

Mr Eric Ripper; Deputy Speaker; Mr Mark McGowan; Mr Chris Tallentire; Mr David Templeman; Mr Mick Murray; Mr John Hyde; Mr Bill Marmion; Acting Speaker; Dr Kim Hames; Mr Roger Cook

CONTAINER DEPOSIT AND RECOVERY SCHEME BILL 2011

As to Appropriations — Motion

MR E.S. RIPPER (Belmont — Leader of the Opposition) [4.27 pm]: I move —

That this house calls on the Premier to seek a message from the Governor recommending that appropriations be made for the Container Deposit and Recovery Scheme Bill 2011 and that the government endorses the bill.

Some time ago, I introduced into this house the Container Deposit and Recovery Scheme Bill 2011. The advice I have received indicates that aspects of the bill are thought to include the concept of appropriations, and such a bill cannot come to a vote in the house without a Governor's message being available to the house. This raises two issues in my mind. The first is that a very good piece of legislation cannot proceed. The second is that even if members of the house have different opinions about the merits or otherwise of container deposit legislation, they will not be able to register those opinions in a vote unless we get a Governor's message. I therefore want to argue that the government should provide that Governor's message, for two reasons. The first is so that we can, hopefully, get support for this bill across the house, and it can be carried by the house. The second is so that, even if we cannot get support for the bill across the house, we can have a proper debate on the bill, and members can formally record their positions for or against the legislation.

I suspect that the government does not want that to happen. I suspect that the government does not support container deposit legislation. I suspect that it therefore does not want its members to vote for the bill. But in the Western Australian community, there is substantial support for this type of legislation. The government also does not want its members to vote against the bill. It does not want its members to vote for the bill and it does not want its members to vote against the bill. So the current situation in which there is no Governor's message and subsequently no vote on the second reading is very comfortable and convenient for government members, because they can avoid having to declare themselves as individuals on an issue on which the government wants to go one way and the community wants to go the other way. We want members to declare their position. In effect, they would be declaring their position by how they vote for this motion. If they vote against this motion, they will be voting against even the possibility of the house voting for the Container Deposit and Recovery Scheme Bill 2011. They can be assured that we will explain the implications of their vote to their community.

Let me now remind members of some of the merits of a container deposit scheme. In Western Australia we have a miserable rate of recycling cans and bottles. We have a rate of recycling cans and bottles of only 20 per cent. It is one of the lowest rates—probably the lowest rate—of all the states. We can raise that recycling rate from 20 per cent to 70 per cent if we have a container deposit scheme. Container deposit schemes have worked successfully in South Australia and will soon be working in the Northern Territory. The opponents of container deposit schemes will say that it will increase the cost of beverages. We are proposing a modest 10c deposit. That 10c deposit is of course refundable when the container is returned.

Dr K.D. Hames: Can I assume that you've changed your mind since you and Hon Judy Edwards were on the Select Committee on Recycling and Waste Management, which I chaired and which recommended against container deposit legislation?

Mr E.S. RIPPER: I understand that the working report supported container deposit legislation. I think the work in 2007, as I recall, supported container deposit legislation.

The opponents will say that there will be an increase in the cost of beverages. The answer to that is that of course the deposit is refundable. The cost of administration and the other costs for the beverage industry amount to about half a cent per container. It is a very small cost per container for the beverage industry. We have compared the prices of beverages in South Australia with the prices of beverages in Western Australia and we have found no difference between the prices; in fact, to the extent that there are small differences, we have found that the South Australian prices are lower than the Western Australian prices. It is pretty clear from the point of view of consumers that the national beverage industry will largely absorb the cost and will not increase prices.

There are also countervailing benefits for consumers. Consumers pay for the cost of landfill through their rubbish charges at a local government level. If we increase the recycling rate for beverage containers from 20 per cent to 70 per cent, we will significantly reduce the amount of waste going to landfill. That will reduce the costs to local government of providing for landfill, and we would hope that local government would pass on those cost reductions to households. Provided that local government passes on those cost reductions to householders, the average family will benefit by approximately \$10 a year. That takes account of any additional cost that families might face at the other end. There would be a net benefit to householders of a modest amount; nevertheless, it would be a net benefit of \$10 a year as a result of the reduction in landfill costs.

Mr Eric Ripper; Deputy Speaker; Mr Mark McGowan; Mr Chris Tallentire; Mr David Templeman; Mr Mick Murray; Mr John Hyde; Mr Bill Marmion; Acting Speaker; Dr Kim Hames; Mr Roger Cook

One of the things that bedevil kerbside recycling and councils' efforts at the moment is the presence of broken glass in recycling bins. Broken glass in recycling bins makes the whole of the contents of that bin unusable from a recycling point of view. What then happens is that all that recycling load, which the householder may have diligently sorted, goes off to landfill. If we get the glass out of the kerbside recycling, we will therefore reduce the likelihood of broken glass in the kerbside recycling and we will increase the efficiency of kerbside recycling. There are benefits for local government in reduced landfill costs and in the improved operation of kerbside recycling.

People need only drive around this state to see the litter problem we have. The government knows that there is a litter problem. That is why the government has brought into this house legislation to significantly increase the penalties for littering. I think that legislation will be much less effective than container deposit legislation. If we really want to clean up the parks, the streets and the highways of this state, we need a container deposit scheme. What we do with such a scheme is mobilise the whole state to work together to clean up the state. There is nothing like a 10c deposit to bring people to the task of working together to clean up the state. Think about how much easier it will be for those people running big events, which typically result in huge amounts of rubbish being left around afterwards. Think about how much easier it will be for those people when a container deposit scheme is in place. I would expect much less of a problem after an event such as the sky show, a major sporting event or a major concert if a container deposit scheme is in place.

There is one additional benefit that I want to refer to—that is, the possibility for community groups to make significant amounts of money by participating in the collection of recycled containers. My understanding is that the scouts in South Australia raise millions of dollars by collecting cans and bottles and redeeming them for the deposit. As well as individuals exercising their commitment to the environment and reclaiming the 10c deposit, community groups will use this as a significant fundraising opportunity. I think that is a big community benefit that we should factor into our calculations. We have to take account of the opportunity for those community groups to make significant benefits as a result of this scheme.

People might ask: how will the administration of the scheme be funded, and will there not be an additional cost on taxpayers? As a matter of fact, the idea that appropriations might be required could give people the idea that this will somehow be a burden on the public purse.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: If people want to have meetings, can they please have them outside. Carry on, Leader of the Opposition.

Mr E.S. RIPPER: It is distracting me, Mr Deputy Speaker.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Yes, it is very distracting, Leader of the Opposition, and it has not stopped for about 10 minutes. Carry on.

Mr E.S. RIPPER: Although there is a significant increase in the recycling rate from 20 per cent to 70 per cent with the introduction of container deposit schemes, it is also the case that some people do not redeem the bottles and cans for which they have paid a deposit. It is those unredeemed deposits that provide the funding stream for the administration of the scheme. Our bill proposes that the Waste Authority receive the deposits from the beverage wholesalers and the beverage industry and that the unredeemed deposits be the funding stream that enables the Waste Authority to administer the scheme. In the end, the scheme would pay for itself and there would be no need for appropriations. I do not have a budget amount for that, but one of my colleagues in the debate may be able to provide that figure for the education of members. However, we must debate the bill so that we can deal with the details.

Mr R.F. Johnson: You should have debated the bill before you started asking for the money. Don't you accept that?

Mr E.S. RIPPER: Private members' bills do not normally get a Governor's message. Because our bill does not draw on the public purse, one might think at first glance that it does not need a Governor's message, but we have received advice that it does, and therefore we are telling the government to get a Governor's message so that we can get the bill through the house or, at the very least, get the Governor's message so that we can have a proper debate on the bill and have everyone declare their position on it rather than on the motion.

Mr R.F. Johnson: If this motion is defeated, there is not much point in carrying on with the debate on the bill, is there?

Mr E.S. RIPPER: If this motion is defeated, we will bring on the debate on the container deposit legislation, we will tell the community what the government has done and we will campaign for the government to change its mind. An issue of great importance is the strong public opinion in support of this type of scheme. The government should check what the stated public opinion on this issue is. It will find that there is overwhelming

Mr Eric Ripper; Deputy Speaker; Mr Mark McGowan; Mr Chris Tallentire; Mr David Templeman; Mr Mick Murray; Mr John Hyde; Mr Bill Marmion; Acting Speaker; Dr Kim Hames; Mr Roger Cook

public support for the scheme. The government is flying in the face of overwhelming public support, and it should be very careful when it does that.

Mr W.R. Marmion: And your bill is the best, is it?

Mr E.S. RIPPER: I believe that we have a very strong bill. If the Minister for Environment thinks it needs to be amended, he should propose some amendments and we can debate them. That is the proper way to deal with it. I think the minister will say that the government is having discussions with the other state governments and the federal government and that there might be a national scheme in due course, but we cannot wait for that. That will take years. That is pie in the sky. The states and the national government have been talking about this for a very long time. If we have a scheme, it must be similar to the schemes operating in South Australia and the Northern Territory. I believe that the scheme proposed in this bill is better than the scheme operating in South Australia because our scheme will be run by the Waste Authority, which is a government agency, rather than the private sector. Because it is run by the Waste Authority, there will be a greater guarantee of providing better coverage across the suburbs and regional areas of the state. I think people will be attracted by the ability to use reverse vending machines in shopping centres where they can put in a used can and get back a voucher or a deposit. That sort of mechanism will make the scheme quite convenient and attractive for customers. It is not as though members of the public need much persuasion on this issue. I am sure that when government members talk to their constituents, they will find that there is support for this scheme. Before government members vote on this motion, they might like to think about that. If they vote to deny getting a Governor's message for this bill, we will take *Hansard* to the constituents of each government member and show them the vote and explain to them that the member is standing in the way of something that the community wants.

This bill is good for the environment, it will have cost savings for householders and it is good for local government and community groups. It is a sensible, robust scheme that will be convenient for consumers and will be better than the scheme operating in South Australia, which has already demonstrated over many years that the principle of these schemes works well in practice. I urge the government to support this motion.

