

CONTAINER DEPOSIT SCHEME

Motion

HON ROBIN CHAPPLE (Mining and Pastoral) [10.10 am]: I move today that this house calls on the government to implement a Western Australian container deposit scheme without further delay.

The PRESIDENT: On a point of clarification, that wording is different from the wording on the Business Program.

Hon ROBIN CHAPPLE: I was trying to make it colloquial.

The PRESIDENT: Oh, sorry.

Hon ROBIN CHAPPLE: I will read it. I move without notice —

That this house calls on the government to take a leadership role and introduce a Western Australian container deposit scheme without further delay.

The issue of recycling drink containers is, indeed, one on which the public speaks with almost one mind in support of container deposit schemes and more and more and better recycling. For years now, surveys across the country, here in WA and other states, have shown that community support for container deposit recycling is 80 to 90 per cent. Now there is a growing political consensus about the best model to apply. This week I released the consultation copy of the Greens WA legislation for a container deposit scheme. It is, of course, available on my website.

Hon Donna Faragher interjected.

Hon ROBIN CHAPPLE: I will give the member the whole thing.

Hon Donna Faragher: I am asking about the website just in case we might have forgotten it!

Hon ROBIN CHAPPLE: Last night, the Leader of the Opposition in the other place gave a second reading of his private member's bill to introduce a similar container deposit scheme. It is an excellent bill. I was very pleased to see that the ALP has adopted a model developed by Greens MLC Colleen Hartland in the Victorian Parliament.

Several members interjected.

Hon ROBIN CHAPPLE: The model is the same as that introduced into the Senate by Greens Senator Scott Ludlam and it is the very same model that is in my draft bill.

Colleen Hartland has always said that this is an issue that should cross party lines because it is so clearly supported by the community. Quite clearly, we know the numbers in this place and in the other place. The intent of this motion is to appeal to the current government and its colleagues to accept either our model or the ALP's model and to look at what is being promoted in those models at the federal level and in other states. As the minister stated in the other place, the government wants a consistent model, and the ALP's and our model seems to be the model being adopted around the nation. I will talk about why we should adopt it rather than wait for the federal government working group to further discuss it. The model is straightforward. It is for a container deposit scheme that maximises public benefits. The model has received the support of the Victorian upper house, plus the support of the Greens, the Liberals, the Nationals and the Independents. The bill has been brought into that house a second time and is now before a committee.

It is excellent to see that the ALP here in WA is advocating this model, making this a genuinely cross-party consensus. At the federal level, this is the key model currently being examined in the regulatory impact statement process. The federal minister's latest communiqués from the environmental ministerial council indicate that ministers endorsed in principle the options in the "Packaging Impacts Consultation Regulation Impact Statement" and reaffirmed that there will be an open and transparent stakeholder consultation on the approaches for improving packaging resource recovery rates and reducing litter, including a container deposit scheme, an advanced disposal fee, and co-regulatory impact product stewardship schemes. The minister has agreed to a teleconference by the end of November to consider the consultation regulation impact statement for release for a four-month consultation period.

This national process has been a long time coming and there is still the potential for significant delays. Along the way, states have become frustrated. The Northern Territory has moved to implement its own scheme and bills are being considered in the Victorian state Parliament and now this Parliament. I think this state government and its colleagues would do well to lead the charge. They could look at the legislation that is available to them—the ALP and the Greens' legislation—and introduce into the house their own bill commensurate with what is being

Hon Robin Chapple; Hon Donna Faragher; Hon Dr Sally Talbot; Hon Col Holt; Hon Ljiljana Ravlich; Hon Max Trenorden; Hon James Chow; Hon Alyssa Hayden; Deputy President

considered at the national level. If we want a national scheme, we should support a WA scheme in the meantime. Firstly, it will take direct action from a major state to get a national scheme moving, and we can be that major state. Secondly, if we start now with a WA scheme, we will be in the most advantageous position when negotiations commence for a national scheme, and we will make it impossible for a national scheme to override our preferences. The scheme that both the ALP and the Greens have put forward is self-funding. We have nothing to lose and everything to gain from being the leaders. That is even without considering the benefits to WA of reducing litter now rather than at a time that pleases the bureaucrats and packaging industry lobbyists in Canberra.

The “National Waste Report 2010” indicates that Western Australia has the highest per capita generation of waste across the nation, at 20 per cent above average; the lowest recycling percentage of total waste; the lowest level of diversion from landfill; and Australia’s highest littering rate by a number of items. I appreciate that Minister Marmion has indicated his support for a national scheme and I understand that he and other ministers have taken a proactive approach on the federal stage and called for container deposit schemes to be prioritised on the national agenda. I thank the minister for his work, as I am sure do most Western Australians. Now is the time for the people of this state to work together to implement container deposit legislation schemes, which will work well across the country. It will take action from states to see container deposit schemes established. It will take leadership from state ministers, not just in national meetings, but also in state Parliaments.

