by a special committee appointed by the Commissioners, the committee, the Board of County Commissioners, and our legislators deemed it would not be in the best interests of the people and the County to have such an establishment in the County, and subsequently denied approval of the application. The Maryland Port Authority honored our decision and concurred in this action.

St. Mary's County has over 400 miles of waterfront. The excellent quality of our seafood enjoys world renown, and approximately 2,000 watermen and their families depend largely on this fine natural resource for a living. Our fine beaches and camping facilities bring many vacationers during the summer months to enjoy our peaceful atmosphere. St. Mary's County and the State of Maryland are spending considerable money annually for development of our waterfront for recreational purposes. In April of 1968, a Comprehensive Park and Recreation Plan was prepared for St. Mary's County by the Allen Organization, Park and Recreation Planners, Bennington, Vermont. St. Mary's County is the Mother County of the State of Maryland, and has great historical significance, attracting literally thousands of visitors each year to specific points of interest where our proud heritage is being preserved.

We are aware of the vital concern of both Federal and State agencies to preserve the nation's precious natural resources. St. Mary's County is rich with such resources. It is one of the few remaining areas with clean water and clean air. We, and our citizens, are of the opinion that St. Mary's County is not the place for heavy industry, especially an oil refinery and desulphurization plant. Further, we are of the firm conviction that the County Commissioners and the people who live here should have a voice in deciding what is or is not allowed to come into the County.

We respectfully request that you carefully consider our foregoing statements, and the adverse effect that an oil refinery and desulphurization facility would have on the general physical characteristics of St. Mary's County, and deny the Steuart Refining Company's application for a General Allocation of residual fuel oil.

Very truly yours,

F. ELLIOTT BURCH, *President.*

FEDERAL REGULATIONS FOR CONTROL OF WATER POLLUTION

Mr. MONDALE, Mr. President, at the recent Duluth, Minn., Interstate Enforcement Conference on Lake Superior, Representative JOHN BLATNIK, from the State's Eighth Congressional District, traced the history and present state of our Federal regulations designed to meet the problems of water pollution.

I believe that Senators will find a great deal of worthwhile information in these remarks. I ask unanimous consent that the address be printed in the RECORD.

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

ADDRESS BY THE HONORABLE JOHN A. BLATNIK, LAKE SUPERIOR ENFORCEMENT CONFERENCE, DULUTH, MINN., MAY 13, 1969

I first became acquainted with Lake Superior more than 34 years ago when I was working in the old CCC Camps near Isabella and Finland on Highway 1 between Ely and Lake Superior. I don't ever think I'll forget the first time I saw the big lake. It was a bright, sunny day, much like this morning, and when I came over the hill near Ilgen City there in front of me was that huge, magnificent, glittering fresh water lake. That was quite a thrill back in the old days when travel was so difficult, and I've had a warm spot for Lake Superior ever since.

That first, exciting experience with the lake had a great impact on me, such an impact that in later years I made it part of my life's work. There I was, standing in front of one of the largest bodies of fresh water in the world. To me, it looked like an ocean.

The lake's unsurpassed beauty, purity and clarity were then, and still are, resources to be preserved and protected. The unique quality of its water transcended anything I had ever seen before, and I could feel the richness of the lake's heritage all around me. But I never really appreciated this great pristine resource, this lovely northern lake and forest country until I went to Washington in January 1947, after the war when I first came to Congress.

I was named to the Public Works Committee, which deals directly with many aspects of water use—navigation, flood control, hydroelectric power, harbors, channels, and pollution. I was also named to the subcommittee on rivers and harbors which was working on the problems of the St. Lawrence Seaway.

While reviewing all of the Great Lakes ports, channels and harbors and studying the St. Lawrence Seaway problems, I saw first hand and was appalled at the unbelievable pollution of the harbors of Chicago, Gary, Detroit, Cleveland and Buffalo, and the major rivers, such as the Ohio, Mississippi, St. Claire, River Rouge, as well as practically all of the major seacoast ports—Boston, New York, Philadelphia, Baltimore, New Orleans, San Diego, San Francisco, etc.

It was then that I began my fight to clean up the Lower Great Lakes, the Mississippi River and the great pollution problems throughout the nation.

