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HCR 205 and HCR 206 request the Sea Grant Extension Service of the University of Hawaii to conduct a feasibility study on mandatory labeling of chlorofluorocarbons (CFC) releasing products and halons and a feasibility study on instituting a total ban on products containing CFCs and halons.

Our statement on these resolutions does not represent an institutional position of the University of Hawaii.

The intentions of HCR 205 and HCR 206 are well founded and deserving of legislative consideration. The long term world wide environmental implications of the continued use and release of CFCs and halons are rapidly becoming recognized by both the scientific and public communities. As an island state in the tropics, subject to major environmental impacts associated with rising sea level and the health risks linked to increased ultraviolet radiation due to decreases in the ozone layer, it seems reasonable that Hawaii take a leadership and coordination role in this issue.
It may be argued that the global problems associated with the release of CFCs and halons would be more appropriately addressed at the national level and not at the state level. However, we understand that a number of western states, including California, Oregon, Washington, and Alaska have expressed interest in developing a regional program to control the release of CFCs and halons and that California, in particular, is considering legislation similar to what is proposed in HCR 205 and HCR 206. The rationale used in considering these state level initiatives has been that a multi-state regional program will encourage and strengthen National efforts.

HCR 205 specifically directs the Sea Grant Extension Service at the University of Hawaii to investigate and report on a mandatory labeling bill. We concur with this directive and suggest that other state and county agencies and departments of the University with appropriate expertise be encouraged to work with and assist Sea Grant in carrying out the directives of HCR 205.

HCR 206 is a more ambitious resolution and seeks to have Sea Grant Extension Service investigate the feasibility of instituting a total ban on products containing CFCs and halons. This resolution would require considerably more information, time and effort, and we must add funds. Furthermore, if mandatory labeling is instituted in response to the studies directed by HCR 205, consumers may reject products containing or using CFCs and halons in sufficient numbers so they are no longer viable in the market place. Removal for economic rather than statutory reasons would result. Therefore, while we concur with the intent of HCR 206, we believe the resolution may not be needed. We suggest that the results of HCR 205 be evaluated before implementing HCR 206.