I urge the minister to consider the model promoted in the consultation copy of my bill, which is available, as I have already stated, on my website, and which was put forward by the ALP to support Western Australian container deposit legislation. Very real benefits would be established by a container deposit scheme in Western Australia. Boomerang Alliance, the peak recycling campaigner, estimates that a container deposit scheme would divert seven per cent of landfill by raising our beverage-container recycle rates to above 80 per cent. Although seven per cent of landfill may not seem like a major achievement alone, it is just the tip of an iceberg of gains from a container deposit scheme. The gains would bring container recycling to about 40 000 homes, interestingly enough, mainly in regional communities that do not have the benefit of conventional recycling programs. It would kick-start the recycling industry with accessible collection deposits across the metropolitan and country regions of the state. It has a parallel: recently, the electronics industry agreed, by itself, to introduce its own recycling schemes. Over the next months members will see trotted out at shopping centres recycling depots for mobile phones and computers and all those sorts of things. Therefore, this is an ideal time for us to move to a container deposit scheme, in parallel with what industry is doing.

The unredeemed deposits will fund the Waste Authority to support research and innovation, support the development of the recycling and reprocessing industries in Western Australia, and support education programs for the community and industry. South Australia has the best recycling and waste diversion rates in the country. South Australia is proud to have had a container deposit scheme for over 30 years. One of the key drivers of South Australia’s success in recycling across all resources is the change in mindset and community education that comes from having an effective container deposit scheme. Container deposit schemes are the most effective litter-busting program available. By adding value to cans and bottles, they no longer are thrown away, and those littered are invariably collected for economic return—adopting a container deposit scheme is literally that. The container deposit schemes that are supported now across parties and across states learn from the South Australian model and make more improvements. In South Australia, the scheme is run by the beverage industry, and the industry keeps the unredeemed deposits. The industry is not obliged to report on the effectiveness of the scheme. Under our model, and indeed the model presented by the Australian Labor Party, the unredeemed deposits will also fund community programs.

Local councils across the state are supportive of container deposit schemes. A container deposit scheme saves councils money on waste disposal, reduces landfill volumes, and significantly reduces the cost of operating kerbside collections by reducing contamination by broken glass. After I gave notice on 31 August 2011 of my intention to bring in a bill for a container deposit scheme, Western Australian Local Government Association Deputy President, Steve Martin, said that there was strong community support for a container deposit scheme. He said —

By putting a deposit on containers it gives people a financial incentive to do the right thing, and it also provides a source of income for community groups and Local Governments collecting these products.

This is particularly important in the country, where recycling is difficult and expensive to put in place.

Councillor Martin also said that at the recent WALGA annual general meeting, Western Australian local governments put their support behind a container deposit scheme for the state, and WALGA would continue to lobby the state government to support the introduction of a container deposit scheme in WA. He went on to say —

Hon Robin Chapple; Hon Donna Faragher; Hon Dr Sally Talbot; Hon Col Holt; Hon Ljiljana Ravlich; Hon Max Trenorden; Hon James Chown; Hon Alyssa Hayden; Deputy President

Apart from reducing litter and increasing recycling, there are other benefits such as appropriate sharing of waste management costs and a mechanism to increase community awareness of waste management ...

Given the obvious benefits and wide ranging support from the community we will be encouraging the establishment of a WA Container Deposit Scheme as soon as possible.

This is from WALGA. This is from an organisation that is at the forefront of dealing with waste. WALGA is encouraging all parties to move forward on this matter.

I encourage all parties in this place to work together to establish the very best container deposit scheme that we can have in Western Australia, and to help facilitate an effective national scheme across the country. The public is screaming out for politicians to work together effectively to achieve benefits for the community. This could be one of those great examples of how all the parties in this Parliament can work together. I am keen to work with all members interested in progressing a container deposit scheme.

I want to turn now to what was said by the Minister for Environment in the other place on Tuesday of this week. I am quoting from the uncorrected proof of *Hansard*. The minister said —

The stakeholder advisory group also concluded, and I quote —

... it would not be advantageous to have a situation where a number of different CDS were operating in different Australian States. This would increase the compliance burden and costs for the beverage and packaging industries.

A better outcome ... would be that a single national CDS is implemented.

To go back to the point that I made earlier, if we in Western Australia could establish a model that was supported by the government, the Australian Labor Party and the Greens, we would be in the box seat for establishing one of the best container deposit schemes in the nation, and we would lead rather than follow. The federal ministers have, in essence, endorsed the model that has been put forward by Colleen Hartland in the Victorian Parliament.

We have put out a discussion document to encourage participation by local government and organisations that are heavily involved in recycling. The feedback so far indicates that the model that we have presented to this Parliament, in both this place and the other place, has uniform support. This is not a model that seeks to generate income. It is a self-funding model. It is a model that will ensure the maximum return from the recycling process, and that will in the long term reduce our waste in Western Australia. The other point that needs to be made is that although we are not supportive of the South Australian model, that model has been so effective that South Australia now has a 67 per cent recycling rate, whereas in Western Australia the recycling rate is only 27 per cent.

The model that we have put forward provides a genuine opportunity for the government of this state to move forward. This is not about party politics. This is a model that is uniformly supported across the nation, both in the other states and in the Senate. I ask the government to be proactive and to take leadership. I know that the government is a bit shy on introducing legislation at the moment, but I would urge the government to look at what we have proposed and look at what Labor has proposed. If the government decides to implement a similar scheme, we could have a great debate about it, and we could move forward, and it would have our guaranteed support.