It was a lonely fight back in those days. Pollution was not the popular issue that it is today. Back then the clean water advocates in Congress could have caucused in a telephone booth. The clean water fighters were few and far between.

But we didn't get discouraged, because it was clearly evident that water pollution was a national problem that was bad and getting worse and that it could only be solved through cooperation by the federal government, the state governments, local governments and industry, and with the understanding and broad-based support of a vast majority of the nation's citizens.

We needed and got the complete support of the conservation organizations—such as National Wildlife Federation, now under the leadership of Tom Kimball, the executive director, who is here with us today; Bill Magie and the Friends of the Wilderness, the Izaak Walton League, the United Northern Sportsmen and many other dedicated groups.

Especially helpful in the early days and right up to the present was the League of Women Voters. Without this kind of determined, grass roots support, we couldn't have done the job.

The big break-through came when I was made chairman of the subcommittee on rivers and harbors, and in 1956 was able to author the Federal Water Pollution Act. I conducted the hearings on the bill in the

Public Works Committee and managed it on the House floor.

This was the first permanent national law for the prevention, control and abatement of water pollution. And it was imperative that it be enacted into law. After passing the House by a vote of 338 to 31, following Senate action on the bill, I filed the report of the Conference Committee and President Eisenhower signed the Bill into Law on July 9, 1956.

The Federal Water Pollution Control Act laid the groundwork for the start of a joint effort by the federal government in full partnership with the states and localities in the clean water fight. The accomplishments of the law were many:

1. It recognized and preserved the primary responsibilities and rights of the states in preventing and controlling water pollution.

2. It authorized continued federal-state cooperation in the development of comprehensive river basin programs for water pollution control.

3. It authorized increased technical assistance to the states, and stepped up research.

4. It authorized the collection and dissemination of basic data on water quality relating to the prevention and control of pollution.

5. It encouraged the continued formation of interstate compacts and uniform state laws.

6. It authorized for five years grants to states and interstate agencies for their water pollution control programs.

7. It authorized federal grants for the construction of municipal waste treatment works.

8. And, Ladies and Gentlemen, it set up procedures for enforcement action against interstate pollution—Yes, the enforcement conference you are sitting at today would not have been possible without the passage of my bill in 1956.

My original bill asked for \$100,000,000 in construction grants. The 1956 Act, as finally passed, authorized annual appropriations of \$50 million for federal waste treatment construction grants of 30 per cent or \$250,000, whichever is less. This was a very modest start indeed—but it was the best we could get through at that time, and it was a start in the right direction.

In 1960, during the 86th Congress, to try to make further improvements and to spur more local effort in the federal program, I introduced a bill to increase the annual grant authorization. This bill also provided for an increase in the dollar ceiling for a single project, and encouraged efficiency and economy by permitting two or more communities to join in a project.

Though we got the bill through the committee, the House and Senate and the Conference Committee, President Eisenhower vetoed it on grounds that this was a local problem. By a vote of 249 to 157 the House fell short of the necessary two-thirds vote needed to override the veto.

In 1961, I again introduced legislation to strengthen the Federal Water Pollution Control Act. I also presided at those Committee Hearings, and managed the bill on the House floor, with passage coming on a vote of 307 to 110.

The Bill, signed into law by President Kennedy on July 21, 1961, increased the appropriations authorization for construction grants to \$100 million a year, finally reaching the \$100 million level we first sought in 1956. It also increased the dollar ceiling for a single project to \$600,000, and authorized multi-municipal projects with a dollar ceiling of \$2.4 million. As you can see, the effect of this bill was to increase the incentive to local anti-pollution efforts.

But I accomplished one other important job in this new law—direction of a continuing study of the quality of the waters of the Great Lakes to protect them from pol-

lution caused by population growth, industrial growth, and increased shipping.

At this time we knew very little about water quality, and it became very evident that an enormous amount of scientific and technological research was needed to answer the many complex questions.

During the 89th Congress I moved again to strengthen the Water Pollution Legislation and introduced the Water Quality Act of 1965 with Senator Ed Muskie as the lead off witness. By 1965 we clean water fighters were getting good support; the Bill passed the House by a unanimous vote, and got overwhelming approval in the Senate as well. It was made Law by President Johnson on October 2, 1965.

