

recycled used oil may be represented as equivalent to new oil.

The purpose of the bill, through both an educational program and the restrictions noted above, is to avert some of the pollution of the State's water and land areas, as well as to recapture used oil, by providing alternative methods for the disposition of used oil. Certainly, that purpose is a good one.

The major problem with the bill is its requirement that all oil sold for off premises use be in resealable or recoverable containers. Testimony presented at a veto hearing on this bill showed that, at the present time, this is impractical and may well be dangerous.

The bill is directed at those persons who buy oil, generally in one quart cans, over the counter, in order to self-serve their cars, rather than taking them to a service station. It assumes that these "do-it-yourselfers" will drain the used oil into a pan, pour it into the resealable one quart cans, seal the cans, and promptly take the filled cans to a collection center for disposition.

According to testimony from representatives of the leading producers of cans used for oil and of the companies packaging oil for off premises use, there has not yet been developed a safe, reliable, and economical resealable or recoverable one quart can that can be used for oil. A "screw-top" can of one quart size may not be practical as a receptacle for used oil drained from a crankcase, and nearly all of the can and oil company representatives assume that the bill would require the cans to contain a plastic cap.

Both Quaker State Oil Company and Boise Cascade Company, a leading producer of cans for oil, have conducted tests on the use of plastic tops, and have found that they are not adequate for the purpose. The cap, which is nonbiodegradable and which itself is manufactured from petrochemicals, has been found not to be an effective seal, as it will become permeated by the oil. If this is so, the storage of oil in such cans could well create its own pollution problems, as well as a serious fire hazard.

Offers were made at the veto hearing by the oil and can companies to work with the appropriate legislative committees over the summer and fall to devise more practical ways of achieving the objectives of the bill, which they and I support. Various alternatives are apparently being tested now. The principal proponents of the bill appearing at the veto hearing acknowledged that some time was needed to work out the problems noted, but