HON DONNA FARAGHER (East Metropolitan — Parliamentary Secretary) [10.29 am]: As the lead speaker for the government today, I rise to indicate the government will not be supporting the motion moved by Hon Robin Chapple. I want to be clear at the outset why we will not support the motion. It is not because we are against initiatives that have the overall aim of increasing recycling and reducing waste in our state. This government supports many initiatives in that regard. I will go through a couple of those in a moment. The reason, however, that we will not be supporting Hon Robin Chapple's motion today is that the government believes that when considering this issue, it is important that work being done at the national level is completed first. This approach has consistently been taken by this government since we came to office and is the appropriate course of action. A similar view has been shared in reports commissioned by the previous government. Hon Robin Chapple has referred to one particular report, which I will also refer to. I am going to get in early, because I am sure we will hear very shortly from the opposition, who will no doubt tell us how wonderful the Labor Party is and will simply restate what was released over the weekend. Again, Hon Robin Chapple has already referred to that. Like so many things, the Labor Party had eight years to introduce such legislation and never did. I was looking back on *Hansard* last night and found an interesting response from Hon Sally Talbot to a question asked by a former Greens member, Hon Paul Llewellyn, on 27 November 2007. Hon Paul Llewellyn asked —

Hon Robin Chapple; Hon Donna Faragher; Hon Dr Sally Talbot; Hon Col Holt; Hon Ljiljana Ravlich; Hon Max Trenorden; Hon James Chown; Hon Alyssa Hayden; Deputy President

I refer to ongoing announcements by the government about container deposit legislation.

- (1) Has the government drafted regulations for a container deposit scheme for Western Australia?
- (2) If yes to (1), when does the government aim to commence the scheme; and will draft regulations be available for public comment?
- (3) If no to (1), why not?

Hon Sally Talbot replied —

I thank the member for some notice of this question. The Minister for the Environment has provided the following response.

- (1) No.
- (2) Not applicable.
- (3) The government has made no decision on the introduction of a container deposit scheme in Western Australia. The Minister for the Environment is awaiting independent economic analysis on the introduction of such a scheme before any decision is made.

That was the position back then, but, once again, we have seen a backflip—a change which has seen the Labor Party once again try to compete with the Greens to get some airtime on environmental issues. That has already been canvassed by Hon Robin Chapple. Inevitably, though, the Labor Party fails dismally when it tries to do that, but that is of no concern to me and to members on this side of the house.

It is important to reflect for a moment on the background to this issue because, as Hon Robin Chapple mentioned, it is extensive. Back in 2006, a stakeholder advisory group was established by the then Minister for the Environment, Hon Judy Edwards. It was chaired by the member for Perth, John Hyde. The task of that group was to investigate best practice container deposit systems for WA. That group examined more than 20 different container deposit systems operating around the world, as well as the South Australian scheme. I will quote from the report's "Executive Summary". That group made a number of recommendations, but noted that it had been —

... unable to provide conclusive advice on a number of elements of CDS design.

Interestingly, as I and also Hon Robin Chapple mentioned earlier, the committee also provided support for the introduction of a national CDS scheme and specifically stated the following on page 25 —

Just as the investigation into CDS in WA has attracted interest from other jurisdictions, it is anticipated that the adoption of CDS in WA could act as a catalyst for other Australian States and Territories to also adopt CDS.

As with many EPR policy instruments, it would not be advantageous to have a situation where a number of different CDS were operating in different Australian States. This would increase the compliance burden and costs for the beverage and packaging industries.

This is the important line —

A better outcome, from the perspective of the SAG, would be that a single national CDS is implemented. This position is also supported by the Government of South Australia.

That backs up the position of this government.

Following that report, the then Labor government commissioned a full cost-benefit analysis of eight potential container deposit schemes in WA. I have been reminded that that analysis found that a 10c deposit scheme would result in an estimated net economic cost of \$38.5 million. I also understand that irrespective of the scheme considered—as I said, eight were—there was a cost to the consumer. That element is important, along with a range of other factors that would need to be considered.

I do not disagree with Hon Robin Chapple that such a scheme has support by some in the community. I remember as a little girl, as I am sure many in this chamber would remember, that there was a similar scheme many years ago. I would go down to Charlie Carter's in Midland, with my wonderful nanna and mum, and drop off bottles of soft drink and get some money back. As the former environment minister, I indicated publicly that I was open to such a scheme but that it was important that the work being done at the national level took its course to look into all of the relevant issues. That is appropriate. I would have thought Hon Robin Chapple would agree that such work is important for any government in order to make an informed decision on behalf of the community.

Hon Robin Chapple; Hon Donna Faragher; Hon Dr Sally Talbot; Hon Col Holt; Hon Ljiljana Ravlich; Hon Max Trenorden; Hon James Chown; Hon Alyssa Hayden; Deputy President

I can say that since coming to government the Liberal–National government has worked constructively with the commonwealth and other states on this and other waste-related issues. I digress for a moment to say that it is a bit cute for Hon Robin Chapple to suggest that ministers at that ministerial council are following the Greens policy being articulated by the member opposite, as well as Greens members around Australia. I think they might actually have a view on that. Anyway, in July 2010 the communiqué of the then Environment Protection and Heritage Council stated the following —

The Council has agreed to undertake the development of a Consultation Regulatory Impact Statement for consultation. Whilst some aspects of the assessment have been contested substantial work has been completed on the assessment of options for national measures, to address resource efficiency, environmental impacts and the reduction of litter from packaging wastes such as beverage containers. Ministers agreed that a RIS will consider not only CDL, but also a limited number of options which may have a positive cost benefit and a tangible impact on recovery rates and litter reduction. The RIS process will be transparent and consultative and the scope and approach will be the subject of early engagement with key stakeholders.

As I understand it, the new ministerial council, I think it is now called the COAG Standing Council on Environment and Water, is currently preparing that consultation RIS. That is due for completion by the end of 2011. I think Hon Robin Chapple referred to a more recent communiqué which re-emphasises that. I understand from our own Minister for Environment that all governments will be in a better position to review their work in 2012.

As such, and quite appropriately, the government will await the outcome of that national investigation. As the Minister for Environment has said, we will then consider all options to ensure an effective and efficient outcome is achieved for waste management in our state. In referring to waste management more generally, I think it is important to reflect that the Liberal–National government takes a very broad focus when addressing waste by targeting sectors of the industry in which significant reductions can be made and by supporting programs that encourage Western Australians to reduce, reuse and recycle waste. It is true that container deposits form part of the waste stream but it is not the only waste that is generated.

Hon Robin Chapple interjected.

Hon DONNA FARAGHER: But I think it is important because sometimes people talk consistently about container deposits as if that will be the panacea —

Hon Robin Chapple: It would not be the panacea but it would have a significant benefit in terms of glass —

Hon DONNA FARAGHER: The member said about seven per cent. There is obviously a larger “other” part of the waste stream that we also need to work through.

Hon Robin Chapple: If I may, it’s also about actually removing glass and those sorts of things from a stream that creates a major problem at the moment.

Hon DONNA FARAGHER: Sure, and we could go into some of the aspects of what the government has supported with respect to recycling glass and the like, but I have limited time. I say though—far be it for me to raise issues about the landfill levy because I know that will be an entree for Hon Sally Talbot when she stands up —

Several members interjected.

Hon DONNA FARAGHER: Since the increase in the landfill levy —

Several members interjected.

Hon DONNA FARAGHER: Members opposite can all go on; they can all get pretty excited; it gets them pretty excited when we mention the landfill levy!

Several members interjected.

The PRESIDENT: Order!

Hon DONNA FARAGHER: When we look at the landfill levy —

Several members interjected.

The PRESIDENT: Order! I think it is time to just reinforce that this is a debate in which each member has a limited time and it is unreasonable for other members break into that time.

Hon DONNA FARAGHER: Since the increase in the landfill levy on 1 January 2010, there has been a 12 per cent reduction in household waste going to landfill. We have also been undertaking, in a legislative sense,

Hon Robin Chapple; Hon Donna Faragher; Hon Dr Sally Talbot; Hon Col Holt; Hon Ljiljana Ravlich; Hon Max Trenorden; Hon James Chown; Hon Alyssa Hayden; Deputy President

complementary reforms that tackle those circumstances in which people dispose of their waste inappropriately. In this instance, I refer to the illegal dumping legislation that passed in Parliament last year along with the announcement that the government made in 2010 about the proposed increase in penalties for littering, and I am quite sure that when a bill is introduced—obviously we announced our intention last year—we will receive the full support of the Greens (WA) and the Labor Party. Of course, since 2008 the government has reinvested millions of dollars into a range of grants and programs across our state and across the sector. As the former Minister for Environment, I had the pleasure of seeing a number of those initiatives in action. I give just a couple of examples. Take hazardous waste: hazardous waste includes pesticides, poisons, pool chemicals, batteries and so on. They can pose a significant threat to health and the environment. In February this year, the government announced \$10 million in new state government funding for the Waste Authority's household hazardous waste program that supports the collection and disposal of these hazardous materials. This funding is on top of the allocation by the Liberal-National government between 2008 and December 2010 of more than \$5.3 million to local governments, which resulted in more than 487 tonnes of household hazardous waste being diverted from landfill, and I think that is a good thing. Then of course there is e-waste—the recycling and removal of any waste such as analogue televisions and computers. Earlier this year, again, another \$1.5 million boost was given by the government. This is on top of funding that was provided last year to six waste depots to improve their capacity for collection and recycling. Those depots are both in metropolitan and country areas. That is also in addition, from an e-waste perspective, and complementary to the government's support for a national scheme that will be in place in 2013. Of course, from a promotion point of view, there is the Waste Wise Schools initiative, and I am sure a number of members have gone along to schools and seen the great things that students are doing. Members might ask how that impacts. Well, we have to change behaviour, and if we do not start with children, we will not have the impact that we want in years to come. I see Hon Robin Chapple nodding in agreement to that. It is important, and the enthusiasm shown by those young people is fantastic. We want to ensure that that is extended as they grow up and become adults. This initiative is also supported by other more general awareness-raising programs. With the limited time I have remaining, I restate that the government believes that in looking at the issue of container deposits, it is appropriate that we work through the Council of Australian Governments standing council and the work that is currently being done. That is the appropriate approach and it will enable the government to make an informed decision on this very important issue.

HON SALLY TALBOT (South West) [10.44 am]: I just say to Hon Donna Faragher that that is a tired old speech. To stand —

Hon Donna Faragher: You're a tired old person!

Hon SALLY TALBOT: Goodness me!

Hon Donna Faragher: Well, you are, seriously.

Hon SALLY TALBOT: If the member wants to draw lines along that —

Several members interjected.

The PRESIDENT: Order! Let us keep the personal comments to ourselves and concentrate on the issues.

Hon SALLY TALBOT: I would have thought that this was one of the motions in non-government business that the government would actually support. How can it oppose a motion calling on the government to provide leadership and to introduce a container deposit scheme into Western Australia without delay? I would have thought that the clever thing to do on the government's part would be to say that the motion was good and that it would provide leadership and then leave it to the opposition to point out how appalling the government's record has been on this sort of thing.

Several members interjected.

The PRESIDENT: Order!

Hon SALLY TALBOT: As I say, that was a tired old speech that is basically predicated on defending the indefensible. Hon Donna Faragher was a disaster as Minister for Environment. We had two years of going backwards at a rate of knots, and I must say that her successor is doing no better.

Hon Donna Faragher: What did you do when you were minister?

The PRESIDENT: Order! I have already made the point once that this is a debate with limited time for speakers. The current speaker and all subsequent speakers have actually less time than the two previous speakers, therefore I ask members to observe that and give the speakers on their feet a fair opportunity.

Hon Robin Chapple; Hon Donna Faragher; Hon Dr Sally Talbot; Hon Col Holt; Hon Ljiljana Ravlich; Hon Max Trenorden; Hon James Chown; Hon Alyssa Hayden; Deputy President

Hon SALLY TALBOT: I start by pointing out that the model outlined in the second reading speech on Labor's Container Deposit and Recovery Scheme Bill, which was given in the other place yesterday by the Labor leader Eric Ripper, is an excellent model—I agree with Hon Robin Chapple—but that model is not owned by any political party and it is totally disingenuous to claim that it is. That model is the best model for Western Australia. Obviously, what anyone will do or the way anyone will start this process of looking at what is best for Western Australia will be to look at existing systems both in Australia and in other parts of the world. It is very clear that the model that fits best is the hub-and-spoke model run by the Waste Authority that is now on the record as Labor policy. We are not doing this in a confrontational way; we are asking the National Party and the Liberal Party to come on board and support our bill, but the model is not owned by any political party. If there is a hero in the container deposit legislation debate, it is the Boomerang Alliance. It is the Boomerang Alliance that should take credit for driving this debate over the last few years. I pay particular acknowledgement at the outset to Dave West, who has been the Boomerang Alliance's principal campaigner for many, many years. I think that it has become Dave's mission in life to see that container deposits are properly embraced by the community—debated and implemented. I also acknowledge Jeff Angel, who runs the Total Environment Centre in Sydney. It is one of the best umbrella groups that I have ever worked with and it really does deserve every credit for getting this matter on the political agenda and for driving it.

In paying credit to those groups, I acknowledge that the work that they have done on the analysis of the South Australian scheme, and the analysis of the many schemes that operate all around the world, have given us a fantastically detailed body of expert advice and research on which Labor has based its bill. It is the intelligence and integrity with which those groups have done that—not by scoring cheap political points, but by being very smart about the strategies they used—that have brought us to a place today where I think we have in the Western Australian Parliament the best bill that we can come up with for Western Australia. Why is it a better model than South Australia? Let me say at the outset that, in essence, the basic principles are exactly the same as in South Australia. A 10c deposit will be refundable to the consumer—the amount refunded in South Australia and the amount to be refunded in the Cash for Cans scheme about to start in the Northern Territory—so the basic principle is the same. The Waste Authority will collect the money from producers and importers of the containers, and the 10c refund will be returned to consumers via depots and hubs. As Hon Robin Chapple stated, and Hon Donna Faragher conceded, the South Australian scheme is very successful. There is every reason to think that it will be embraced by the Western Australian community with as much enthusiasm and vigour as it has been in South Australia and other parts of the world.

However, there are two important distinctions between the model outlined in our bill and the model that operates in South Australia. The first and perhaps most significant is that schemes run by industry, as the South Australian scheme is, have been shown over and over again in research to have a poor audit trail; that is, they lack the transparency and openness that Labor made a core principle in its waste avoidance and resource recovery legislation. The South Australian scheme is run by industry. Transparency and an open auditable trail of money in the system are important for two reasons. First, we are talking about big bucks—this is a very, very profitable industry exercise—and it is absolutely right and proper that Western Australian taxpayers have full access to the money trail in this industry. Second, the scheme is best not run by private enterprise because in order to keep track of how the scheme is going, good solid reliable data about the amount of recycling in the system is needed. A major problem in the waste recycling debate all over the world is getting hold of good, solid data streams. Putting this scheme in the hands of the Waste Authority will ensure that data stream. It will be fully auditable. It will be accountable through the estimates process in Parliament. And we believe that is the best way to go.

The second respect in which Labor's proposed model is different from that of South Australia is that we have selected what is colloquially known as the hub-and-spoke model. In opposing these schemes, the Liberals are very fond of talking about the cost-benefit analysis, without ever remarking on the major failing that every commentator has identified in those cost-benefit analyses—namely, that every single analysis that concludes that a recycling system will not financially benefit individual households has included what it calls an “inconvenience cost” on the recycling process. It has been shown over and over again, in every scheme that has ever operated, that the community does not regard this as an inconvenience. The community loves recycling bottles, cans and cartons. People either do it themselves as part of their weekly shopping trips or they donate the cans, cartons and bottles to people like the local boy scouts or the local primary school, who use them as a fundraising exercise. I might point out that in South Australia the scouts raise between \$7 million and \$9 million a year through —

Hon Ljiljana Ravlich: How much?

Hon SALLY TALBOT: Between \$7 million and \$9 million a year in recycling cans. Interestingly, the scout registration fee in South Australia is the lowest of any state in Australia.

Hon Robin Chapple; Hon Donna Faragher; Hon Dr Sally Talbot; Hon Col Holt; Hon Ljiljana Ravlich; Hon Max Trenorden; Hon James Chown; Hon Alyssa Hayden; Deputy President

The hub-and-spoke model will provide, in terms of the spokes, a network of small depots all over Western Australia, and not just in the metropolitan area. There will be collection depots in all those areas that the National Party works in—in all the small regional centres. They will be located in many service stations, supermarkets and shopping strips in the suburbs. Many of the collection depots will be in the form of reverse vending machines, a great invention, and another great opportunity for local Western Australian manufacturing if we can get the scheme up and running.

In South Australia, because the scheme is controlled by industry the nearest recycling depot is often up to five kilometres away from the shopping centre—where it would be much more convenient to dispose of the empties. In the hub-and-spoke model there will be a network of small depots statewide, and regional transfer stations used to collect the recycled material from the smaller depots and from what are called the large-scale redeemers—that is, industry, local government and community groups.

Why would we want to deny our community groups such a great opportunity to raise money? The support for these schemes is very, very wide and local government supports the scheme because it improves the value of kerbside recycling.

HON COL HOLT (South West) [10.54 am]: I wish to say a few brief words from my perspective. Container deposit schemes have a great deal of merit, and we have all heard the stories about the operation in South Australia. I am sure that we have all visited Adelaide and not seen a container or bottle lying anywhere on the road; although it may be a little different further out in the boondocks of regional South Australia! Container deposit schemes definitely have—

Hon Simon O'Brien: Adelaide is the boondocks.

Hon COL HOLT: Pardon? There certainly is some merit in container deposit schemes. Recycling schemes have been talked about for a while as a means by which to increase recycling rates and decrease landfill rates. I know that in some regional centres there is some doubt and scepticism about the separate recycling bin collection. People who put their newspapers, bottles and cans in the bin in good faith expect them to be recycled. I know that in some circumstances, just because of economies of scale and critical mass, much of it ends up at the tip anyway—an outcome no householder likes to see when they have chosen, in good faith, to recycle. A great recycling challenge for regional WA will be to ensure the collected containers are collected and transported in bulk to a place where they can be recycled. There will need to be a profit incentive for that to happen. The community attitude supports recycling. Hon Robin Chapple spoke about the public sentiment, and I think that he was absolutely right when he said that people want to recycle. And if a deposit container scheme will help us recycle, I think that it should certainly be looked into.

As Hon Robin Chapple spoke, I was reminded of the huge issue of broken glass in regional Western Australia. Not that long ago, I was in Newman working with the locals on community safety. One of the biggest issues was the broken glass on roadways, footpaths and sporting grounds. It was a massive problem for the community. We were not talking about waste or recycling or public amenity, but community safety! The glass really was a visual and physical deterrent that many communities worry about. Perhaps a container deposit scheme could address this and other similar issues.

There is some proof that recycling works in regional Western Australia. One such proof that comes to mind is the annual drum muster in agricultural regions. Chemical drums are returned to suppliers for recycling. It is perhaps a bit different when it is a 20-litre or 100-litre container, which are a little easier to recycle than some of the smaller products, because people add more value to the recycling of a larger container than they do, for example, to a can of cool drink.

Hon Robin Chapple: Interestingly enough, Ruggies, which is operated by the mining industry, has a similar process whereby the mines have their own recycling and the profits go to Princess Margaret Hospital, so you can do it.

Hon COL HOLT: I am sure it can be done, but there are some real challenges out in regional WA. Although some of the major centres and the regional cities probably have that critical mass to make it work, there are some real challenges further out to increase recycling rates and to make sure those products get to where they need to be to be recycled. I know the member talked about decreased landfill costs, but I reckon that there could also be increased costs to store some of those materials.

Hon Robin Chapple: Interestingly enough, again, we originally had recycling in the north west. Western Power's trucks coming back were always empty, so we carted all the waste back on the empty trucks at no cost basically.

Hon COL HOLT: Is it still happening?

Hon Robin Chapple; Hon Donna Faragher; Hon Dr Sally Talbot; Hon Col Holt; Hon Ljiljanna Ravlich; Hon Max Trenorden; Hon James Chown; Hon Alyssa Hayden; Deputy President

Hon Robin Chapple: No, it fell over. It was not because of the cost; it was because of lack of interest.

Hon COL HOLT: That highlights some of the challenges. It was working for a while, but the scheme fell over and where did we get to with it?

In closing, we are very interested in container deposit schemes, but we recognise that there are a whole heap of challenges in regional WA and we need it to be part of a greater scheme. We all want to see reduced waste and increased recycling, but we need to look at the whole package of how we do that in a greater scheme not only in our state and Australia, but worldwide.

HON LJILJANNA RAVLICH (East Metropolitan) [11.01 am]: I rise to support the motion. In my view, it is really a no-brainer. I do not have a doubt in my mind that we should move to a container deposit scheme without any further delay because it is in the public interest to do so.

No doubt the packaging industry is big and powerful. Quite frankly, I, for one, as a consumer am fed up with the amount of packaging that is wrapped around goods generally. It really reflects a waste of resources and a huge problem for the average consumer. We do not have to be too technical about this. We buy one product and it is plastic wrapped and then it is carton wrapped and so on. Basically, I am sick of standing there with a Stanley trimmer knife cutting these things to size so I can fit them in the recycling bin. It is a really huge problem and we have to stand up to the packaging industry and to the big end of town and say that enough is enough. This is not in the public interest and we should do something about it.

I refer to cash for cans and bottles. I grew up with this, as did many people in this place. Like many other families, my family had a place where we would store bottles. Back in those days, the bottle-oh would sometimes come and give us a total payment for our bottles, both beer bottles and cool drink bottles. Back then cans were not such a big thing. In my family Sunday was a big day; my family had a habit of having a roast on Sunday and between the five kids we would have a big bottle of something. It used to be Fanta, because Fanta was a big deal. Members might remember Fancy Nancy from the 1970s. She had a big orange afro haircut and everybody thought that Fancy Nancy was the bee's knees. In the Ravlich household we would get a container of ice-cream and a bottle of Fancy Nancy Fanta between the five kids. Mind you, given that we collected only four Fanta bottles a month, it took a while to pile up enough to get a lot of money for them at the shops. No doubt there was a very, very good culture back then when people appreciated recycling and when there was an incentive to recycle. Just about every kid I knew in the neighbourhood, if they saw a bottle, would pick it up and take it to the shop and get a Choo-Choo Bar. Do members remember the old Choo-Choo Bars? It just was a matter of course.

Hon Max Trenorden: They used to make your teeth black.

Hon LJILJANNA RAVLICH: That is true. I think there are so many things going for this initiative. Mums and dads love it. Of course they would love it because it means their kids would not hit them up for pocket money; they could do a bit of work to get it. Mums and dads would find this a very, very good policy. No doubt sporting groups would find it a great thing for fundraising. As has already been said by Hon Sally Talbot, in South Australia the boy scouts pick up anywhere between \$5 million and \$7 million, but I heard on the radio the other day it was as high as \$14 million. Any of those amounts of money are significant. No doubt from a social perspective, this policy has great advantages attached to it. That is not even looking at the environmental considerations of the introduction of a container deposit scheme.

It is a very sad reflection on the people and government of this state that Western Australia has such a poor record in recycling. When we compare our record to South Australia, which has had a container deposit scheme since 1970 and has consistently recycled, it begs the question: what is wrong with Western Australia and what is wrong with the Western Australian government that it has not moved to enact legislation quickly? No doubt WA needs to take action. The Barnett government, in not moving in this area, shows clearly that it does not care about the environment. The Barnett government has one obsession—that is, mining and digging up the earth. That is where it starts and stops. I think the government needs to pay more attention to social policy and take much more interest in the environment. The container legislation needs to be given important due consideration by the Barnett government and it should move to legislate a container deposit scheme in this state.

When we look at how we line up with the rest of the nation, as I have said, we see it is very disappointing. According to a report on different state governments and landfill levies, we have the lowest recycling rate in the country and we re-use less than half as much waste as South Australia re-uses. If we look at the comparison, we see that in Western Australia 71.8 per cent of waste goes into landfill compared with 33.7 per cent in South Australia.

We have to accept that our natural resources are finite. We cannot continue to pollute and be irresponsible. We need to give due consideration to the impact of the sorts of lives we lead on the environment and on what we

Hon Robin Chapple; Hon Donna Faragher; Hon Dr Sally Talbot; Hon Col Holt; Hon Ljiljanna Ravlich; Hon Max Trenorden; Hon James Chown; Hon Alyssa Hayden; Deputy President

leave for successive generations. I personally think it is a poor reflection on us as individuals or, in this case, on the government, that we do not give more consideration to how we can leave a better environment for those successive generations. Clearly, introducing a container deposit scheme is only a small step, but it is a significant step.

Only in the last week I went to Textile Traders and I got fabrics and other bits and pieces and I was handed the material without any packaging. I thought, “Isn’t this great?” One of the things I like about Bunnings is that when people walk out, if they have not brought their own bag, it is bad luck. There are some cartons, but, by and large, Bunnings does not use plastic. I think that is very good. When I walk into those shops, I think that these people understand the destruction to the environment caused by plastic bags and containers. I do not have a doubt in my mind that the average person wants to do the right thing, but we have to give them some incentive to do it. Quite frankly, I remember a time when people could duck-dive into the Swan River and pick up a pebble or whatever from the bottom because the water was so clear. When I look at the river now as I drive past it and see that it is so polluted, I think, “What are we doing?” For goodness sake; as a community, we need to wake up to ourselves. This is a small, but important, step. I wholeheartedly support this motion.

HON MAX TRENORDEN (Agricultural) [11.10 am]: I am going to say some things that other members have said, but I am going to put a “but” at the end. I, like everyone in my age group with grey hair and all the rest, loved those days. I was a scout and cub master in Northam. I knocked on people’s doors, I collected bottles and I took them back. I understand all of that totally. People would deliberately put aside their bottles and not get refunds for them so that those groups could get the revenue. I understand that totally.

I want to run the other side of the argument. I say to Hon Robin Chapple that I am 100 per cent supportive of the process, but I do not want to say any more until one other very important factor is mentioned. A year or so ago, we had a debate in this place about the landfill levy. I heard the parliamentary secretary say that I am not allowed to talk about it, so I will not talk about the levy, parliamentary secretary!

Several members interjected.

