

CONTAINER DEPOSIT SCHEME

Motion

Resumed from 17 February on the following motion moved by Hon Darren West —

That this Council condemns the Barnett government for its failure to introduce a container deposit scheme in Western Australia.

HON STEPHEN DAWSON (Mining and Pastoral) [1.09 pm]: As Mr President alluded, I made a contribution on this motion last time we sat and dealt with motions and I had congratulated Hon Sally Talbot on bringing this motion forward condemning the Barnett government for its lack of action on the issue of a container deposit scheme or container deposit legislation in this state. During my previous contribution I briefly outlined what the other states and territories have been doing for the past few years, and I will mention those states and territories again for the benefit of members who might not have been in the house the last time the matter was debated.

Members know that South Australia has been a leader in this area for a very long time. Through legislation, it introduced a container deposit scheme in the 1970s. Forty years ago South Australia passed the Beverage Container Act 1975—the year of my birth. Since 1977 a scheme has been in operation in that state. In the past few years the Northern Territory has moved along the same track by creating a container deposit scheme. It was controversial in that some beverage companies took umbrage with the issue and went to court over it, but I am pleased to say that the Northern Territory persevered and now has a scheme in operation. New South Wales and Queensland are in the process of establishing a scheme. Almost two years ago the Premier of New South Wales, Mike Baird, announced that he would like to implement a container deposit scheme and, in the time since, New South Wales has set up a process to look at the different models and possibilities around what a container deposit scheme should look like. In the meantime, Queensland announced that it is investigating a scheme. It is likely that the Queensland scheme could work in partnership with the one in New South Wales, so it would likely be implemented in 2017–18. In past years the Australian Capital Territory had decided that it did not have the capacity to implement its own scheme; however, in light of the fact that New South Wales has announced a scheme, the ACT has announced that it would likely support the New South Wales scheme. The ACT would not act alone but would work in conjunction with New South Wales. All states and territories apart from Tasmania, Victoria and Western Australia have moved on the issue. Queensland, New South Wales, the ACT, the Northern Territory and South Australia have schemes or are working towards the introduction of a scheme, but, woefully, we have seen no movement from this state government on the creation of a container deposit system.

Over the years government ministers have commented on this issue, saying, “Yes, yes, we will look at it”, but nothing has happened. The minister representing the Minister for Environment in this place asked what we did when last in government. We commenced a study. The then environment minister, Judy Edwards, commenced some work on what a best practice container deposit scheme would look like in this state —

Hon Helen Morton: Did it take eight years to do that?

Hon STEPHEN DAWSON: Wow! It starts; the nastiness does not take long, does it?

Hon Helen Morton: It’s true. I forgot that you went to the election early, so it was seven and a half years.

Hon STEPHEN DAWSON: There she goes again.

If the minister had been listening to what I said in my previous contribution—she obviously was not, which is why it is good that I have another opportunity to speak—she would have known that I said all states and territories were waiting on a federal system. They were waiting on the ministerial council, nationally and federally, to sign up to a scheme, and work was done. But that ministerial council and federal process went nowhere. When we were last in government we were committed to a federal process, as were other states and territories. However, it went nowhere. Since then, out of frustration, states and territories with good leaders who have good vision and who care for and want to protect our unique environment for future generations have shown leadership. They have moved forward in this space. They have said that they will not wait for the Feds anymore because this is far too important an issue, and they have introduced schemes in their states after doing some work on what they should look like. That is what we committed to when last in government. Since then, however, the federal process has fallen apart, and there has been absolute inaction from this government; it has paid lip-service to the issue. Over the past eight years various Liberal ministers have promised to do this and that, but they have stopped promising; they do not even do that anymore. When this motion was last debated the minister told us that the government is not going to move in this space. That is a great shame, because the benefits of a container deposit system are that the level of recycling increases and the amount of rubbish going to landfill decreases, and it helps clean up streets in communities, particularly in country towns and regional

Hon Stephen Dawson; Hon Martin Aldridge; Hon Peter Katsambanis; Hon Martin Pritchard; President; Hon Dr Sally Talbot

communities. Container deposit schemes reduce litter on our beaches and streets and in our parks. They also, as I stated last time I spoke, provide economic benefits; they create new jobs in recycling and other industries. During my previous contribution I quoted the statistics of the Boomerang Alliance on how many jobs would be created if a scheme were created in this state.

During my previous contribution I stated that other countries are way ahead of us. Not all states in the United States are very good on the environment and environmental issues, but some have moved on this issue. The states that have include California, Connecticut, Hawaii, Iowa, Maine, Massachusetts, Michigan, New York, Oregon and Vermont; they all have similar types of schemes. I have previously stated that a great number of European countries have also introduced schemes.

Why is this government afraid to introduce a scheme? Why will it not tackle the high number of cans, bottles or plastic bottles that go to landfill? It has been estimated that about 15 000 bottles and cans go to landfill every minute across the country. That is substantial, and a tremendous waste of valuable resources. In this day and age, now that we have finally started realising that we cannot go on the way we have been and that we have to look after our valuable resources, why is this government not acting on this issue? One has only to go to the beach to see huge amount of plastic in the sand or floating in the water off the coast. We have a woeful recycling rate in this state. Only 40 per cent of our recyclable containers are recycled. We have a great waste management authority in this state, we have had great policies and it has been a great initiative, but we have not seen it increase the rate of recycling, so much so that a container deposit scheme is now necessary.

In the few seconds I have left I say to this government that it is not too late to listen to the voice of the people. We have seen polls published on this issue; people in the community want action on this issue. People in the community want a container deposit scheme in this state. I urge the minister to think about what she said last week and to push her government to ensure that we get action on this issue.

HON MARTIN ALDRIDGE (Agricultural) [1.20 pm]: I rise to speak on this motion on behalf of the National Party this afternoon. From the outset, I must confess that before this motion was listed on the notice paper, it was not something that I had considered in any great depth and I am sure that the speakers before me have probably spent much more time—if not many years—considering types of models that could constitute a successful container deposit scheme. I am broadly aware that Parliament has considered this matter on several occasions, including motions in the previous Parliament in this house and also a private member's bill in the other place in the previous Parliament. I suspect that the Nationals' position, on those occasions, was slightly different from the position that I will put today, and I will explain the reasons for that.

In 2013, our state conference resolved to support a container deposit scheme in Western Australia. Up until that time, there probably had not been a previous consideration of such an area of policy. In 2015, that decision was reinforced by a motion resolved at the state conference that largely reflected the 2013 motion to support a container deposit scheme and in which reference was made to the South Australian model. I am aware of the government's position when we last debated this matter in the previous Parliament. Listening last week to the minister responsible in this house, I do not think that the government's position has changed in preferring a national scheme. But given the circumstances that have evolved since 2011 when the bill was introduced in the other place, other states have been acting towards state-based container deposit schemes, which significantly erodes the argument of waiting for a national scheme. I am not sure, but if just Western Australia and potentially Victoria do not have a CDS post-2018, I think we will have lost the impetus that would be needed for a national scheme because, apart from two mainland states, the rest of Australia will have moved to their own state-based regimes.

We have heard some commentary about New South Wales in the debate. It will probably be the next jurisdiction to move towards a container deposit scheme in Australia. As I understand it, the New South Wales Liberal-National government took that policy to its last state election and it received quite significant opposition from the beverage industry. Ultimately, the industry ran campaigns against government members and, by the sounds of it, threw some significant resources behind the campaign to try to thwart the introduction of a container deposit scheme in New South Wales.

In my quest to learn more about container deposit schemes in Australia, I spent some time looking at the New South Wales discussion paper, which was released in only December last year. I looked at potential designs and issues that need to be considered as part of the scheme, and possible models for a successful container deposit scheme. It is quite a lengthy document—some 60 pages. The response from the beverage industry is interesting with the re-election of the Liberal-National government in New South Wales. It was obviously involved in the formation of the discussion paper and it put up an alternative to a container deposit scheme in that jurisdiction, which I want to talk about a little bit this afternoon. The New South Wales beverage industry felt that a container deposit scheme was not the right way to go. The alternative option that it put up was

Hon Stephen Dawson; Hon Martin Aldridge; Hon Peter Katsambanis; Hon Martin Pritchard; President; Hon Dr Sally Talbot

a program called “Thirst for Good”. It is not an insignificant investment. I note that New South Wales is a much more populous state and it is geographically much smaller than Western Australia. Essentially, the beverage industry put a proposal on the table in a discussion paper released in December last year for a \$15 million annual investment by industry. The proposal is to be in lieu of a container deposit scheme; I doubt that it would be complementary to one. Despite the campaign that was run to oppose a container deposit scheme, and obviously following the re-election of the government in New South Wales, \$15 million a year was put on the table to try to ultimately tackle the challenge of reducing litter across that state. Five programs were suggested for the \$15 million “Thirst for Good” proposal. The “Community Cash for Containers” program was to provide all 152 of New South Wales’ local councils with a trailer and a \$300 cash incentive when the trailer was full of recyclables and its contents returned by a community group within the local government. It also proposed that the industry hire from a labour hire agency 100 litter collectors to be trained and given the necessary personal protective gear. The industry also suggested installing 2 000 new litter bins across local councils in New South Wales for use in litter hotspots and where bins were not currently located. Industry would also provide support to the operational costs of maintaining and emptying those bins. The fourth proposal was to commit to providing reverse vending machines. In his contribution last week, Hon Stephen Dawson talked about his experience with reverse vending machines in Europe. It is certainly not a concept that I was aware of until reading this discussion paper in which there is a proposal to have 100 reverse vending machines in New South Wales. The discussion paper also contains a proposal for a community education program. That is obviously quite a significant response from industry. I have to ask myself whether that was the goodwill of the industry to consider what measures it had in place prior to, I guess, being forced to the table to discuss the potential of a container deposit scheme.

I will move on. There has been some talk about the Queensland government. Obviously, there has been a change of government in Queensland. As I understand it, an announcement has been made that Queensland is likely to follow the lead of New South Wales, albeit a year later, in 2018. Previous speakers have mentioned the Australian Capital Territory’s desire to have a container deposit scheme. Some unique factors mean that it probably would make more sense for the ACT to have a scheme either in conjunction with or similar timing to a New South Wales-type scheme.

There has been a lot of talk about South Australia, which has had a scheme in operation since the 1970s. The Northern Territory is the most recent jurisdiction in Australia to have a CDS. There has been a lot of discussion about the Northern Territory and some of the constitutional issues it experienced as a result of the passage of the scheme and about the High Court’s decision regarding the legality of the scheme.

To reinforce my initial comments, we have moved beyond waiting for a national agreement and I think so has just about every other jurisdiction in Australia. If New South Wales and Queensland, and potentially the ACT, introduce their schemes as they plan to in 2017 and 2018, we may find ourselves—with Victoria—being the only other mainland state without a container deposit scheme. I think that some of the issues around wanting a national approach have concerned cross-border issues. Western Australia’s relative isolation is probably an advantage in regard to those cross-border issues that might be experienced in jurisdictions with container deposit schemes and those jurisdictions that may not. Recyclables may cross borders and a refund may be returned on a container that did not have a deposit charged on it when it was initially produced. In those respects I seriously question the value of a national scheme, particularly given the comments I have just mentioned.

In my view and, I think, in the view of some of the other members who have spoken about some other reasons why a container deposit scheme is a good thing, two of the main guiding reasons why container deposit schemes are a good thing are the reduction of litter and an increase in the recycling effort. Recycling is challenging, particularly in a regional context. Hon Sally Talbot made comments about recycling and its viability in the Shire of Denmark; a lot of it ends up in our waste streams, which I think is largely because of transport distances to appropriate recycling facilities. The CSIRO did some work recently, in 2014, looking at marine environments in Australia. It did a study of the beaches and offshore waters in each state and found that South Australia has fewer plastic bottles and aluminium and steel can waste in those environments than any other jurisdiction. We may conclude that that could be a result of having had a container deposit scheme in place since the 1970s, or there may be some other reason, but that is an interesting point to consider in the context of the effectiveness of a container deposit scheme on reducing litter within our communities.

The opportunity to improve the economics of our recycling efforts is something I will talk about further. One of the arguments that is sometimes mounted in opposition to a container deposit scheme is that it actually devalues the recycling efforts already in place, particularly kerbside recycling through local councils, because it takes valuable recyclables out of the waste stream if people are taking them to recycling centres for the return of their deposit. This is a concept that was considered in New South Wales. A body there called the Local Government

Hon Stephen Dawson; Hon Martin Aldridge; Hon Peter Katsambanis; Hon Martin Pritchard; President; Hon Dr Sally Talbot

and Shires Association of New South Wales, which I assume is probably the equivalent body to our Western Australian Local Government Association, commissioned a report by Mike Ritchie & Associates titled, “The impacts (cost/benefits) of the introduction of a container deposit/refund system (CDS) on kerbside recycling and councils”. I want to talk about that report briefly. It was commissioned in 2012 and it found that revenues for sorted recyclables would be 31 per cent higher under a container deposit scheme in New South Wales. It found that local governments in New South Wales could expect to save between \$23 million and \$62 million on recycling costs, and that local governments across Australia could realise savings in the order of \$69 million to \$183 million. Obviously there are some big variables in there; there is reference in the report to the extent to which the recycling facilities pass on those efficiencies to local governments within their kerbside recycling contracts. They are the sorts of savings that were projected in this assessment of the impact of a CDS on local government kerbside recycling. I would expect it to be a considerable portion of the recycling effort that we currently see in our communities.

I want to quote briefly from the executive summary of that report. It reads —

Material eligible to receive container deposits (eligible CDS material) comprises 21% of kerbside recyclables. Under a CDS and based on South Australia CDS return rates, 82% of NSW eligible CDS material generated *at home* would be diverted to depots, reducing kerbside recycling by 17%.

The remaining 18% of eligible CDS material would remain in the kerbside system, comprising 5% of the comingled recycling bin by weight.

The contribution of unredeemed deposits to the average commodity value (of sorted materials) is significant: increasing the value of sorted material from \$123/t \$194/t.

The net impact on MRF total commodity value is an overall commodity value increase, or net gain, by 31%, (\$72/t).

That is interesting. Obviously, this is a New South Wales context, but it would be interesting to know how that might be applied in the Western Australian context. I know that regional local governments in my electorate that are in close proximity to Perth do not, largely, pay significant costs for kerbside recycling, but we do not have to go too far beyond the metropolitan regional boundary before distance starts to become a real barrier to recycling, requiring some significant subsidy or support from local governments and ratepayers to make kerbside recycling efforts viable, not to mention small communities and towns, and their distance from recycling facilities and the like.

A number of things need to be considered as part of a potential container deposit scheme in Western Australia, and some of them have already been mentioned during this debate. A couple of things that spring to mind for me would include ensuring that the regional collection and return of containers was available under a container deposit scheme. We obviously do not want to have a system whereby everybody who buys a container pays a deposit—say, 10c—but they have to live in a large regional city or in the metropolitan area to be able to easily access the return of the deposit paid on the container. That is something that is worthy of further consideration. I know that South Australia has largely overcome that issue through the use of Scouts, service groups and others in the smaller regional context. Recycling facilities are more readily available in the larger regional cities and in the metropolitan area.

The other issue is the extent to which the government may need to be involved in administering the scheme and whether it is a purely industry-based scheme, which requires a greater level of government investment or regulation, or whether it can be funded and supported fully within the scheme itself. Obviously, consideration should be given to smaller beverage producers. There would be an impact on smaller companies, and I am thinking how the scheme might apply to, for example, the sorts of microbreweries that probably operate in most of our electorates, or any other small or micro-producer that creates and sells a product that would usually fall under a container deposit scheme. We would need to work with those groups, businesses and communities to understand more fully some of the likely positive and negative impacts a CDS might have on them.

That is why the National Party broadly supports the position of a container deposit scheme, which, as I have already outlined, stems from a policy created by our lay party in 2013 and reinforced in 2015. Are we at the point at which we are ready to commit to a final design and how it might work right across the large state of Western Australia? No, we are not. I think we can learn a lot from other jurisdictions and I think we can certainly do a lot more than we are currently doing in terms of assessing what a Western Australian model might look like and how it might work.

Having said those things, I want to conclude my remarks, but before I do, I want to talk specifically about the motion. Obviously the National Party cannot support a motion framed in such terms.

Amendment to Motion

Hon Stephen Dawson; Hon Martin Aldridge; Hon Peter Katsambanis; Hon Martin Pritchard; President; Hon Dr Sally Talbot

Hon MARTIN ALDRIDGE: I move —

To delete all words after “Council” and insert —

encourages the state government to consider the introduction of a container deposit scheme in Western Australia.

HON PETER KATSAMBANIS (North Metropolitan) [1.41 pm]: Once again, it falls on me to rise and break the general bonhomie around the container deposit scheme. Most members have spoken about it as generally being a good idea, and really it is the mechanics of whether it is introduced —

The PRESIDENT: Member, I just want to make it absolutely clear that the question before the house now is the amendment.

Hon PETER KATSAMBANIS: Yes, I am addressing the amendment specifically, Mr President.

With the amendment that the government consider this type of scheme, the general feeling is that it is a good scheme. I must put on the record that I am certainly not convinced that this is a good scheme. I am certain that it is a tax—a great big tax. I am speaking on the amendment that the government consider this idea of a container scheme, which, to me, reads very much like a tax. I am happy for the government to consider the idea. I am just advancing my personal opinion that I am yet to be convinced that this tax would lead to the benefits claimed—that is, a reduction in waste caused by containers. I am not necessarily certain about the definition of containers either, but let us accept that a group of containers will be taxed. I think 10c is the going rate in some of the states that have such a scheme.

Hon Simon O’Brien interjected.

Hon PETER KATSAMBANIS: Thank you, Hon Simon O’Brien. I will get there. I do not have much time, but I will get there.

Ten cents will be charged on every container. They will somehow or other be collected and magically, by some mysterious means, all the containers will be recycled when they were previously dumped by the side of the road. I accept that Western Australia has a very poor recycling rate. We are getting better. The statistics show that over time we are improving, but other states do it better. Interestingly, according to the statistics, the state which has the highest recycling rate and which people hold up as an exemplar of recycling in Australia is Victoria. It is one state that has not introduced a scheme. I am not certain, but I have not heard that the government is contemplating introducing such a scheme in Victoria. If the Victorians are doing it so well without a container deposit scheme, what are they doing that is not a 10c tax on every container?

If Western Australia does introduce this tax, what sort of bureaucracy will be built up around it? I heard Hon Stephen Dawson say that it will create jobs. Yes, it will create jobs in the bureaucracy administering this scheme. It would certainly create jobs, but would they be productive jobs? Do we talk about growing our economy by adding more public servants, bureaucrats, administrators or tax collectors? I do not think so.

We must consider the equity of this sort of scheme. I know that members opposite like talking about equity. If they buy a bottle of chardonnay, as the chardonnay socialists who like proposing new taxes as a solution to everything, and there is a 10c tax on that —

Several members interjected.

Hon PETER KATSAMBANIS: Members opposite can select their drink of choice. A 10c tax on an expensive bottle of wine is neither here nor there. However, for families and pensioners struggling to make ends meet, 10c on a bottle of milk or lemonade, or even 10c on a bottle of beer for that matter, is a lot of money. The supermarket sells bottles of water in packages. It is \$8 for 24 bottles of water. That works out to 33c a bottle. Stick 10c on that—10c on every one of those 24 bottles in that pack—and that is a 30 per cent increase in the price of water.

Hon Darren West: You get it back.

Hon PETER KATSAMBANIS: I will get there. People are saying, “Pay it up-front and get it back.” Somehow or other people get it back. We are told that along the way this refund will become pocket money for kids or it will create another industry for people. I will tell members which industry it does create. This has occurred in South Australia, which has had a scheme for a little while. It encourages people to rummage through rubbish bins in the middle of the night. I have heard stories from friends in South Australia that they might be having a party at the back of the house and the bottle collectors come around, leaving a mess behind as they plough through the rubbish to pick up beer bottles and water bottles that have been discarded. That is the behaviour such a scheme encourages.

Hon Stephen Dawson; Hon Martin Aldridge; Hon Peter Katsambanis; Hon Martin Pritchard; President; Hon Dr Sally Talbot

Hon Martin Aldridge in his contribution alluded to the fact that sometimes in remote communities, where I understand the disposal of waste is a genuine, legitimate issue, often people may not have direct access to the exchange scheme. They may have bought the products in town and taken them home. What are they going to do with them—store them for weeks or months until they find a place where they can get their money back? If this scheme is going to genuinely create an industry, if it is going to stimulate jobs, it means that people will collect these bottles and take them to waste facilities. If people buy the bottle and then take it back and exchange it for another, the supposed job-creation scheme is not going to happen. There is completely conflicting evidence as to what it is going to do for that side of it. The reality is that for most people this scheme would mean an increase in the cost of buying everyday products. People say this scheme is popular—of course. We could poll people with the question, “Do you think a container deposit scheme would be a good idea to increase recycling in Australia and eliminate waste?” People listen to the buzz words. They would tick “recycling” and “eliminate waste” and the result would be yes, they were all in favour of that. However, if they were asked if they would like to see a carton of beer go up by \$2.40 in the vain hope that that extra charge would somehow or other end up reducing waste, we would quickly find that that response might not be as positive as it would be if the question were framed the other way—that is, around a bottle of milk or any other containers, be they juice or water or anything else. Where do we draw the line? What containers do we tax? What containers do we not tax? Do we tax Vegemite jars? They are containers; they can be disposed of. Where do we draw the line? How many of these things will be taxed?

I am convinced that if the government introduced a container deposit scheme, it would be an increase in taxes on ordinary Australians. I am not convinced about the rest of the equation. We encourage recycling. I think we do a pretty good job. Surveys show that about 98 per cent of Australians claim that they recycle on a weekly or daily basis, and that is good.

Point of Order

Hon MARTIN PRITCHARD: I am hoping that this is a point of order. I have been listening to Hon Peter Katsambanis and trying to work out whether he supports the amendment. I was wondering whether you could address that, Mr President.

Several members interjected.

The PRESIDENT: Order! It is a valid query. I am not sure that it is a point of order, but it is a valid question.

Hon PETER KATSAMBANIS: Thank you, Mr President.

Several members interjected.

The PRESIDENT: Order! The very strict interpretation of this amendment would be only the change in emphasis from condemning the government for something to encouraging the government for something. Essentially, the words of the amendment are pretty much the same as the original motion; therefore, it is a bit hard to draw a definitive line. A member can get up and speak and still leave us confused about their position. That is out of my hands; it is in the hands of the member speaking!

Debate Resumed

Hon PETER KATSAMBANIS: If Hon Martin Pritchard wants to refer to *Hansard* and what I said earlier, let the record show that I made my position perfectly clear. I said that I am extremely happy for the government to consider this scheme. I then went on to say, and I am continuing to say, the reasons that I am not convinced that this scheme is a good idea and why upon consideration it should be implemented. I have every right to say that and I intend to say that. If members want to take frivolous points of order that will extend the time, that is up to them.

As I was saying—I do not want to labour the point—I understand the first part about having a container deposit scheme. I understand the imposition of a cost and a charge on every single Australian every time he or she buys a drink container of any type. I understand that in the case of a 24-pack of water, there will be a 30 per cent increase, paid upfront, in the vain hope that somehow it will come back if the scavengers do not take the bottle, if people forget it or do not bother and throw it in the bin. As I said, Australian Bureau of Statistics prove that the vast majority of Australians say that they recycle and use their recycling bins at home. We complain about recycling rates. I note that Hon Amber-Jade Sanderson was getting very pent up about our horrible record of recycling. The City of Stirling, which is generally a good council, told people that it was collecting their stuff from their verges and bins every single week and embarking on a massive recycling drive. All the good people of the City of Stirling put out their waste to be collected by the City of Stirling in the expectation that it would be recycled. They did that in good faith. It was discovered that for a long time the City of Stirling had not been recycling; it was sending the waste to landfill. Why are we going to blame the public? Why are we going to tax

Hon Stephen Dawson; Hon Martin Aldridge; Hon Peter Katsambanis; Hon Martin Pritchard; President; Hon Dr Sally Talbot

the public because of the way that local government, in that particular case—I am sure that if we examined it, there would probably be other examples—took the public for a ride. As I said, the City of Stirling generally does a good job, but it is acknowledged by everyone that in that case it was a massive failure. When we look at recycling rates, let us not blame the public, because maybe it is not the public's fault.

I have only a short time available. South Australia is held out as the panacea. Before Christmas I had the unfortunate need to travel through South Australia to attend the funeral of my godfather being his only real remaining relative in Australia. I drove along Spencer Highway, which is the national highway that extends north from Adelaide to Port Pirie. The amount of litter on the road was no different from the amount of litter that can be seen on regional roads in Western Australia, New South Wales and Victoria. I saw papers, discarded bottles, potato chip packets and chocolate wrappers floating around. That is significant litter. If we really want to reduce waste, why do we not expand the taxing regime to cover all the bits of rubbish that are thrown out of a car window? Why focus only on bottles, because even then it will not have an impact? From what I observed in South Australia, bottles are strewn along the roads having been discarded by drivers or people walking along the road. I am sure that someone will collect them, but that happens here too.

We are always going to agree to disagree on these things. A lot of these things are feel-good factors. Yes, we feel good because we are going to get people to recycle waste—fantastic, we are already doing that. We should be doing a better job. Let us look at the reasons that Western Australia does not have a good a rate of recycling compared with Victoria and New South Wales, which still does not have a container deposit scheme. The New South Wales scheme will be introduced next year, but already it has a significantly higher rate of recycling than Western Australia does. Why do we not examine those factors to allow us to reduce or eliminate waste in a better way? Why look at a tax? It is because it is easy and simple and because it has become a bit totemic. Unfortunately just because it is easy, simple and totemic, it does not sway me. If consideration of a container deposit scheme happens because this motion succeeds, I will continue to examine the information provided to me and I will take a critical view about whether container deposit schemes really lead to a reduction in waste and benefit the public or whether they are another money-go-round to create another great big bureaucracy that serves that bureaucracy very well and makes the proponents of the scheme feel fuzzy and warm inside, but imposes another great, big, fat tax on the public.

HON SALLY TALBOT (South West) [1.57 pm]: Labor will not support the amendment. I listened very carefully to the argument put by Hon Martin Aldridge. I am sorry that this is a topic about which he does not know more or feel able to make more informed comments. I can tell Hon Martin Aldridge that everybody in his electorate knows what a container deposit scheme is and the majority of people in his electorate actually want one. That is a real shame. I urge Hon Martin Aldridge to pay a bit more attention to what he hears when he is out and about in his electorate.

Although I absolutely accept your ruling, Mr President, that the content of the amendment does not infringe the standing order that we cannot negate a proposition with an amendment, WA Labor wants to condemn the government, including the National Party that is a coalition partner in this government. The National Party has sat around the cabinet table for eight very, very long years and no action has been taken in the face of overwhelming community support for a container deposit scheme. All that has happened since September 2008, since the Nationals joined with the Liberals to form a conservative government in this state, is that we have gone backwards both in our rate of recycling and in the slow and tortuous path towards putting a container deposit scheme in place.

Hon Martin Aldridge: It's about time you were recycled.

Hon SALLY TALBOT: We have done that joke because I said that about that rubbish that we just had. It was an absolute disgrace to have that speech by Hon Peter Katsambanis read into *Hansard*. Of course, he very deliberately did not take any interjections during his speech because that would have pointed out that there was uproar on this side of the house for the whole 20 minutes or so that Hon Peter Katsambanis was spouting such utter rubbish, such completely unsubstantiated propositions about the effect of a container deposit scheme, the amount of rubbish around the place and the fact that container deposit schemes do not do anything to increase recycling rates or reduce the amount of rubbish that goes into landfill.

Several members interjected.

The ACTING PRESIDENT (Hon Alanna Clohesy): Order, members! Hon Sally Talbot has the call.

Hon SALLY TALBOT: Thank you, Madam Acting President.

That is absolute nonsense. In my contribution to the debate, I laid out the statistics on all these issues. I urge anyone who follows this discussion at a later date in *Hansard*, or perhaps, if they are a real political tragic, are listening to it live, to go back to those facts and figures. I feel sorry for the electors of Hillarys, who are going to be subjected to this nonsense from the Liberal candidate for the next 12 months until they can make —

Extract from *Hansard*
[COUNCIL — Wednesday, 24 February 2016]
p683c-690a

Hon Stephen Dawson; Hon Martin Aldridge; Hon Peter Katsambanis; Hon Martin Pritchard; President; Hon Dr Sally Talbot

Hon Darren West: I don't think he's the Liberal candidate.

Hon SALLY TALBOT: I do not know what he is. Clearly, there is some kind of agenda on the other side of the chamber, because absolute nonsense is being spruiked by the Liberal and National Party members. They do not know very much about what is going on—this is the first they have heard about the fact that container deposit schemes are a good thing. So, no, Madam Acting President, we will not be supporting the amendment.

Visitors — Presbyterian Ladies' College

THE ACTING PRESIDENT (Hon Alanna Clohesy): This might be an appropriate time to acknowledge the presence in the gallery of students and staff from Presbyterian Ladies' College. You are very welcome.

Members: Hear, hear!

Division

Amendment put and a division taken, the Acting President (Hon Alanna Clohesy) casting her vote with the noes, with the following result —

Ayes (18)

Hon Martin Aldridge
Hon Ken Baston
Hon Liz Behjat
Hon Jim Chown
Hon Peter Collier

Hon Brian Ellis
Hon Donna Faragher
Hon Nick Goiran
Hon Dave Grills
Hon Nigel Hallett

Hon Col Holt
Hon Peter Katsambanis
Hon Mark Lewis
Hon Rick Mazza
Hon Robyn McSweeney

Hon Michael Mischin
Hon Helen Morton
Hon Phil Edman (*Teller*)

Noes (11)

Hon Robin Chapple
Hon Alanna Clohesy
Hon Stephen Dawson

Hon Kate Doust
Hon Sue Ellery
Hon Lynn MacLaren

Hon Martin Pritchard
Hon Amber-Jade Sanderson
Hon Sally Talbot

Hon Ken Travers
Hon Samantha Rowe (*Teller*)

Pairs

Hon Alyssa Hayden
Hon Paul Brown

Hon Darren West
Hon Adele Farina

Question thus passed.

Motion, as Amended

Question put and passed.