

Mr. BLATNIK. Well, the full text will appear in the record.

Mr. MAXA. I think the only point of Mr. Smyers and I think the only point our report makes is from our contact with the industry it is a little bit misrepresentative of the facts, and this is what we are hopefully pointing out. What we encounter in our contact with vessel operators in this subject of nutrients, people up and down the Mississippi River and Ohio River, all these commercial operators are saying from their interpretation of certain reports that this is going to go the way of holding tanks. There are so many people whose opinion is based on certain reports on the subject of nutrients and that is why they are going to have to put in holding tanks. This nutrient business is a problem of a sewage disposal tank. All we are trying to point out is the calling off—

Mr. SCHWENGEL. I think you got a real good point here. We are pressed for time. If you are sufficiently interested and can arrange a schedule, maybe you could care to stay around. I would like to hear some of this testimony.

Mr. SMYERS. Later this afternoon or when?

Mr. SCHWENGEL. I do not know what the schedule is. Do we plan to meet this afternoon at 2? Do we have permission?

Mr. BLATNIK. We have the permission to meet.

As I understand it, you expect better performance from the small compact unit you have on pleasure craft and boats.

Mr. SMYERS. That is right. If you prohibit the macerator/chlorinator and say you must use the holding tanks, the boat either dumps the nutrients into the lake or pumps it at a dock through the sewage system and back into the lake again. The other point is the macerator/chlorinators developed are reducing the B.O.D. much better than the municipal systems in use because most of the systems in use are only primary systems these days.

Mr. BLATNIK. Thank you, gentlemen. The document will be incorporated into the record.

(The document referred to follows:)

WATER POLLUTION BY SEWAGE FROM WATERCRAFT . . . ANOTHER VIEWPOINT

The issue of Water Pollution by wastes from watercraft has recently become a controversial subject. Some reports have exaggerated and some have belittled the effect of such pollution. It is probably fair to say in any case, that even if the present degree of pollution from watercraft is insignificant compared to pollution from other sources, this type of pollution can cause an undesirable situation in local areas and if not controlled could in time become a significant part of the total water pollution situation, especially if industries and municipalities are successful in their efforts to curtail the pollution they themselves contribute. Therefore, let's support the basic philosophy to taking steps to require that wastes from watercraft shall be controlled but let's be realistic and let's be fair to the various sectors of the community involved:

1. Let's not pass laws just to trade one type of pollution for another of equal severity or merely to change the time or place of the pollution.

2. Let's not discriminate by limiting a particular type of pollution by one sector of the community until it is at least technically feasible and thus foreseeable that other sectors of the community can, in the not too distant future, be required to similarly limit that same type of pollution.

3. Let's be ready to change in response to changing pollution hazards and in response to advancing waste treatment technology.

4. Let's try to stipulate performance requirements that are meaningful.

To discuss the specifics of this subject it is probably best to have a general understanding of some of the terms used by technical personnel who work in the field of sewage disposal: