

Mr. BLATNIK. No questions. I do appreciate your testimony. We are very interested in this small boating problem in Minnesota, of course; and many other States—Michigan, Wisconsin—particularly the growth of boating which has just been incredible in recent years. We first ran across it in connection with the highway program, trying to anticipate, back in 1955, what would be the mobility, the needs, the recreational uses, demands, more time and more money, and we find that the sale of camping equipment and boating and motor boats and water skiing equipment and fishing gear, trailers, house trailers behind automobiles, have exceeded any forecast by enormous amounts, and it is getting to be a problem of lakes that are overcrowded, getting to be fouled up. And to get uniformity is a problem.

If we leave it to the States, if you leave it all to the States, you get relief to some degree in some States. You have no assurance that you would have an adequate sort of minimum throughout the country.

STATE APPLICATION OF FEDERAL GUIDELINES TO ALL WATERS POSSIBLE

Mr. Boggs. The problem, Mr. Chairman, is that the Federal Government really does not have jurisdiction over some of the inland waters of the States, and they cannot really enforce the Federal statute on those waters. That is why I think the Boating Act has worked so well. The States, in effect, adopted the Federal legislation throughout. Had they not adopted that act, the Federal Government would have at least maintained primary jurisdiction over the navigable waters.

Mr. BLATNIK. On page 8, Mr. Boggs, you mentioned it would be a mistake, in your opinion, to give any Federal agency absolute authority to set standards or to approve devices to control waste disposal from watercraft. There has to be close collaboration between the Federal Government and the States and local agencies responsible for water pollution control, public health, and boating law enforcement.

Any rules or regulations established by Washington, without such collaboration, would make matters worse for boaters, et cetera.

Could you clarify that just a little bit more?

I think in essence I would agree with you, again have absolute and final authority and complete authority in a Federal agency, yet we ought to have something more than just admonishing these States to collaborate and work with the Federal Government.

Mr. Boggs. Mr. Chairman, I think what we are suggesting is that the Federal Government adopt a pollution standard for a pleasure craft very similar to the one set forth in your bill, and the other bill introduced by Mr. Fallon.

We are secondly saying that the standards suggested by the Federal Government can really only apply to the navigable waters of the United States and to the manufacturers of the devices which the Secretary of the Interior can regulate.

That still leaves a third area, the nonnavigable waters on which most of your pleasure craft operate, which the Federal jurisdiction does not reach by an act.

We are suggesting that the States would act and accept the Federal standards if they were given an incentive to do so, and that incentive, we maintain, is the concurrent jurisdiction over the navigable waters of their State to control pollution in those waters as well.

This, as I say, has worked in the Boating Act.