MR M. McGOWAN (Rockingham) [4.45 pm]: I will speak briefly on this motion to explain to members exactly what we are dealing with so that they understand what is going on. We are, of course, dealing with this matter in private members' business, which is predominantly opposition time. This is an opportunity for members to support a Governor's message so that the Container Deposit and Recovery Scheme Bill 2011 that was introduced by the Leader of the Opposition on 19 October can be brought to a conclusion. That is what it is. This is an opportunity for Parliament to exercise its democratic vote and for all members to bring this matter to a conclusion. It is unusual to seek a Governor's message on these types of matters. I do not recall having done it before. Apparently a Governor's message is needed to put forward a bill that requires an appropriation from Treasury. On the face of it no-one would have thought that the container deposit legislation would have required an appropriation from Treasury. I would have thought it was self-funding —

Mr J.E. McGrath: What if the public takes a while to pick it up? You have to set up all the infrastructure.

Mr M. McGOWAN: That might be a legitimate argument. In any event, I would have thought that the house could have voted on it without a Governor's message, but if we require a Governor's message, we require a Governor's message. However, we are not actually voting on the bill; we are voting on the opportunity to vote on the bill. That is what this debate is about. We on this side support container deposit legislation, and I supported it as the Minister for the Environment. It is difficult to bring into operation —

Dr K.D. Hames: Why didn't you do it?

Mr M. McGOWAN: I was the environment minister for only a year, but I progressed it and the Waste Avoidance and Resource Recovery Bill 2007—I may even have brought the waste bill to a conclusion.

Mr D.A. Templeman: No.

Mr M. McGOWAN: Was that the member for Mandurah?

Dr K.D. Hames: The member for Mandurah did not progress the work that you had done on container deposits.

Mr M. McGOWAN: No, he did not. That is another black mark against his name!

In any event, this is an extension of what was contained in the waste bill. The waste bill had what is called "extended producer responsibility". The idea behind that is to safely dispose of or re-use some materials, particularly tyres and batteries, that are dangerous to the environment. This bill is an extension of that process but on a far bigger scale. All containers that are either hazardous to the environment or are able to be recycled will be recycled compulsorily, or virtually compulsorily. In fact, it is more of an incentive for individuals to

Mr Eric Ripper; Deputy Speaker; Mr Mark McGowan; Mr Chris Tallentire; Mr David Templeman; Mr Mick Murray; Mr John Hyde; Mr Bill Marmion; Acting Speaker; Dr Kim Hames; Mr Roger Cook

ensure that containers are recycled. These sorts of measures were around in the past. Anyone over the age of the member for South Perth will remember that well. Indeed, he looks a little bit like he has been recycled himself!

Dr K.D. Hames: We used to get money for Coke bottles when we were kids. There used to be deposit legislation on cool-drink bottles.

Mr M. McGOWAN: I am not sure whether it was legislation. I think the schemes were run by the drink companies. When I was a kid living in New South Wales, I went the footy—or rugby league—and the bottle system was in place. Each bottle returned 5c, and I can guarantee members that there were no bottles in the bins. There were no wasted bottles where I grew up. That is what we want to put in place on a grand scale in Western Australia. All the arguments run by the people opposed to it will be that it will increase costs and it will knock over some of those kerbside recycling schemes, for example. But I think all the evidence, in particular from South Australia, is that those arguments do not carry any weight. The South Australian scheme works. The costs of products that are recycled are not any higher, and kerbside recycling still works. I do not have the figures before me, but tens of thousands of tonnes of additional waste will be recycled if this scheme is put in place. We want to put in place that system. We introduced legislation and extensive work was done on it, in particular by a committee chaired by the member for Perth when the former government was in office. In light of the waste bill, the system was progressed. This is the natural extension of the process set up by the waste bill for extended producer responsibility.

However, this motion is not to discuss all those issues; it is to allow the house to debate them. I indicate to government members that after this vote, we would like this matter to come to a conclusion. We would like it to be successful. But, unfortunately, we are down the important vote of the member for Pilbara, who is not with us. I do not know where he is. I am sure he is a lot happier where he is than he would be if he were here.

Mr J.E. McGrath: Where is he?

Mr M. McGOWAN: He is not with us.

Dr K.D. Hames: Who is it?

Mr M. McGOWAN: The member for Pilbara. He is not with us, but were he with us, I am sure he would be quite happy to support us. In any event, we would like to see this matter brought to a conclusion so that we can get on and debate the real Container Deposit and Recovery Scheme Bill 2011, which we will do in any event after this matter has been concluded.

MR C.J. TALLENTIRE (Gosnells) [4.51 pm]: I am very pleased to speak to this motion calling on the house to ensure that the Premier seek a message from the Governor recommending that appropriations be made for the Container Deposit and Recovery Scheme Bill 2011 and that the government endorse it. I was reminded of the need for the urgency of this bill when I was out cycling on the weekend and yet again got another puncture caused by glass. It does not happen to just me; all cyclists are suffering from this problem. That is why members opposite will find the bike shops in their electorates have petitions calling for this container recycling scheme. They vote Liberal; they vote Labor; and they vote for the Greens. The cycling community votes for all parties but I think they will come over to us on this issue. They will see that if members opposite do not support this legislation, their only hope for glass-free cycling on the roads in future will be through supporting Labor.

The bill is not just about making the lives of cyclists easier to manage; it is about also improving the sense of security that people feel in our community. What is worse than seeing the footpaths strewn with shrouds of glass? People feel a sense of danger when they walk along footpaths where smashed glass is under foot. We can hear the crunch of smashed glass as we walk along. That is disturbing to anyone. It was the experience my neighbour and I had when we walked to the train station this morning. As we walked along a walkway down to the Thornlie train station, we saw smashed glass. I have reported the matter; it was there on the weekend and it is still there now. It is a constant problem. If we want to clean up the streets of Perth of smashed glass, this is the way to do it.

I am sure some people still do not bother to collect their empty bottles. Under this legislation, people will come by and pick up the empty bottles before they are smashed and become a hazard to people, who want to feel they can walk around in safety without the risk of treading on glass. The need for a container deposit scheme is many faceted. Of course, the case outlined by the Leader of the Opposition was the economic and environmental case. We must get in place the critical mass to enable a viable recycling scheme. At the moment the volume of cans and bottles that are recycled does not provide a sufficient mass for that good, vibrant resource recovery program for bottles and cans. Under this scheme we will switch to a volume that will enable industries to be profitable and make good money out of the recycling of bottles and cans. The legislation is well designed. But, of course, I am speaking now to the motion to seek a message from the Governor. While the legislation has been designed to be cost neutral, understandably, there will be some initial setting-up costs that will require funds, and that has

Mr Eric Ripper; Deputy Speaker; Mr Mark McGowan; Mr Chris Tallentire; Mr David Templeman; Mr Mick Murray; Mr John Hyde; Mr Bill Marmion; Acting Speaker; Dr Kim Hames; Mr Roger Cook

triggered the need to seek a message from the Governor. I think the arguments that we establish a scheme are compelling. That is understood; it occurs in many other cases. When we establish a new scheme we have to invest and provide the funds so that the bureaucracy can work on the final details of the scheme. We have to enable promotion of the scheme so that the community understands how it will work and perhaps provide the essential infrastructure until private investors can invest in things such as the reverse vending machines I spoke of previously. They are machines designed so that when we want to return empty containers, we can put them into the machine and receive a chit of paper that will entitle us to a refund on the value of the containers we put into the machine. Those machines are deployed elsewhere in the world and work extremely well. They are a very efficient way of enabling people to get their due refund on returning their bottles and cans.

We have heard much about how good the South Australian scheme is. It is indeed a good scheme. We can see the difference between the footpaths and roadsides in South Australia and those in Western Australia. By comparison, our Western Australian roads are dirty and dangerous. The cans we see on the side of the road quite often trap wildlife. It is an unfortunate fact that we sometimes see lizards, attracted to the sugars in the drink, crawling into half-empty cans of coke or some other soft drink, but then they get trapped inside. That sort of thing could be phased out if we were to introduce this scheme. We have heard from Ian Kiernan, the founder of Clean Up Australia, how much of a problem bottles and cans are. They dominate those Clean Up Australia Days; they are an absolute disgrace. Unfortunately, very powerful corporations that are involved in the beverage industry make huge profits while not taking responsibility for the waste product that is associated with their profit-making activity. That is quite unacceptable. We could say that they make a profit out of polluting our environment. That has to stop, and we have the perfect mechanism for it under this legislation. With a container deposit scheme we can ensure that the producers of the beverages—those companies that make profits—will be held accountable for their product through its full lifecycle. That is the point we want to get to. We want to be at a point at which we can say that somebody making profit out of a product is responsible for the product throughout its lifecycle. That seems like a very reasonable position for us to take. It sounds like a reasonable place for our whole business community to move towards. I think it is the foundation of a sustainable society in which manufacturers of products take responsibility for their products through their full lifecycle. It means an incentive is built into the system that requires manufacturers of products to design their products in such a way that there is minimal waste, and it is easy for consumers, in this case, to return the used products so that they are not left on roadsides.

I think the motion before the house is essential. It will enable the bill presented by the Leader of the Opposition, which was, I think, initially drafted by Hon Sally Talbot from the other place. It is an excellent piece of legislation. It is a piece of legislation that has wide community support. All the survey work on this shows broad community support for a container deposit scheme. We know that there is something like 90 per cent support, and that has been consistent over the years as well. I am aware of a 2007 Newspoll survey that showed there was about 90 per cent support for the scheme. The test was even done with the actual deposit being in the order of a 20c deposit, and there was still very, very high support for the scheme. Labor proposes a 10c deposit. That deposit is refunded to people as soon as they return the beverage container, and there is no extra cost to consumers. In fact, the way the system works, we have calculated that the saving to householders will be about \$10 a year overall. That is how it would work. This is a self-funding scheme that has the beauty to it that the administration of the scheme can be paid through the small percentage of bottles and cans—beverage containers—that are not returned. The international experience is that around 14 per cent of beverage containers are not returned and the deposit is not redeemed, and that is where the funds are acquired to pay for the administration of the scheme. It is a very well designed scheme. I have heard many members allude to former schemes during the course of the debate. We all recall similar schemes that existed years ago. For many of us it was an activity of our youth to raise pocket money by walking along roadsides and in parks looking for discarded bottles. We were able to return those bottles to the local corner store and be given enough of a refund that we would be able to buy some lollies or some other confectionery from the local store. Such is the way that we supplemented our pocket money. These schemes are immensely popular. They are a perfect way of helping tidy up our streets.

Mr J.M. Francis: Is the 10c amount set in the bill? Is the amount of 10c actually specified in the bill or is it something that you are going to recommend can be changed? If it is set at 10c, is there a mechanism to increase it at a later stage?

Mr C.J. TALLENTIRE: From memory—I do not have the bill in front of me now—it is 10c and I think that it is set at 10c.

Mr J.M. Francis: The Leader of the Opposition made the point that at the moment people go to Skyworks and just drop bottles and cans, but that if they were worth a small amount, they would not do that. I am not saying

Mr Eric Ripper; Deputy Speaker; Mr Mark McGowan; Mr Chris Tallentire; Mr David Templeman; Mr Mick Murray; Mr John Hyde; Mr Bill Marmion; Acting Speaker; Dr Kim Hames; Mr Roger Cook

that is right or wrong, but I suggest that people will not pick up a bottle at Skyworks for the sake of 10c. Is there a mechanism in it—you do not have to answer the question now—for it to —

Mr A.J. Waddell: Yes, the regulations will allow it to go up.

Mr J.M. Francis: The regulations will allow it to go up—okay. I would suggest—I am just asking for comment—that would it not be the case that in order for something like this to work, it would need to have an impact on cost? The amount that you set it at actually has to be worth something for people to take the time to —

Mr C.J. TALLENTIRE: Thank you, member; the sorts of questions the member asks will be tackled during consideration in detail. I can point to clause 7(b) of the bill that outlines what the deposit will be and what the mechanism will be for increasing it.

The information that we have—I have mentioned a Newspoll survey and other surveys that have since been done—indicates that a 10c deposit would be a very effective level. I might draw the member’s attention to the fact that until quite recently—about four years ago—the South Australian deposit was only 5c. It only recently increased the deposit to 10c, which seems to be the optimum level. As I have also said, the acceptability of a 20c deposit was tested, and the acceptance was very high as well; in the order of 87 per cent of respondents to a Newspoll survey felt that a 20c deposit level would have been okay.

Mr J.M. Francis: In Western Australia?

Mr C.J. TALLENTIRE: In Western Australia. However, 10c works; so why go higher? If that can do it, it is perfectly adequate.

Looking at the detail of the legislation, as some members are obviously keen to do, the beverage container environmental levy account fund will act as the central repository for the funds. Producers and/or importers of beverage products will have to pay the deposit amount into that account, and that is the point from which the funds are drawn to refund consumers. That is how the money turns around. It is a very neat way of doing things. I suppose members may say, “But surely this is going to inflate the cost of beverages.” As I think my colleagues have indicated, that is not the experience; it just does not happen. The fact is that a person who buys a soft drink in South Australia today pays exactly the same amount as a person who buys one in Western Australia today. The beverage industry has the capacity to work this deposit into its cost structure in such a way that it does not lose sales and it does not add extra to the cost of the product, and it enables us to have cleaner streets, cleaner parks, cleaner communities and a cleaner environment. We are moving forward to a situation in which producers are taking responsibility for the lifecycle of their product. This is a great way of demonstrating what full lifecycle management of products should be. There is absolutely no reason for us to not progress this measure. We just need to make sure that in terms of the administrative arrangements for getting things through this house, we put the necessary arrangements in place. That is why I come back to supporting the motion put forward by the Leader of the Opposition today to seek that message from the Governor recommending that appropriations be made for the Container Deposit and Recovery Scheme Bill 2011 and that the government endorses the bill. I will conclude my remarks now, but I look forward to getting into the sort of detail that I hear other members are keen to discuss.

MR D.A. TEMPLEMAN (Mandurah) [5.07 pm]: I would like to make a comment on the motion moved by the Leader of the Opposition. Before I do that, I think members are aware of the major fire in the South West of the state. I understand that a number of houses have been lost. I am sure all members’ thoughts are with the communities affected by the fires and with the personnel who are fighting the fires. I am sure our thoughts are with all the people in those communities, and that we all wish for those fires to be extinguished as soon as possible and certainly that no more damage is experienced. I hope that there has been no loss of life or injury to any person. Our thoughts are with all those people.

The motion introduced is effectively a procedural motion about the need for the government to seek a message from the Governor for an appropriation to accommodate the Container Deposit and Recovery Scheme Bill.

I want to go through a bit of history because, like the member for Rockingham, I also was an environment minister in the previous government—from 2007 to 2008, for just over 18 months. I just want to make sure that people are aware of the process and where we have come from in terms of trying to achieve for the state a container deposit scheme. The member for Rockingham is right: it is not a scheme that can be implemented without doing all the important work in assessing how the scheme will operate and how it can be ensured that the community will get maximum benefit from it.

When I was minister during that period, I initiated the Western Australia and Queensland partnership, which I think the current minister might be aware of. Western Australia and Queensland had carriage of a range of things related to a container deposit scheme, particularly from a national perspective. I think the ideal is a national

Mr Eric Ripper; Deputy Speaker; Mr Mark McGowan; Mr Chris Tallentire; Mr David Templeman; Mr Mick Murray; Mr John Hyde; Mr Bill Marmion; Acting Speaker; Dr Kim Hames; Mr Roger Cook

scheme. Quite frankly, we will not get one. Unfortunately, it is not only because we have various different governments and different parties in power across the country now but also because we have different philosophies and recycling programs that vary in their effectiveness and success. The telling thing about Western Australia is that our recycling rates are the lowest in the country. That trend has continued, unfortunately. A container deposit scheme for beverage containers is, in my view, the best way to not only lift recycling rates of those particular containers but also continue to develop a culture of genuine recycling throughout our community, because in many respects that culture still lags behind most of the other states and territories in Australia.

It is the opposition's view that waiting for a national answer is not achievable in the medium to long term. We will probably have more ministers than we have had over the past six to nine years going to ministerial councils, continuing to put the argument, but a national scheme will not be achieved. That is sad, because it would be the best scheme. It would ensure that there was a level playing field across all the states, because the reality is—I am sure the minister will know from his briefings on this—that the South Australian system, which has been in place since the 1970s, has operated because the government of the day that introduced it and successive South Australian governments have strongly supported it. But the key is that South Australians, as electors and members of their communities, strongly support it. When I was minister I visited South Australia. I would say to the minister that it is worth going across to South Australia, if he has not already. From memory, I went to South Australia in late 2007. I met obviously with all of the bureaucrats from the relevant South Australian departments, but I also went to a couple of the collection points or deposit points. Most of them were of a similar model. Basically people could pull up with their trailer, their car or their ute. They could have bags of bottles, cans or whatever. It was a very efficient system in which those bottles and cans were counted, and they would collect their deposit. I also spoke to members of a football club that had a system where they encouraged members to collect on behalf of the club so that the club would get the money.

Mr W.R. Marmion: The scouts.

Mr D.A. TEMPLEMAN: I think we met with the South Australian scouting association.

The evidence of community support has been mentioned by a number of members. I am not going to go over that. The percentages are higher than most questionnaires on public policy. Support has certainly not declined, to my knowledge. If anything, it has increased. What it means for retrieval rates is very strongly understood. Retrieval rates of 70 per cent and 80 per cent are remarkable when Western Australia has retrieval rates for beverage containers of 20 per cent or less.

Dr K.D. Hames: Can you explain what happened between the member for Rockingham saying he was preparing stuff and you coming in? What was it that stopped you being able to put it in in your time?

Mr D.A. TEMPLEMAN: I took the program to minco in late 2007, because in my view at that time a national scheme was the best option. I took to minco a motion that was supported, which established Western Australia and Queensland jointly having carriage of developing a national scheme.

Mr J.E. McGrath: Why would a national scheme be better than having state ones?

Mr D.A. TEMPLEMAN: A national scheme would be better because a national scheme would be uniform across Australia. That means that there would be a deposit scheme in every state or territory. A culture would naturally develop such as has developed in South Australia. I think recycling is innate for South Australians now. A number of South Australians in Mandurah have told me a number of times that they just cannot understand why we do not have the same system in WA.

Mr J.E. McGrath: When I was in Adelaide once, member, and wanted to look at it, I noticed a few hobos getting into bins in the city and pulling bottles out and things like that.

Mr D.A. TEMPLEMAN: The simple thing is that that would have been the best scheme. The political reality is that achieving that is difficult. Western Australia and Queensland were, if you like, charged with developing a national proposal.

Dr K.D. Hames interjected.

Mr D.A. TEMPLEMAN: If I can just finish. I will be very interested in the minister's view on this.

We then went into 2008.

Mr J.E. McGrath: A very great year.

Mr D.A. TEMPLEMAN: Yes, it was a bit premature for us in the end. The realisation I was coming to as minister was that the progress of that joint approach was getting bogged down, quite honestly.

Mr Eric Ripper; Deputy Speaker; Mr Mark McGowan; Mr Chris Tallentire; Mr David Templeman; Mr Mick Murray; Mr John Hyde; Mr Bill Marmion; Acting Speaker; Dr Kim Hames; Mr Roger Cook

Mr J.E. McGrath: Who bogged it down?

Mr D.A. Templeman: As the member knows, we used to have three or four mincos a year. In fact, from memory, I did not get to the last minco of 2008 because the election had been called. I think I might have got only to 2009. It would have been the second minco of 2007 that set up the working team. I always remember that, because it was at the MCG. Then, I think in early 2008, there was a progress report—I am sure the minister would have the details from briefings from the department. But we never got to the second minco of 2008. That was a great regret of mine; I will be honest with members. One of my biggest regrets was that we could not achieve a national scheme. That underpins why Western Australia should be the second state in Australia to introduce a scheme of its own. There are interesting synergies of states that are adjacent to each other. We now have an opportunity to demonstrate some leadership as a state to go it alone, if you like, with South Australia.

Some important lessons can be learned from South Australia. I will be totally honest with members; there are some romantic views about schemes of this nature because a lot of people remember the deposit scheme of their childhood, which was a very different time. The deposit schemes in place then were not the same as the one proposed here, as such. Most of those schemes related to bottle-ohs and, usually, corner deli stores that distributed cool drink bottles. We have to remember that I do not think canned drinks even existed back then.

Mr W.R. Marmion: They had just come out.