This landmark legislation created the Federal Water Pollution Administration, and it also provided for the establishment of water quality standards for interstate waters and stated for the first time that the purpose of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act is to enhance the quality and value of our water resources and to establish a National Policy for the prevention, control and abatement of water pollution.

Under this new law we also increased the annual appropriations authorization for construction grants from \$100 million to \$150 million, doubled the dollar ceilings, afforded more realistic assistance to populous areas and gave new incentives to state participation in waste treatment plant financing.

In 1966 we took another big step toward increasing the quality of this Nation's water during the 89th Congress with the passage of the Clean Water Restoration Act, of which I was the author.

The most significant provision of the 1966 Act was the vast increase in the authorized level of federal support for municipal waste treatment plant construction, the grant program begun in 1956 under my original legislation.

The 1966 Act also removed the dollar ceilings on projects, provided new incentives for state participation in financing and for the application of water quality standards to receiving waters.

Among its other provisions, the law authorized 50 per cent federal grants to planning agencies for the development of comprehensive basin plans for water quality control; doubled the level of federal support for the strengthening of state and interstate water pollution control programs; provided for research and demonstration grants in the areas of advanced waste treatment and waste water renovation and the control of industrial pollution, plus many other new provisions.

In addition the 1966 Law transferred to the Secretary of Interior responsibility for administration of the Oil Pollution Act of 1924, and expanded its application to include the Great Lakes and other nontidal navigable waters.

The successive amendments to the Federal Water Pollution Control Act and related law reflect the response of Congress to the magnitude of the total water pollution problem, its complexity, the emergence and recognition of new problem areas, and the mounting public demand for clean waters.

Congress has not only been responsive with Legislation on the enforcement and construction aspects of the programs, it has also authorized millions of dollars in research, development and demonstration projects.

In 1956 the appropriation for these projects was \$443,219. This has grown to \$43,668,846 in 1969. Waste treatment construction grants grew from \$50 million in 1957 to \$214 million in 1969.

This winter I personally conducted an investigation and hearings in Santa Barbara following the disastrous oil spills off the coast of that City. This catastrophe underscored the need for more effective control of pollution of waters and shorelines by oil.

We returned to Washington, conducted

hearings on the Water Quality Improvement Act of 1969 and passed it through the House of Representatives on April 16 by a vote of 392 to 1. I expect early action by the Senate.

This bill would provide for the control of pollution by oil and other matter from vessels, offshore facilities and onshore facilities; from acid and other mine drainage; and from activities operating under federal licenses and permits as well as from federal installations. It also authorized more intensive work on the Clean Lakes Program.

The Federal Water Pollution Control Act, enacted in 1956, strengthened in 1961, 1965 and 1966, and the expected enactment of the Water Quality Improvement Act of 1969 all came under my chairmanship of the rivers and harbors subcommittee.

This was work, hard work. It took years of study, hundreds of hours of committee hearings and volume after volume of testimony. But it is all worth it if we can help the Lower Lakes and keep Lake Superior the clean beauty that she is.

Back in 1962, I realized that the best way to preserve Lake Superior was through preventive measures. But nobody knew enough about pollution to establish a comprehensive preventive program. The problems of water pollution are so complex, so varied, and so numerous that existing knowledge and techniques are not adequate to deal with all of them. This is where the idea of the National Water Quality Laboratory came in. We simply needed more scientific information about pollution.

I obtained federal authorization for the laboratory, and the City of Duluth donated the building site in March of 1962. The lab was dedicated on August 11, 1967.

What does this all mean? It means that on the shore of Lake Superior standing like a watchful, protective beacon, is a \$2.2 million structure which houses \$1 million worth of the most sophisticated, advanced scientific and technical equipment that American science can produce in this field.

Now we have the most scientifically advanced fresh water laboratory in the world to study and research the environment of Lake Superior waters and determine in a scientific manner the best preventive methods to avoid pollution of Lake Superior.

We also have, as I outlined earlier, a good legislative base from which to embark on an orderly, responsible program of water pollution control, and effective enforcement where necessary.

