

pollution of the Detroit River which is caused by municipalities and industries of greater national concern than such pollution as is caused to the nation's waters by the total recreational boating fleet of this country.

But if the Committee is correct in its conclusion, then how can the vigorous legislative activities in this field on the state level and, now, on the Federal level, be explained? The only explanation available to the Committee is that curbing whatever pollution is attributable to recreational watercraft is considered to be reasonably easy, and is therefore a good place for health officials wishing to make a start in this field to begin. Further, because such legislation affects a relatively small percentage of the population of a given state and because the goal of the legislation is admittedly for the good of all, it is difficult for those opposed to such regulation or the form it takes to gain any appreciable support for their position.

If this has been the source of the considerable legislative activity on this subject in the past; then it is the inescapable conclusion of this Committee that it will continue to be in the future. That such legislation can and often does impose incalculable and unnecessary hardships on recreational boat owners hasn't deterred such efforts in the past and is unlikely to be of greater significance in the future.

The Committee predicts that legislation prohibiting entirely the use of a marine toilet on the waters of a given state will continue to be passed in the future as it has in the past, even though no action of any consequential nature is taken by the same state to clean up the heavy pollution of its waters caused by municipal and industrial wastes.

What can and should recreational boat owners or the National Association of State Boating Law Administrators do to correct this situation? Should we oppose each and every attempt to curb such pollution as can be attributed to recreational boating because it is of such insignificance in the total pollution picture? Should we advocate a total program to correct all pollution as an alternative to regulations covering boating alone? Or should the Association continually refer to this report and its conclusions in hopes that this alone will reduce legislative activity in this field?

Reasonable though any of these courses of action may appear, it is obvious that none of them will result in action favorable to recreational boat owners. Legislating against pollution in any form is gaining popularity, and opposing anti-pollution legislation or regulations is comparable to opposing motherhood or the American flag. The situation has passed the point where reasonableness is a criteria so that concerted opposition to such regulation by recreational boat owners or groups representing them, regardless of the facts in their favor, will accomplish nothing constructive and might even result in the adoption of harsher regulations than would otherwise be the case.

The Committee believes that what must be done by this Association and by other recreational boating interest groups in the country is recognize that regulation of this problem, regardless of its significance, is certain to continue; that such regulations will continue to vary considerably from state to state; that many, if not a majority, of the regulations in this area will be of the type completely prohibiting the discharge of wastes in any form, whether treated or not, from marine toilets; and that such regulations will be injurious to the mobility of recreational boating that this Association is attempting to foster in other fields.

If this is so, then what can be done to amend or modify these regulations so that they are less injurious to recreational boat owners and to the mobility of recreational craft? The solution suggested by the Committee is the preparation of a model law on this subject that will avoid the shortcomings of most of the present regulations and still alleviate the problem of the discharge of untreated wastes from recreational watercraft.

Before such legislation can be effective, however, there must be available anti-pollution devices capable of installation on recreational craft at a reasonable cost. An assessment of such devices is then necessary.

ANTI-POLLUTION DEVICES FOR RECREATIONAL WATERCRAFT

There are three principal types of treatment devices now available:

1. *Chlorinators*.—Chlorinators are devices designed to hold sewage for at least a nominal period of time to permit introduction of dosages of disinfectants to kill bacteria contained therein. To meet any reasonable health standard, such