Mr D.A. Templeman: That is right; they were only a new entity. There is some romanticism about this issue. We have to be very careful to remind ourselves that the container deposit scheme of our childhoods was from a different era and for a different product. There were no plastic milk bottles or containers for most beverages; most of it, if not all, was glass. With transportation costs and handling costs, glass was always more expensive because of volume and weight et cetera. I am very conscious of the romantic aspect of this. What we propose in the legislation is very much a modern approach to a national and international problem—that is, of course, how we ingrain in all our communities a culture of waste reduction, which is what the Waste Avoidance and Resource Recovery Act was all about. The WARR act was a landmark piece of legislation that the member for Rockingham tried to steal as his by claiming that he nursed it through the house.

Mr J.N. Hyde: You're kidding; he didn't!

Mr D.A. Templeman: He tried. He did not get very far, but he tried.

That is what the WARR act was all about. The reality is that humankind, particularly in the western world, has become so used to a throwaway society that it is now almost innate in those cultures for this to continue. We have only to see that amazing footage of the big whirlpool in the Pacific Ocean to realise the problem; the way in which the currents of the oceans in the Pacific come together creates a massive whirlpool of absolute flotsam and jetsam and rubbish. This is a wake-up call.

Of course, the government will not like that we have introduced this as a bill and that is probably the reason why government members will vote against it. However, there comes a time when we must acknowledge that it is more important to demonstrate leadership and to draw the line in the sand and say, "We have tried the national scheme and tried to get a national approach, but it is not going to happen. However, as Western Australians we can do it ourselves and we can learn from the experiences both in South Australia and internationally." We can look some of the retrieval options, such as the reverse vending machines that I saw when I travelled to Belgium, I think it was, and the Netherlands.

Mr J.E. McGrath: You were much travelled as a minister.

Mr D.A. Templeman: I was not, actually. If I had my time again, I would be far more travelled, like some of the current ministers; they are off on planes all the time—I cannot believe it. I think I made only one international trip.

Mr J.N. Hyde: May I interject? When you sit down, will I be next?

Mr D.A. Templeman: That is up to the member. The member for Perth is on the list for the container deposit legislation.

I will conclude here because we want to get on to the bill. This motion is a procedural motion in that it seeks a message from the Governor. I urge members opposite to not simply vote it down because they have been told to. Do not just knock it over. Let us be genuine. I put out a petition in my electorate for about two weeks and I got nearly 3 000 signatures. I was amazed at how many people were so keen to sign the petition and get it out to their groups, including cycling groups such as the one that the Deputy Premier and I are co-patrons of, the Over 55 Cycling Club. All those clubs strongly support this legislation. They understand that this is a real win-win situation. The Leader of the Opposition was spot on when he said that this bill delivers a win-win. It delivers a win-win for the environment, community organisations, community groups, scouts, sporting teams and those

Mr Eric Ripper; Deputy Speaker; Mr Mark McGowan; Mr Chris Tallentire; Mr David Templeman; Mr Mick Murray; Mr John Hyde; Mr Bill Marmion; Acting Speaker; Dr Kim Hames; Mr Roger Cook

sorts of groups. It is a win for the community because the community will feel good about their local environment because we will cut down on the amount of litter that might otherwise have been simply discarded on the side of the road or in our waterways. It is a win-win all round. It means that Western Australia would once again lead; that is a good thing for us. I ask those on the opposite side to not vote this down because they have been told to. Many members opposite have continued to tell us how independent they are. Some of them have acted independently, much to their demise in some respects.

Mr M. McGowan: “Detriment” is the word.

Mr D.A. TEMPLEMAN: Yes, it has been much to the detriment of some who have had the courage to cross the floor. I always refer to the member for Southern River. I told the Premier that there is a great saying of Henry II when the Archbishop of Canterbury was causing him all sorts of problems: “Will no-one rid me of this turbulent priest?” I thought that the Premier might have been thinking that about a particular member on his side during the debate on the Franchising Bill.

I think this is a good bill and it is an important message that we seek from the Governor. He is a very accommodating and generous Governor. I hope that members will support this motion.

MR M.P. MURRAY (Collie–Preston) [5.27 pm]: A lot has been said and much of it has been about how we should go forward. If I have seen one bill in this house that is popular right across the electorate, this is it. The appropriation for the Container Deposit and Recovery Scheme Bill 2011 should be recommended so that we can put the proper bill in place. It has probably been one of the most popular issues in my electorate. Even today a schoolteacher rang me from Donnybrook and asked who the kids can write letters to for this bill to be pushed forward. We are talking about the future and our youth. They do not want to see the rubbish and broken glass that is in our forests, along highways and down streets. I am sure many people who travel in country areas and see the reflection of broken glass along the highways would be very disappointed and certainly would like to see that stop. How do we do that? We introduce this bill.

I can understand why some in this house do not want the bill. I talked to the member for South Perth and I understand his trepidation; when he was a kid he got caught stealing bottles to sell. That is not really bad; it is recycling going around in circles. Let us think about the people who collect cans for the aluminium. There are plenty of them. We see them on the highways with bags over their shoulders. We will have clean roads and clean camping areas. People will collect for football clubs and environmental issues. Do members know what we will also see? With the way the economy is going under this government, we will see people collecting bottles so that they can pay their electricity bills! That is how bad it has become in this state. Here is an opportunity to get everyone on one side, but we are knocking it back.

Never in my 10 years in this Parliament, if I had gone out and surveyed everyone in my electorate, would I have had 90 per cent agreement that something should be done, no matter what political party I was a member of. Going back some time, I remember a poll being held in which 93 per cent of people polled said that they would support a bill such as this one in WA. It was great to hear the member for Mandurah’s comment that he did not know why this bill had taken this long. Why has this not been an Australian government issue in which the government puts in place blanket legislation across Australia? This issue is about our environment and it is about recycling in more ways than one. We should pick this bill up very quickly and get on with it. I do not want to leave this Parliament in another 20 years and say —

An opposition member interjected.

Mr M.P. MURRAY: Maybe in 20 years’ time or maybe in 15 years’ time!

I do not want to leave this Parliament and say we have not done it. This is one of the most asked questions. When I go to a barbecue and start talking about recycling, the first thing people ask me is, “Why haven’t you brought that bill in? It must be so simple—South Australia has it.” Our nearest neighbours are already working that way. On any bottle in that state it says that there is a refund available of 5c. People cannot understand why political parties have not embraced that idea.

Just to step back a little, as I was saying, I was talking to the member for South Perth about the past, and I can remember when beer bottles were worth a penny. We used to scrounge around to try to get a couple of beer bottles and swap them for a few lollies. But the cream of the crop was a milk bottle: for a milk bottle we used to get, I think, equal to 10c today. Finding a Peters milk bottle was like finding a £1 note—honest; it was that exciting to find one! Down the line we got the big Coke bottles, which at the time were all recycled and run through the system. Now, with our throwaway society, people just say, “Okay, put them back through the crusher.”

Mr Eric Ripper; Deputy Speaker; Mr Mark McGowan; Mr Chris Tallentire; Mr David Templeman; Mr Mick Murray; Mr John Hyde; Mr Bill Marmion; Acting Speaker; Dr Kim Hames; Mr Roger Cook

Some years back I went to Surabaya in East Java and there I saw a recycling system, or really a rubbish dump more than recycling system, where people utilised every bit of rubbish that went onto that tip. Three hundred families lived off that rubbish tip. The people running the tip wanted to bring in new technology and they brought in a machine from Germany that was supposed to put the rubbish in one end and bring it out the other. It was never utilised because the people who worked at the tip vandalised it because they could see their jobs going out the window. I saw little girls there who were cutting bits of that really hard-to-break plastic wrap and making it into brushes to brush the street. I saw the smallest bits of glass pulled out of the rubbish and a person manually grind that glass to be recycled. That was a matter of necessity, but if we look at what little was left over out of all that rubbish, we should take a leaf out of their book—not through necessity, but because of the way our society discards things and leaves rubbish around. We now have some recycling bins at different areas around the place; we have fortnightly collections and those sorts of things, but we are still so wasteful. We do not have the real urge to separate our rubbish for recycling, and many, many bottles and containers go out the door and into landfill. They should never end up there. Members of society should take control of this issue, but if there needs to be a small incentive from government to go forward, so be it. Kids and grown-ups will keep their bottles at home and put them into recycling depots or collection points. Even if they do not want the refund, sporting clubs could pick up the bottles. Even my local Catholic college has a thing outside with a great big sign that has “cans here” written on it, and people can drop their cans into it and be recycled. Why can we not do that with all beverage containers? If something makes a return for a school of \$100 a month or \$100 a week—it does not make any difference—why not do it?

It was interesting to hear another member say that the price of Coke in South Australia and Western Australia is the same. Why can South Australia do it, but not us? I know that there has been opposition from a few of the big companies such as Coca-Cola. Going back a couple of years, they lobbied me about not having a container scheme because they would have had to change all the branding on their bottles and containers. So what? If for a small offset we get a really large gain, this Parliament should look very hard at how we can do it. We do not want to go into our future being bullied by a few multinationals and a few companies that make containers in Australia, because they say that it might cost them a fraction of a cent more and, therefore, they will add to the price of what is in the container. I do not believe that will happen. I believe that in the round-robin system, sooner or later things will even themselves out.

Another area I want to talk about is the savings to the community through this scheme. Most people do the right thing by putting their rubbish into plastic bags or containers before they finish camping and then move on, but because the rubbish is smelly, they do not take it all the way home. They end up dropping it off at a rubbish dump so it all goes into the one landfill. If there was the container deposit scheme, I am sure people would separate that rubbish, or the leftovers, at their campsite so that they would have a container for recyclable rubbish and a container for general waste. They would then drop the general waste off and take the container of recycling home because there is a refund on it. It would be the same thing with single bottles. I do not think many people would just throw them out into a rubbish bin. I know there are some arguments that the recycling programs of today will suffer because a lot of those recyclable materials will not go into the recycling bins. I do not think things will change that much. Some of those people will just put their recycling back into the yellow bins that we have around the street. Certainly amongst those people living in units who do not have the ability to store the containers and take them to a recycling depot, the containers will still go into the recycling bins and recycling groups will still be able to make money and keep going around. Can people imagine being at Scarborough Beach on a Sunday afternoon and when everyone gets up and walks away, there are no bottles or containers on that strip of sand? Something like that would make me really proud to have been a parliamentarian, in government or in opposition, when a container deposit and recovery scheme bill was passed.

Mr W.R. Marmion: And no cigarette butts either.

Mr M.P. MURRAY: Once bins at the beach are full and overflowing, some of the rubbish blows down onto the beach. A lot of people do the right thing; I am not saying that they do not. But imagine being able to say, “Here we are; we have finally succeeded in achieving something that was a long time coming.” If this government knocks back the Container Deposit and Recovery Scheme Bill, it will be held accountable at the ballot box. Members would be surprised how many people are on the same wavelength in regard to this container issue. Many, many people think that way. It would be silly of the government to vote this bill down because there are seats on the government’s side of the house held by very small margins. If the government knocks back this bill, it will see the result when people vote, and they will say about the government, “They’re the people who knocked back that recycling container deposit scheme that was put before the Parliament.” Believe me, they will. Government members might think that this is only a little issue, but why does it come up time and time again when we talk to people in the community? It is very, very high on the list. It is beyond me why this bill has not gone through and why it has not been strongly supported by all people in this place. I say to members that this is

Mr Eric Ripper; Deputy Speaker; Mr Mark McGowan; Mr Chris Tallentire; Mr David Templeman; Mr Mick Murray; Mr John Hyde; Mr Bill Marmion; Acting Speaker; Dr Kim Hames; Mr Roger Cook

their chance to do their bit for the environment and for their state. I have had letters on this issue from Walpole, Katanning and from the Shire of Capel from most of the keep Australia clean groups, because I put a pressie out around there. I have had letters from all over the state with people congratulating the Labor Party for putting this bill forward. I am really certain that if this bill is knocked over, it will be part of the next election cycle; I have no doubt about that in my mind. I will be keeping members on my side honest: if members opposite do not do it, we will. By the look of the numbers today, we do have the support in the room. I know we have the support, because we brought the bill forward. We will be using this as part of the election cycle. I am putting a word of warning out there. It is only a small thing in here, but, believe me, out in the community it is a huge issue.

I think we have come to the stage now where we are learning in opposition to listen to the people outside this place. We are learning to do the things that people are asking us to do. The reason we were kicked out of government is that we stopped listening. We have now started to listen, and we have proved our credentials in the green area. I think Labor will be far in front of that if we can get this container deposit scheme bill up. If we cannot do that, it will be on members on that side of the house. I believe it is a vote catcher, and the people who do not vote for it will certainly be exposed at the next election. I certainly support this motion and the passage of the bill.

MR J.N. HYDE (Perth) [5.40 pm]: I am delighted to support this motion. It is important that we offer the Barnett government a very simple way for it to cover itself in glory and introduce a container deposit scheme. I speak as the chairman of the Stakeholder Advisory Group Investigation into Best Practice Container Deposit Schemes for Western Australia. That group produced a landmark report, which the minister quoted from at length during his time. I tabled that report in January 2007. That was a most comprehensive study of the pros and cons, the benefits, the rationale and the reasons for introducing a container deposit system in Western Australia. My committee looked at 20 different container deposit schemes in operation around the world, not only South Australia. It is intriguing that the further we look into container deposit schemes to see why they have been introduced, the more we find that often the prime motive of the government is not the environmental aspect but other aspects. There is a range of benefits from a container deposit scheme. I know that the minister has read my report closely, and occasionally he quotes from it, out of context —

Mr W.R. Marmion: What did the committee think about the South Australian scheme ?

Mr J.N. HYDE: The minister has read the report.

Mr W.R. Marmion: Yes. That is why I am asking.

Mr J.N. HYDE: It is interesting that the first time I went to South Australia to look at its scheme, I was taken there by the beverage industry as the president of the Western Australian Local Government Association, along with a number of other leading mayors. They took us there to show us why they did not think the scheme worked. That is probably where the minister is coming from as well. But it was incredible.

Mr W.R. Marmion: I might say I have heard very positive things about the South Australian scheme.

Mr J.N. HYDE: Yes, but because of the way it has ended up now. I went there with a number of conservative mayors, and if anyone saw it in operation, they would end up becoming a convert. One of the most amazing benefits of the South Australian scheme is the benefit that it provides to regional areas. It empowers local volunteer groups—scouts, footy clubs, Rotary groups and Apex groups—with an income stream. It is actually at the forefront of smaller government, because the scheme does not need to be run by an overarching government department but can be devolved. That is surely one of the benefits of Liberal governments, which are all about devolving to the community and local businesses and empowering them. So, it is cost effective for our society, and it is very beneficial in providing jobs and keeping money in the local community.

One of the other great benefits of a container deposit system for a state such as South Australia is that it provides an economic benefit from back-loading. Giant semitrailers go to regional outposts, and often they return to the capital city empty. However, with a container deposit scheme, those semitrailers are able to take back to the capital city something of value. It is clearly economically inefficient to have world's best practice recycling of glass, aluminium, steel and plastics in every regional town in South Australia, or in Western Australia, but utilising back-loading capacity provides an added benefit. The sustainability argument for a container deposit scheme is not purely about the cans and bottles; it is also about things such as the fuel that is wasted when a semitrailer that has delivered Coca-Cola or beer to Port Hedland or Derby comes back empty and cannot be back-loaded.

Mr J.E. McGrath: The Coca-Cola trucks used to drop off the wooden carry boxes at the shop and pick up the empties, and you would see them—half the truck would be full bottles, and half would be empties—and they would take them back, as I recall.

Mr Eric Ripper; Deputy Speaker; Mr Mark McGowan; Mr Chris Tallentire; Mr David Templeman; Mr Mick Murray; Mr John Hyde; Mr Bill Marmion; Acting Speaker; Dr Kim Hames; Mr Roger Cook

Mr J.N. HYDE: Yes, as the member recalls. I actually bought my first surfboard with money that I got from deposits. I do not know whether the member for South Perth was verballed regarding stealing —

Mr J.E. McGrath: I think I was a bit! I think I swapped one from one box to another.

Mr J.N. HYDE: I remember that some of my mates and I may have gone slightly half an hour ahead of the garbos on particular mornings and obtained some bottles in that way. But for people of my generation growing up, it was not only our education on thrift, but it allowed us to work to get something, and value recycling and a sustainable product.

I want to go now to some interesting asides about the benefits. One of those is in the state of Massachusetts in the United States. After Massachusetts introduced a container deposit system, it had a 12 per cent or 14 per cent drop—the exact figure is in our report—in cut glass presentations. When there is not a deposit on bottles and cans, of course many of them are discarded, some are broken accidentally and some are broken on purpose, and often small children present with cut feet or other accidents from cut glass. The empirical evidence in the state of Massachusetts is that there was a 14 per cent drop in cut glass presentations.

Another issue that has been discussed is why local government, particularly in Western Australia, has become so supportive of a container deposit scheme. That is because local government is massively subsidising the collection of recyclables. Our estimation, when the Dun and Bradstreet full economic analysis was done, was that if councils had a reduction in the amount of glass, cans, plastics and whatever that they had to collect and recycle, families would be \$22 to \$29 better off, because that would be the impact on rates if councils no longer had to subsidise the collection. Everyone thinks that councils will be missing out on the 1c or the 0.8c that they get from recycling glass and other products. But when we do the full sustainability analysis, local governments and councils are much better off economically—this is what happened in South Australia—and that cost saving is passed on to the ratepayers.

I only want to speak briefly, I believe.

Mr W.R. Marmion: I am fascinated! I want to hear more!

Mr J.N. HYDE: Having written a lot of this in 2007—although perhaps the member for Rockingham wrote it for me! I am not sure!

Mr M. McGowan: I did!

Mr J.N. HYDE: He did! Okay. Sorry. Then I obviously polished the grammar and did the apostrophes or something!

This is a matter that I am very passionate about and that other people are passionate about. There is a range of reasons why Parliament should support this motion, and I urge all members to vote for it.

MR W.R. MARMION (Nedlands — Minister for Environment) [5.49 pm]: I must make it clear that we are not debating the Container Deposit and Recovery Scheme Bill 2011. The government will not support this motion, which states —

That this house calls on the Premier to seek a message from the Governor recommending that appropriations be made for the Container Deposit and Recovery Scheme Bill 2011 and that the government endorses the bill.

I will begin by quoting an extract from page 8794 of *Hansard* of Tuesday, 17 June 2003. Mr A.P. O’Gorman asked a question of the then Minister for the Environment and Heritage. He asked —

Can the minister please advise what is the Government’s position on container deposit legislation, and what action is being taken to ensure that container deposit legislation is properly considered as a potential option for managing litter and improving recycling rates for beverage containers?

It was a very good question.

Mr M.P. Murray: That’s the problem with you guys; you’re still living in the past.

Mr W.R. MARMION: This was 2003. It is extremely relevant. The response from Dr J.M. Edwards states —

I thank the member for the question. The Western Australian Labor Party made a commitment to review whether it would be worthwhile to consider introducing container deposit legislation for this State. The Waste Management Board reviewed that policy and advised me recently that container deposit legislation would not be terribly helpful. However, since that time I have had the opportunity to meet with the South Australian Minister for Environment and Conservation and have heard a presentation from the South Australian environment department. Container deposit legislation works

Mr Eric Ripper; Deputy Speaker; Mr Mark McGowan; Mr Chris Tallentire; Mr David Templeman; Mr Mick Murray; Mr John Hyde; Mr Bill Marmion; Acting Speaker; Dr Kim Hames; Mr Roger Cook

extremely well in that State. Some 95 per cent of containers are returned. The scheme has been extended to other beverage containers from January this year.

These issues are being considered nationally. I have asked the Department of Environmental Protection to make sure that Western Australia participates and contributes to that process. The department will examine the other trials that are being conducted to find out whether it would be appropriate to implement them in Western Australia. For instance, container deposit legislation was introduced in Germany in January, and is working in conjunction with its kerbside recycling collection. We have an opportunity to examine further container deposit legislation, to cut down on litter and to improve recycling. By building on the work done in Germany by integrating container collections with kerbside recycling, we can achieve a win-win situation and provide a much better outcome for our environment.

We have heard that message again and again, and most speakers opposite have just reiterated what was said in 2003.

Moving on, where are we now? The member for Mandurah made the assertion that it would not work nationally. I can understand that.

Mr M. McGowan: We are Western Australian first.