Since early this year there has been considerable intensive, often emotionally supercharged discussion about pollution of Lake Superior and about this Enforcement Conference. Many well-meaning but ill-informed statements have been made proposing action that should be taken by the federal government or the State of Minnesota, some even calling for legislation to stop pollution of Lake Superior.

This kind of talk has confused the people and created a misunderstanding about the Water Pollution Control program and has even led to rumors that attempts are being made to whitewash this enforcement procedure.

As author of the first permanent, comprehensive law to control water pollution and manager in the House of all its major amendments, I feel it is most important to set the record straight on the whole enforcement procedure.

First, let me point out that no new legislation is needed now to cope with Lake Superior problems. That authority has been on the federal statute books for 13 years. All we need to do is implement and enforce the law, and that is precisely what we are here to get underway today. This Conference, with official status in the eyes of the law, sets in motion the Federal, and I hope State, legal machinery to abate, prevent and stop pollution in Lake Superior.

Few people realize that this Enforcement Conference was called and that our meeting

today is being held under the authority of the basic 1956 Biatnik Water Pollution Control Act, and that whatever cleanup action this Conference determines should be taken will be taken under the authority of that law. The objective is to reduce pollution to tolerable, permissible, harmless limits, and if that can't be done, then to stop it entirely.

Second, I want to emphasize that the Enforcement procedure has proved to be both workable and effective in cleaning up polluted waters throughout the United States. Let me underscore this point with a few facts:

This Enforcement Conference is the 46th in the past 13 years:

Preceding Conferences have issued cleanup orders to: 42 States and the District of Columbia, 1,300 municipalities, 1,800 industries, 89 federal installations, 73 State or private institutions, and, 11,168 miles of riverway.

America's most populous states have figured in previous enforcement actions, as have our largest metropolitan areas, such as New York City, Chicago, Detroit, Cleveland, St. Louis, Minnesota's own Minneapolis-St. Paul and the giants of industry: United States Steel, General Motors, Chrysler, Ford Motor Co., Standard Oil Corporation, Youngstown Sheet and Tube, Republic Steel, International Paper Company, Weyerhaeuser, Crown Zellerbach, Scott Paper Co., and a long list of others.

Corrective action called for by those conferences is underway and in many cases already completed at a total cost of some \$10 billion invested in municipal and industrial treatment plants.

To give you some recent examples of the magnitude of the cleanup effort resulting from an enforcement proceeding, the Lake Erie Conference involved five states, 115 municipalities, 101 industries, and 11 federal installations. A complete cleanup schedule was agreed upon by all the participants at a total estimated cost of \$5 billion.

The Lake Michigan Conference held just last year affected 4 states, 174 municipalities, 53 industries, 20 federal installations, and is expected to cost some \$4 billion.

Of all the Great Lakes, the waters of Lake Erie are in the most advanced state of pollution—perhaps irreversibly so—and many call it a dying lake. Lake Michigan, though sick, is not anywhere near the degree of aging and decay of Lake Erie and the enforcement action taken there still has a chance of reversing the pollution.

Lake Superior is unique among the Great Lakes—the least polluted: the largest body of fresh water: the most to be gained from early action. The action on Lake Erie could be termed "stop gap" at best: In Lake Michigan, remedial and restorative; In Lake Superior, preventive and preservative. We must, by acting now, prevent pollution from destroying this priceless resource.

And we will do it under the three step enforcement procedure I wrote into the 1956 Law: (1) Conference, (2) Public Hearing, (3) Court Action.

Today we are participating in the first, or conference, stage of the enforcement procedure. The role of the Conference, which, by the way, is conducted on an informal basis and is not an adversary proceeding, is to establish the facts, such as: the nature and extent of pollution, whether measures now being taken to abate pollution are adequate, and the kinds of problems expected to be encountered in preventing pollution. With all the facts before them, the conferees will try to reach agreement on a remedial program of pollution abatement.

If this doesn't work then we go on to Stage 2, the Public Hearing, which is a formal proceeding directed at individual, alleged polluters. A formal hearing is held before a five member board appointed by the Secretary of the Interior and sworn testimony is taken. The Board's findings and recommen-

dations are sent to the polluters—whether state or federal government, municipal or private—and to the state with a time table for compliance.