Mr W.R. MARMION: Okay; it is a good point. I can understand the member's point that it has been going on since 2003, 2004, 2005, 2006 and 2007, yet we are still going through a national process. I understand that, but guess what? At the very first meeting of the new Standing Council on Environment and Water, which I attended a couple of months ago, the states strongly supported a speed-up of the process that the commonwealth is undertaking. Indeed, there was strong support from Victoria, Queensland and New South Wales for the commonwealth to speed up what it has been doing. The concern has been ongoing.

Mr M.P. Murray: So fix it. You're in the box seat; get on and do it.

Mr W.R. MARMION: Absolutely, and that is what we are doing. I can report that the consultation —

Mr J.N. Hyde: You're a newbie.

Mr W.R. MARMION: But I have had a fair bit of experience with federal affairs and how to get things across the line, member for Perth. The council is aiming to have a consultative regulatory impact statement ready by the end of this month.

Mr M. McGowan: Wow! That's incredible. You must be so proud!

Mr W.R. MARMION: I am very proud. We actually put a time line on it, so it has been completed.

Mr J.N. Hyde: When will we get a deposit for a drink can in WA; that's the question.

Mr W.R. MARMION: We are debating this motion.

There will be a link-up between state ministers and the commonwealth minister in a week or two and we will discuss the impact statement. I am very confident, and, indeed, the member for Mandurah has said, that the best way to implement a container deposit scheme is by a national scheme. They were his words. I totally agree with him.

Mr D.A. Templeman: I just want my kids to be able to cash in their cans. But they'll be all grown up by the time this comes in.

Mr W.R. MARMION: I do not think so.

Mr D.A. Templeman: There are four under four at the moment. Can you try to hurry it up?

Mr W.R. MARMION: It is not just this government that thinks that we should give serious consideration to what is happening nationally. We should look at it. It has taken all these years. Shall we just dismiss it?

Mr J.N. Hyde interjected.

Mr W.R. MARMION: I am taking a fresh approach to this.

Mr D.A. Templeman: I reckon we'll be back here next year and it won't have happened.

Mr W.R. MARMION: We shall see. The stakeholder advisory group chaired by the member for Perth strongly supported the introduction of a national scheme. That is what I have been advised.

Mr D.A. Templeman: Have you met with Coca-Cola Amatil recently?

Mr Eric Ripper; Deputy Speaker; Mr Mark McGowan; Mr Chris Tallentire; Mr David Templeman; Mr Mick Murray; Mr John Hyde; Mr Bill Marmion; Acting Speaker; Dr Kim Hames; Mr Roger Cook

Mr W.R. MARMION: I do not want to mislead the house about whom I have or have not met. But I go back to the 1990s when there was an issue. I know that the packaging industry is very strongly against this.

Mr J.N. Hyde: Not all of them.

Mr M. McGowan: Go ask Diageo.

Mr W.R. MARMION: The report of the former government's advisory group indicated that there would be disadvantages with a number of the container deposit schemes operating in different states across Australia. If a scheme were to be introduced, I guess the starting point would be to look at what South Australia is doing at the moment. It seems as though every previous environment minister has gone to South Australia —

Mr M. McGowan: Since 1979.

Mr W.R. MARMION: My notes go back only to 2003.

Dr K.D. Hames: I'll talk about 1995 in a minute. I chaired the Select Committee on Recycling and Waste Management in 1995.

Mr J.N. Hyde: And you achieved nothing.

Dr K.D. Hames: You should read the report. Everything that was there we are now doing as a state.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr P.B. Watson): Minister for Health, one of your own ministers is talking and you are interjecting over the top of him.

Mr W.R. MARMION: The report stated that if a national scheme was not introduced, it would increase the compliance burden and costs. The ideal scheme would be a single national scheme.

Mr J.N. Hyde: You're verballing. That was the second alternative. In a perfect world, yes, but the recommendation was to introduce it in WA. You are the minister; you have the power to do that.

Mr W.R. MARMION: In terms of due process, it would be silly if the process was not completed if it is going to take only a few more months.

Several members interjected.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Members, the minister is on his feet. If you want to speak, member for Kalgoorlie, you will have an opportunity.

Mr W.R. MARMION: I call on the opposition to support the approach that we are taking. It is a very sensible and pragmatic approach to get the report.

Mr J.N. Hyde: We did that for five years. That is why in 2007 we said, "Enough is enough! Let's introduce our own." What you're doing is you have gone backwards and you're going to wait.

Mr W.R. MARMION: No, we will get a report from the commonwealth with all the options.

Mr D.A. Templeman: We won't see this before the next election. You won't make a decision on this before the next election and you won't make it an election commitment.

Mr W.R. MARMION: The member can say that, but I am more optimistic than he is. Why should we not look at the options and fully cost it? That is a reasonable thing to do.

Mr J.N. Hyde: You've got the Dun and Bradstreet report that we produced for you.

Mr W.R. MARMION: Is the opposition against having a national way of bringing it in versus the state going it alone? If the national outcome in six months is that it will not work, logically we will still be in the same position we are in now and we can make a choice.

Mr D.A. Templeman: You should make an ultimatum to Canberra that if there is not a national scheme by a certain time, Western Australia will go it alone.

Mr W.R. MARMION: We actually did make an ultimatum. The ministers from Victoria, Queensland and I made an ultimatum. We wanted this report completed by November. We have given the federal government some targets to meet, and it has met the first target. Apparently there is a draft, although I have not seen it.

Mr D.A. Templeman: You'll get the report and you'll digest it, masticate it, eat it, swallow it, regurgitate it and it will sit there for another year.

Mr W.R. MARMION: The member for Mandurah is predicting the future. He is such a cynic.

Mr Eric Ripper; Deputy Speaker; Mr Mark McGowan; Mr Chris Tallentire; Mr David Templeman; Mr Mick Murray; Mr John Hyde; Mr Bill Marmion; Acting Speaker; Dr Kim Hames; Mr Roger Cook

Mr D.A. Templeman: This time next year, we will be back here and we will not have a container deposit scheme commitment by this government. That is the reality.

Mr W.R. MARMION: Apparently, according to my notes that have been provided to me, because I was not a member in 2001, when the Labor Party came to government in 2001, it promised to investigate the issue.

Mr M.P. Murray: We want to know what you're going to do.

Mr W.R. MARMION: I have told the member. I have also been advised that in 2002, the member for Perth—where has he gone?—urged his own party to implement a container deposit policy and stated in this house —

The State Government should make deposits for bottles, cans and other recyclable containers compulsory.

Dr K.D. Hames: Which year was that?

Mr W.R. MARMION: That was 2002.

Dr K.D. Hames: Which year did it lose government?

Mr W.R. MARMION: It lost government in 2008. In 2005, the then Minister for the Environment, Judy Edwards, called for a container deposit scheme and said that refundable container deposits clearly work and that she supported phasing in such a system in this state. In recognition of the member for Perth's terrific interest in this matter, he was appointed as chair of a stakeholder advisory group in 2006. In April 2007 the group reported and the member for Perth emphatically stated that WA should aim to have a 10c deposit for containers by 2008. The member for Mandurah pleaded for a container deposit scheme when in opposition and he was the Minister for the Environment when that report was delivered in 2007, and nothing happened.

Mr D.A. Templeman: That is not true. That is absolutely not true. In my contribution, I went through the process of where we have got to. I have said quite clearly that it was a deep regret that we never got to the end point. But what we are saying now to you, minister, is that you are stonewalling and are not prepared tonight to say, "We will introduce a container deposit scheme in Western Australia."

Mr W.R. MARMION: No, I will not.

Mr D.A. Templeman: You're falling into the same trap.

Mr W.R. MARMION: I am not.

Mr D.A. Templeman: Don't say that I did nothing, because it isn't true.

Mr W.R. MARMION: In fairness, I know that the member is a strong supporter of it.

Mr D.A. Templeman: Have you got the briefing notes from the department? You would have them. Have you got the briefing notes about the co-chairing process?

Mr W.R. MARMION: I am sure that the member supports it strongly.

Mr D.A. Templeman: Do you have them there?

Mr W.R. MARMION: I have notes everywhere. I do not know where all my notes are.

Mr D.A. Templeman: That is something that you should have been briefed on.

Mr W.R. MARMION: Nevertheless, the outcome is that the former government had an opportunity to introduce container deposit legislation. Most members opposite seem to support it. In the whole time they were in government they supported it, yet it did not come in. Unfortunately, we are in power —

Dr K.D. Hames: Unfortunately for them.

Mr W.R. MARMION: Unfortunately for them and fortunately for us, we are in power and have the opportunity to look at it. Why should we not look at it?

Several members interjected.

Mr W.R. MARMION: We are not opposed to giving all the options due consideration. I know, as the member for Mandurah said, that the statistics show that in South Australia it can deliver a high recovery rate of bottles and cans and that it also benefits the community, particularly scouting groups and children. I reflect back on my time—I am about the same age as the Deputy Premier —

Mr D.A. Templeman: You are romanticising it.

Mr W.R. MARMION: I will romanticise it because I have the right to, just like everyone else. As a child, I topped up my pocket money by collecting bottles. I recall not having enough money for lunch to get a cool

Extract from *Hansard*

[ASSEMBLY — Wednesday, 23 November 2011]

p9721b-9740a

Mr Eric Ripper; Deputy Speaker; Mr Mark McGowan; Mr Chris Tallentire; Mr David Templeman; Mr Mick Murray; Mr John Hyde; Mr Bill Marmion; Acting Speaker; Dr Kim Hames; Mr Roger Cook

drink, but if I got a bottle and added the amount I got for it to the money that my mum gave me for lunch, I could get a roll and a bottle of cool drink. I could get back fourpence for a large bottle of Coke, and I was not alone.

Dr K.D. Hames: It has seven teaspoons of sugar in it.

Mr W.R. MARMION: I did not know that at the time but I liked it.

I recall an embarrassing situation. There are a number of ways to carry bottles. They should be carried between one's fingers but I took a whole pile of bottles once —the member for Collie—Preston is laughing already. This is very embarrassing. Did it happen to him, too?

Mr M.P. Murray: They swell up a bit.

Mr W.R. MARMION: The member is exactly right; he is ahead of me. I had six bottles but I could not get them all between my knuckles. The only way to carry them was to stick my fingers down the neck of the bottles, which I took to the local deli. I was pulling them off all my fingers at the deli, and guess what?

Mr J.E. McGrath: You could not get one off.

Mr W.R. MARMION: The member is dead right. I could not get one off. The lady in the shop said, "What about that one?" I recall my words to this day, which were, "I want to keep this one." I had an affinity with it!

Mr J.J.M. Bowler: You had become attached to it, in more ways than one!

Mr W.R. MARMION: I was attached! The shop assistant was very surprised that I wanted to keep the bottle and I walked out of the shop. I was a little distressed because even by the time I had walked home I could not get it off. My father was a mechanical engineer and had studied physics. He said that if we heated it, it would expand and we could get it out. The problem was that if he heated the bottle, it would also heat my finger! Glass is very brittle and not very good under tension. It is good under compression but not under tension. I found this out because my dad believed that it would work. He put my finger and the bottle in a vice and turned the vice until the bottle shattered. Nothing happened to my finger.

Mr M.P. Murray: Did you cry because you'd lost your deposit?

Mr W.R. MARMION: I was upset because fourpence went down the drain but I was very pleased not to have a scratch on my finger. However, I am romanticising.

Surveys show that well over 80 per cent and up to 90 per cent of people support a container deposit scheme. Obviously, we must look at it. It makes great sense, if we are nearly there, to actually finish the process and see what the commonwealth and the states can deliver. Again, I understand that there are economic benefits to the community and there is strong support for it in the community. Even the scouts have met with me and explained how beneficial it is to them in South Australia.

Mr M.P. Murray: We can have plastic cows and singing toilets, yet we can't have a recycling scheme.

Mr W.R. MARMION: I keep saying that if we are going to bring in a system, it should be a national system.

I want to make another couple of points about bringing in a container deposit scheme. The first is that we should make sure that it does not contravene the commonwealth Constitution. There is no use in trying to bring in a state scheme if the commonwealth is going to stand in the way, and if we implemented a national scheme through the Council of Australian Governments process, we would bring the commonwealth along with us. I raise two areas where there could be problems. The first is mutual recognition, which is a problem South Australia would have had if it had not gotten an exemption because it already had a container deposit scheme in place. If the Northern Territory looks at bringing in a scheme, the Premiers of each state have to agree to waive the mutual recognition arrangements.

Another area of concern, if the commonwealth wanted to intervene, is whether it would be deemed an excise; an excise can be collected only by the commonwealth, so legal barriers could be imposed through the Constitution.

Mr M.P. Murray: Haven't I heard the Premier say that the commonwealth is not going to tell us what to do? What about over a bottle container scheme?

Mr W.R. MARMION: We can only try, can we not? We do not want the commonwealth to tell us what to do, but sometimes it uses its constitutional powers to tell us what to do.

Mr M.P. Murray: Have a go!

Mr W.R. MARMION: I would be uncomfortable supporting appropriations for the Container Deposit and Recovery Scheme Bill 2011; I will not go into the bill itself, because that is for another time. This motion calls on the Premier to go to the Governor and ask for a message recommending an appropriation. What appropriation

Mr Eric Ripper; Deputy Speaker; Mr Mark McGowan; Mr Chris Tallentire; Mr David Templeman; Mr Mick Murray; Mr John Hyde; Mr Bill Marmion; Acting Speaker; Dr Kim Hames; Mr Roger Cook

would the opposition recommend? How much is it going to cost? There would have to be an idea how much it would cost, and that would have to be worked through. All those things would have to be worked through.

I want to see the regulatory impact statement on this bill and all the different options it suggests, but my immediate reaction would be that if we were to bring in a national system, we should try to link it in as best we could with the South Australian scheme. This is different from the South Australian system in that it is a government-based system; South Australia's is an industry-based system. We would have to work out the best system, and we want a system that is uniform across Australia, because the benefits in terms of packaging and collection would be far better on a national scale. Section 109 of the commonwealth Constitution, which everyone would know of course, provides that when a state law is inconsistent with the commonwealth law, the state law is invalid. That is how the commonwealth would end up getting us if they wanted to. I think that is all I will say at this point.

Mr M.P. Murray: Can I say, minister, that you have been less than enthusiastic in your opposition. I think, underneath, you also have a very strong position that we should be doing it, but because of the dollar issue you are just not.

Mr W.R. MARMION: I am not worried about the dollar; I just want to make sure that if we actually bring in a scheme, it is the right scheme. Obviously, it is a scheme that everyone would support. A massive amount of work has been done for the environment by water ministers throughout Australia, and they have just finished it. I think it makes good sense to look at the report—who knows what it will say? But if container deposit legislation is supported, there is a strong case that it might move forward.

DR K.D. HAMES (Dawesville — Deputy Premier) [6.14 pm]: I am very interested in commenting on this motion, but I will not be commenting on anything to do with appropriations for the Container Deposit and Recovery Scheme Bill 2011 because, frankly, I have not seen the bill, nor has our party developed any position on our support or otherwise for container deposit legislation. We have managed to resurrect from the library a copy of a report of the Select Committee on Recycling and Waste Management, which I chaired in 1995. We had select committees rather than parliamentary standing committees in those days.

Mr E.S. Ripper: It stands the test of time, does it?

Dr K.D. HAMES: It does, yes. I have just been reading through the recommendations, and we made some very good recommendations, most of which have been followed by both our governments. On that committee was me as chair; Dr Judy Edwards, the member for Maylands who went on to become Minister for the Environment; Arthur Marshall and Rhonda Parker—an interesting combination if ever we saw one; and keeping the peace between those two was Hon Michelle Roberts, MLA.

Mr D.A. Templeman: Didn't they get on?

Dr K.D. HAMES: Michelle Roberts was very good at —

Mr E.S. Ripper: She was the peacemaker.

Mr D.A. Templeman: I thought Arthur got on with everyone!

Dr K.D. HAMES: Yes—well!

And, at some stage, the current Leader of the Opposition was on that committee. I do not know whether he was part of our investigation at the time; I know he came with us on one of our trips, but certainly his name does not appear on the list of committee members.

Even though that was 16 years ago—it is amazing how things stick in our memory—I recall that we made a determination on the recycling of glass. I looked through all the recommendations and notes and could not find it, but I knew it was there. I eventually found it in the prelude to the report. It states —

Arguments were put to the Committee that recycling was a waste of time and effort —

Remember these were the very early days of recycling. A few years before this, the Bayswater council was the first in Australia to introduce the 240-litre recyclable bin; we copied it from Brisbane, where they had a 120-litre recyclable bin. It was early days, and issues to do with how much was collected, whether glass was collected, what was to be done with it and the market for those products were very much part of the debate. This report states —

Arguments were put to the Committee that recycling was a waste of time and effort. It was suggested, often with reasonable supporting figures, that the energy equation costs did not support recycling. That is, the energy cost of collecting, transporting and processing recycled products often outweighed the

Mr Eric Ripper; Deputy Speaker; Mr Mark McGowan; Mr Chris Tallentire; Mr David Templeman; Mr Mick Murray; Mr John Hyde; Mr Bill Marmion; Acting Speaker; Dr Kim Hames; Mr Roger Cook

energy cost of virgin production. This was particularly true for glass, in that the energy consumed by the burning of fuel for transport created a negative equation for distances of more than 160 km.

So, if someone was collecting glass solely for the purpose of conserving energy, the debate on recycling at the time was that as a planet we were wasting lots of energy producing products and that we should recycle them to stop that waste of energy, and glass was one of those. But this finding was that the energy costs of the fuel for driving the truckload of glass more than 160 kilometres was greater than the cost of producing the glass in the first place.

Mr M.P. Murray: Minister, there are variations. What about back-loading and stuff like that, where they are coming back empty? You can't use that as a flat rate.

Dr K.D. HAMES: No; nevertheless, the cost of fuel has gone up and the cost of wages has gone up. There would need to be a total reassessment.

Mr M.P. Murray: If a truck is coming back empty, you could put two tonnes of glass on it.

Dr K.D. HAMES: Member, the point is that this was unanimously supported by a person who became the Labor Party's Minister for the Environment, and by a person who became the Minister for Police and a senior member of the Labor government.

Having said that, I want to put on the record that I am not against the concept of recycling of glass; I think we have moved beyond that concept of cost of energy and why we recycle. An enormous amount of recycling goes on throughout Australia, and in most electorates we now have the recycling of glass to a reasonable level. But what concerns me is what I see when I go north. I particularly remember driving from Port Hedland to Roebourne and the massive number of bottles I saw on the side of the road that had been chucked out of trucks. We did not see any cans; people collected the cans because the scout groups got value for them. If we had container deposit legislation, we would find that roadside litter would disappear. There is other rubbish and we have rubbish collection programs. I think that sort of litter is one of the blights on our country. In the areas of this huge state where most people live, teams of people collect rubbish, put it in bags and clear it away. But in those long distances north, the glass stays there for ever and, slowly, over time, the amount of glass builds and builds so that there is almost a carpet of glass along the roads. I think that bringing in container deposit legislation, for better or worse, would improve that situation. It would also give local clubs an alternative means of income. It may be that rather than chucking all our glass into a recycling bin we put it all into a single bin, as occurs in the City of Stirling. In Mandurah we have a separate recycling bin. I have to say that I prefer the separate bin.

Ms J.M. Freeman: Have you been to the recycling station at Alice?

Dr K.D. HAMES: Many, many years ago, in the early days when they were producing it. I have been around for a long time, the member might have noticed. I certainly prefer that separation. Instead of putting the bottles and cans in that recycling bin, we will put it in a container and drop it off for scout groups. I think that will be a good thing; it will help them. Will it increase costs? They have said in South Australia that it does not, but it is hard to imagine that if producers have to start paying 5c or 10c a container, they will not pass it on to the purchasers. Frankly, I do not care. From a health point of view, with the large levels of sugar it contains, people drink far too much of the sort of fluid in those containers anyway. Nevertheless, lots of people want to dodge that, and lots of other fluid comes in other containers. Really, I do not think it is such a big issue. If the total cost of the package is greater, I do not think 5c or 10c is a big issue. Overall, I would be very happy for this state, if the commonwealth does not do it, to very seriously look at the very issue the Leader of the Opposition has brought forward.

The Minister for Environment is right; we are not debating whether we adopt that legislation, but whether we send a message to the Governor saying that we do not know how much money is involved, but we need some so we are seeking a message of appropriations. The Minister for Environment is on the verge of making a decision. Maybe that decision is in the negative and in six months we can review that issue. I think it has never been more promising. The problem in the past has been that neither environment ministers in many other states nor the commonwealth have been supportive. Here we had a recent meeting at which all, including the commonwealth, were in favour and they are bringing forward a report on how to do it. Given there is a long-standing and successful South Australian model, it makes great sense that the rest of us adopt that model and proceed down the same path. It is simple, it is easy and I think it is something that people would be very comfortable using in this state. It makes sense for us to wait.

Members on the other side will say, "Well, what's the good of waiting again; we've waited all this time." Despite Dr Judy Edwards, who became the Minister for the Environment in, I think, 2001, having the view at that time that it was not worthwhile, but in 2003, the member for Perth saying that the government should do it,

Extract from Hansard

[ASSEMBLY — Wednesday, 23 November 2011]

p9721b-9740a

Mr Eric Ripper; Deputy Speaker; Mr Mark McGowan; Mr Chris Tallentire; Mr David Templeman; Mr Mick Murray; Mr John Hyde; Mr Bill Marmion; Acting Speaker; Dr Kim Hames; Mr Roger Cook

members opposite had until 2008. The member for Rockingham worked to support it, as did the member for Mandurah. But whatever the reason, at the end of the day, it did not happen. Here we are with an opportunity for it to happen on a national level, which I think everyone agrees is the right way to go, and I think the minister needs to be given a fair go. In fact, all the state and commonwealth ministers need to be given a fair go to see whether they can pull it off. If they pull it off, they will have done something that has been hanging in the wings for at least 10 years. If they can pull it off, there will be a lot of credit due to them. If they do not, they will be no worse off than any other minister has been for the past 10 years. But as a state, we will have a chance to make a decision. I am not saying that we would support that as a state because I am not the one who makes that decision; we will discuss it and decide as a team whether we are going to do it. But I have to say, on an individual level, without hearing the arguments against, as I have not done, other than all those years ago—I need to give myself the opportunity to hear the arguments against before I make up my mind—in my mind, I will put the arguments for.

Question put and a division taken with the following result —

Ayes (18)

Dr A.D. Buti	Mr F.M. Logan	Ms M.M. Quirk	Mr M.P. Whitely
Ms A.S. Carles	Mr M. McGowan	Mr E.S. Ripper	Mr B.S. Wyatt
Mr R.H. Cook	Mrs C.A. Martin	Mrs M.H. Roberts	Mr D.A. Templeman (<i>Teller</i>)
Ms J.M. Freeman	Mr M.P. Murray	Mr C.J. Tallentire	
Mr J.N. Hyde	Mr J.R. Quigley	Mr P.B. Watson	

Noes (24)

Mr P. Abetz	Dr E. Constable	Dr G.G. Jacobs	Ms A.R. Mitchell
Mr C.J. Barnett	Mr M.J. Cowper	Mr R.F. Johnson	Dr M.D. Nahan
Mr I.C. Blayney	Mr B.J. Grylls	Mr A. Krsticevic	Mr D.T. Redman
Mr J.J.M. Bowler	Dr K.D. Hames	Mr J.E. McGrath	Mr M.W. Sutherland
Mr I.M. Britza	Mrs L.M. Harvey	Mr W.R. Marmion	Mr T.K. Waldron
Mr G.M. Castrilli	Mr A.P. Jacob	Mr P.T. Miles	Mr A.J. Simpson (<i>Teller</i>)

Pair

Ms R. Saffioti

Mr T.R. Buswell

Question thus negatived.

Second Reading

Resumed from 9 November.

MR R.H. COOK (Kwinana — Deputy Leader of the Opposition) [6.30 pm]: I rise to make a few comments about this legislation because I know it is a difficult issue for the government. It is not an issue about which members opposite necessarily want to be exposed. It is not an issue that they wish to vote against, and I note the member for Dawesville's misgivings about this legislation, particularly from the perspective of 1994 when he was on a select committee that examined the issue. But clearly we are in new times and a number of members have already observed that Western Australia has the lowest rates of recycling, and a number of members have observed that this is an extremely popular initiative and an extremely popular policy. I add my support to members of this place who have already said that they would like to see a container deposit scheme introduced in Western Australia. I do not think there is a member of the public who would not agree that we must do more to reduce the amount of litter in our community. The government acknowledges this fact in its Litter Amendment Bill, which seeks rather impotently to increase fines for people who are caught littering. However, we know that we live in different times, and that we have to have a more comprehensive system to drive down the amount of litter in our streets. I heard the member for Gosnells comment earlier about glass in the streets of Thornlie where he rides. I can assure him that it is much worse in my electorate. Nevertheless, that is not the point about which I wish to speak tonight.

I want to speak tonight about the great opportunity that container deposit legislation represents to the community. We have a range of volunteer organisations and community groups in Kwinana, all of which are engaged in enriching our community through the services they provide. Obviously, what comes with that is a huge amount of effort in the area of fundraising to make sure that those community groups can continue to work and provide those services. Part of the appeal of these organisations is that they provide their members with a way in which to become engaged in fundraising activities so that they can continue the camaraderie, the bonhomie and the culture of their organisations. I remember as a very young member of a jujitsu club becoming involved in bottle rounds, which is a very old form of fundraising. A truck and a team of kids would go from house to house requesting bottles from people at each house. Donated bottles were taken and traded in for 10c each, or whatever it was, to raise money for the community group. For many years that fundraising activity was

Mr Eric Ripper; Deputy Speaker; Mr Mark McGowan; Mr Chris Tallentire; Mr David Templeman; Mr Mick Murray; Mr John Hyde; Mr Bill Marmion; Acting Speaker; Dr Kim Hames; Mr Roger Cook

a great way for community groups to sustain their activities. Those days are sadly gone. I am sure that all members reflect on the fact that we have an increased level of litter in our community. We cannot go past making the connection between the availability of a good container deposit scheme and the amount of litter that people see in our community.

The community groups of Kwinana have a huge opportunity should this legislation be passed because it will provide them with a way of continuing to sustain their organisations. I understand that in South Australia the scout movement raises in the order of \$3 million a year through a coordinated effort to raise funds. I would like to see the same opportunities presented for the community groups of Kwinana so that they can take full advantage of this sort of legislation.

The members for Warnbro and Rockingham and I recently undertook a bit of a publicity exercise to raise community awareness about the potential of this sort of legislation. We collected on the side of the street one morning to have our photograph taken. We did not have to look very far to find the litter that we needed to demonstrate what we were talking about. It was everywhere. We need to create extra incentives for the community to make sure that we drive down the incidence of litter.

We are all familiar with the fine system associated with littering. We are all familiar with the education program that comes with littering. We are all familiar with scab duty at school. These sorts of negative notions around littering are impregnated in our minds as we go through our lives. But there is another element in combating littering—that is, the opportunity to make a positive contribution and make a positive scheme. That is to say that not only littering is bad, but also removing litter from the community and the streets is a good thing. That is why the container deposit scheme is so effective. South Australia has astronomical rates of recycling—rates that put our rates to absolute shame. We know the difference is that South Australia has container deposit legislation; Western Australia does not. It is self-evident to the people on this side of the chamber that we should move swiftly to introduce this sort of legislation.

I have heard the Treasurer wax lyrical in this place about the sorts of costs imposed on households because of the pricing impact associated with a container deposit scheme. But the cost of soft drinks—Coke and so forth—in South Australia is exactly the same as it is in any other state; it is exactly the same. The market simply does not work in the way that the Treasurer would have us believe; that is, if a small return is added to the container in the event that it is returned to the registered depot or collection point, it will automatically transfer to a cost on top of the original product. It simply does not work that way. The market for these sorts of products does not work that way. We can therefore legislate with confidence and in a manner to ensure a container deposit scheme and not place an unnecessary burden on households in relation to the associated costs. If there is a slight deviation in costs—I do not think there will be—I do not think it would be of great concern to the community because people know that if they take the drink bottle back to a collection point, they can retrieve the costs that might in some part be factored into the original cost of the product. However, as I have said, that has not been borne out in the evidence and the experiences in South Australia. I know this is the sort of scheme that state governments have collectively looked at from time to time, but I also think that we can all die of old age waiting for state governments across Australia to agree upon such things. What we actually have to do is act. We can amend and modify schemes if we want to create some uniformity across the jurisdictions, but we have to act because there is an imperative. There is an imperative in relation to the environment and an imperative in terms of the public health of our community. Landfill is, quite frankly, out of control in Western Australia, and despite the modest gains made in reducing the amount of product going to landfill through our recycling schemes, we need to do more.

We have to do more because we have to drive the return of these products away from infill in a much more aggressive manner. I might say that there may come a time when we also consider imposing statutory restrictions on the sort of packaging in which companies market their goods. I cannot believe that it takes a solid plastic container and a plastic bag to buy half a dozen apples nowadays, but that is the way they are presented in the supermarkets. Quite frankly, I think that is outrageous. As custodians of environmental legislation, of litter legislation and, in this case, of recycling legislation, we should not allow retail outlets to continue to plough wasteful amounts of packaging into their products that simply contribute further to the problem. I therefore support this legislation. I cannot believe that we have not had it until now. I am sure former ministers can provide me with very good reasons for why we have not had it to date. Perhaps current ministers can also present a bunch of so-called obstacles to the reason why we should not move forward this legislation. However, I think the compelling argument is writ large on the roadsides of Western Australia, and this is too good an opportunity to pass up. It is too good an opportunity to pass up for the environment of Western Australia, it is too good an opportunity to pass up for managing the waste in our community, and it is far too good an opportunity to pass up for providing community groups with an extra way of raising money. Certainly, as the member for Kwinana and a constituency that has a lot of these groups engaged in fundraising and in providing important social services to

Extract from *Hansard*

[ASSEMBLY — Wednesday, 23 November 2011]

p9721b-9740a

Mr Eric Ripper; Deputy Speaker; Mr Mark McGowan; Mr Chris Tallentire; Mr David Templeman; Mr Mick Murray; Mr John Hyde; Mr Bill Marmion; Acting Speaker; Dr Kim Hames; Mr Roger Cook

a community that has a fairly low socioeconomic profile, I think this legislation represents an absolute opportunity that we should be taking with both hands.

Debate adjourned, on motion by **Mr R.F. Johnson (Leader of the House)**.

House adjourned at 6.42 pm