Stage 3, Federal Court Action, is the last resort in the enforcement procedure. The court has jurisdiction to enter whatever judgment or order may be necessary to safeguard the public interest.

However, so successful is the conference stage of the enforcement procedure that in the 13 years of the Federal Water Pollution Control Program, a public hearing has been required in only 4 cases, and court action only once.

The purpose of this Duluth Enforcement Conference is to study the pollution problems of the entire Lake Superior Basin.

However, because of the close coverage by the news media and a concerned public, the focal point of the conference is the discharge of tailings from Reserve Mining Co.'s E. W. Davis Works at Silver Bay.

The report indicates that Reserve's tailings discharge do have an adverse effect on the quality of the Minnesota waters of Lake Superior. If this is determined to be a fact during the conference or at a later date, then the Governor, the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency—with the help of the federal government—and the Mining Company should and must take corrective measures.

Although the Government report indicates that at the present time there is not enough scientific evidence on which to base a finding of interstate pollution, it does recommend that the FWPCA and the State keep the discharge of tailings under continuing surveillance and report back to the conferees at six month intervals.

I wholeheartedly support this action.

I will go further and say that with the help of the National Water Quality Laboratory, if there is pollution anywhere in the Lake we're going to find it and when we find it we are going to stop it under the enforcement section already in the law.

If there is interstate pollution then the Federal Government can move in at once to take action. If there is intrastate pollution there is still no excuse for delay as the Governors of the three states can act under state law. If they have a problem or need help they have only to ask the Federal Government for help and I assure you help will come.

All of us—the Federal Government, the State Government, local government and industry—have a tremendous responsibility in keeping Lake Superior as clean as possible. We must protect the high quality of her water and as long as I have anything to do with it, it will be protected.

I want our sons and daughters, their sons and daughters, and generation after generation to experience the exhilaration I did when I got my first look at that beauty out there. This can be accomplished and this Enforcement Conference here today is a big step toward determining the best method of preserving Lake Superior as the beauty that she is.

RESTORATION OF U.S.S. "ENTERPRISE"

Mr. INOUE. Mr. President, early this year on January 14, disaster struck the U.S.S. *Enterprise* during a practice bombing mission off the coast of Hawaii. My colleagues will recall that an accident started a series of serious fires and explosions which took the lives of 28 men and did extensive damage to the ship.

At the time, it was estimated that it would take up to 9 months to complete repair work on the *Enterprise*. However, the workers of the Pearl Harbor Naval Shipyard put the full thrust of their ef-

forts into the emergency repair work and restored the ship in a record time of 49 days, 41 days before the projected completion date.

Leading the men at the Pearl Harbor Naval Shipyard was Mr. William D. Bennett. In recognition of his years of invaluable service to the U.S. Navy and in appreciation for his outstanding service in restoring the U.S.S. *Enterprise*, the Department of the Navy presented him with the Distinguished Civilian Service Award.

For their outstanding performance in this monumental undertaking, the Secretary of the Navy presented the Special Commendation Award to the leadership and personnel of the Pearl Harbor Naval Shipyard.

It is with great pleasure and pride in the men of the Pearl Harbor Naval Shipyard that I ask unanimous consent that the remarks of the Assistant Secretary of the Navy, James D. Hittle, and the citations of the awards presented to Mr. Bennett and the personnel of the Pearl Harbor Naval Shipyard be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the remarks were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS BY JAMES D. HITTLE

Ladies and Gentlemen: I am honored to be with you today as the representative of the Secretary of the Navy. I have come to express to you the Secretary's personal appreciation and that of the entire Department of the Navy for your magnificent performance in accomplishing the repair of the U.S.S. *Enterprise*. This task, achieved by the workers of the Pearl Harbor Naval Shipyard, should be a source of pride to everyone gathered here today—and I'm sure it is.

The job which confronted this shipyard on that fateful day when the *Enterprise* came limping into harbor was urgent. As you all know, on 14 January, while operating at sea, disaster struck the *Enterprise*. During a practice bombing mission, preparatory to her deployment to her fourth tour of duty in Vietnam waters, an accident occurred near an aircraft on the flight deck. This accident started a series of fires and other explosions throughout the ship. Only the heroic efforts of the ship's crew brought the fires under control. Although the crew reacted with amazing speed, serious damage was caused. The flight deck was cluttered with demolished aircraft; there were gaping holes in the ship's decks and her casualty list stood at more than 100 men dead and injured.

You well know the story from that point on. You were close to the tragedy.

You were part of the subsequent achievement. The original estimate of the time required to return the *Enterprise* to service ranged as high as 3 months. But those who had predicted that it would take this long to complete the repairs had, apparently, underestimated one factor—the shipyard workers at this activity.

With a full realization of the importance of your mission and of the necessity to return the *Enterprise* to service as soon as possible, you the workers of the Pearl Harbor Naval Shipyard, demonstrated what the real "can do" spirit is. For it was the shipyard workers who spearheaded an effort which completed the necessary repairs in a record breaking 49 days—not in the original estimate of 90 days—but in an actual 49 days.

Of course, the full story of the team work that went into the repair of this great ship involves the cooperative efforts of private industry, other naval shipyards, and certain naval activities in the continental United States.

But the keystone of the entire achievement

was this shipyard and you, the members of the shipyard team.

It was here that your skill, hard work and dedication forged in a coordinated and cooperative effort, proved effective as well as inspirational.

Your accomplishment in putting the U.S.S. *Enterprise* in condition for sea was in keeping with the spirit and the records of the World War II era. Then, this shipyard established records on damage repair, records that were broken only by its own later efforts.

Your achievement with the *Enterprise* have already been recognized in part when Admiral John J. Hyland, Commander in Chief, Pacific Fleet, presented a number of personal awards to your key military and civilian leaders.

But we all realize that any effort, as large in scale as the repair of the *Enterprise*, is a collective effort.

That is why the Secretary of the Navy has asked me to travel to Pearl Harbor to be with you today. I have come to show you the Navy's respect for all of you as members of the Navy-Marine Corps team.

I have come to thank you on behalf of the Secretary of Defense, the Honorable Melvin R. Laird, and the Secretary of the Navy, the Honorable John H. Chafee, and to present to all of you as evidence of the Navy's appreciation through Captain Barnhart as your representative, this Special Commendation from the Secretary of the Navy.

I highly regret that it is not possible for us to reward each of you individually but the Navy's appreciation is no less real.

You performed an important mission and you did it in a manner better than anyone had the right to expect.

Please accept our thanks, and particularly—from the Secretary of the Navy—accept this time honored commendation of duty precisely performed—"Well Done."

CITATION BY SECRETARY OF THE NAVY

The Secretary of the Navy takes pleasure in presenting the Distinguished Civilian Service Award to William D. Bennett in recognition and appreciation of the distinguished services set forth in the following citation for outstanding service to the Department of the Navy for many years and for his valuable contributions to the Fleet in production and ship repair operations. Mr. Bennett has served the Navy with distinction in many capacities ranging from shipfitter to Group Master. Through his unwavering dedication and excellent leadership he has inspired hundreds of others to perform in a manner which surpassed their own expectations. His vast and detailed knowledge of ships and their construction and equipment have enabled the Pearl Harbor Naval Shipyard to meet seemingly impossible deadlines for ship restoration and repair under emergency conditions. The most recent example of his ability to act under adverse conditions was his remarkable performance as Production Manager for emergency repairs of fire damage sustained by the U.S.S. *Enterprise* (CVA(N)65) on 14 January 1969. As a result of his incredible foresight, initiative, and enthusiasm, the emergency repairs were completed in only seven weeks. Mr. Bennett's superlative efforts and untiring devotion to duty have brought the highest prestige and honor to the Navy. He is richly deserving of the Navy Distinguished Civilian Service Award.

JOHN H. CHAFEE,
Secretary of the Navy.

APRIL 9, 1969.

SECRETARY OF THE NAVY SPECIAL COMMENDATION AWARDED TO PEARL HARBOR NAVAL SHIPYARD

Citation for outstanding achievement from 14 January 1969 to 4 March 1969 in accomplishing repairs to the U.S.S. *Enterprise* (CVA(N)65) which was damaged by fire and explosion. Under extremely adverse conditions and facing pressures involving short