Hon MAX TRENORDEN: No; I am only joking! This is one of my private passions in life—not so much as a member of Parliament. I can inform members of Parliament that we are getting close to the closed circle; that is, when a housewife in Perth or in Northam puts a lettuce leaf in the bin, it is very likely to come back on her plate as food. It will; it is that close.

Hon Robin Chapple: I am watching the parliamentary secretary having quizzical thoughts about this.

Hon Jim Chown: Lettuce leaves break down in the soil.

Hon MAX TRENORDEN: Yes; that is what I am saying. The regional councils are now talking to three different organisations in the state about that collection process to turn that lettuce leaf into an environmentally friendly, alkaline-based natural fertiliser. It is a beautiful product. When I started looking at the normal fertilisers available to farmers, councils and those sorts of people, I found that this product is worth something to the tune of \$800 a tonne. I am not quite sure what it is worth today, but it will not be too far from that amount. If a lettuce leaf can be turned into a product that is worth \$600, \$700 or \$800 a tonne —

Hon Robin Chapple: If you can get the glass and steel out of it.

Hon MAX TRENORDEN: I am coming to that. Not only is that a product of Mother Nature, but also it is not acid based; it is alkaline based. If that product is put on a playing field or is used next to the Swan River—Hon Ljiljanna Ravlich referred to the Swan River—it will have a different outcome from that produced by the fertilisers that are currently used. The probability is that it will not cost \$800 a tonne; it will probably cost less than that. It is always risky to make these sorts of statements, but probably all of us in this chamber will agree that the best way to drive the environmental debate—this is the member’s argument in part—is to make it economically attractive and viable to recycle. We are getting to a situation in which it will not be too long before the lettuce leaf comes back onto our plates. It has a chance to become a natural fertiliser that is used by somebody, whether it be a market gardener or a farmer, to produce the food that we consume. What better outcome could we have? In all of that process—there has been much debate in this place and in other places—people such as my wife, who regularly beats me up when she sees me heading to the wrong bin —

Hon Kate Doust: Is that elder abuse?

Hon MAX TRENORDEN: I actually think that is a good point. I could be in for some money, could I not? I could make an earning out of this. That is a very good point. I will have a word to her and then I will have a word to my solicitor!

The point is that she is so keen on that recycling process that she watches me like a hawk as I head to the bins.

Hon Robin Chapple; Hon Donna Faragher; Hon Dr Sally Talbot; Hon Col Holt; Hon Ljiljana Ravlich; Hon Max Trenorden; Hon James Chown; Hon Alyssa Hayden; Deputy President

Hon Sally Talbot: As she should.

Hon MAX TRENORDEN: As she should. I am a convert. I am trying to do that too. The difference between her and me is massive—she is female; I am male!

Hon Robin Chapple interjected.

Hon MAX TRENORDEN: That is a fair point. We males have a different way of operating.

Hon Sally Talbot: It's recycling from Mars and Venus!

Hon MAX TRENORDEN: Yes! I try to do the right thing, but as I walk to the bin, I think about something else. When she walks to the bin, she thinks about the bin. That is to her credit, not mine.

The point I am making, though, is that people are really switched on to that recycling system. There is no point in going over this process for hours, and I do not intend to do that. In all these arguments, there are places that have developed such a sophisticated recycling process that their landfill percentage is down to single figures. That is what we need to do. All of us will probably agree with that. Like many arguments we have in this place, my argument is that if we have this really good idea and take that out of the recycling process, we will remove money from the recycling process. We have to think about that. The best way of getting our landfill percentage down to the lowest possible figure is to drive it through economics. So the bottle we were talking about is worth 10c as it is handed over the counter, but it is also worth 10c if it is in the rubbish bin. That is the only argument I put to Hon Robin Chapple. I do not want to argue about the intent of his motion, but I would like him to think about that in the process of the distribution of rubbish.

Hon Sally Talbot: Aren't you talking about giving things such as lettuce leaves their economic value? Isn't that the basic principle we're talking about? I think we agree. We need to give what is now called waste an economic value.

Hon MAX TRENORDEN: It might have been Hon Sally Talbot, but somebody asked us today why we do not just support the motion. The government could do that; we could just support the motion. I am very supportive of the motion, but I do not want to vote for a motion until I know that the outcome that Hon Robin Chapple is talking about, which he has every right to do, will be the very best way of getting to a single-digit landfill percentage. There is just as good an argument that that bottle is valuable. It is valuable to the boy scouts, if I can use that example. If we had the German model, that bottle would go into a single bin and would be taken out of the stream by technology, not by human beings. It would be put into a single place and it would still have that value. That is my argument, Hon Robin Chapple. The question is: where is that 10c or that \$1, or, in the case of the boy scouts in South Australia, \$5 million, better directed? I am fully supportive of where the member wants to go. I want to be sure that we are actually doing the best thing. The dollar might just be better in the rubbish bin and in that other process. I would like to be sure about that before I support the motion.

HON JIM CHOWN (Agricultural) [11.19 am]: When I viewed Hon Robin Chapple's motion yesterday, it reminded me of the days when the bottle-oh worked through the metropolitan area and some country areas. In fact, on occasion they would turn up to the farm, always unannounced, usually on a two-year or three-year basis. You could hear them coming down the drive. Years later of course we had that wonderful ditty by Benny Hill about Ernie, the fastest milkman in the west, and his delight for saucy Sue, and Two-Ton Ted from Teddington. Of course, Two-Ton Ted brought Ernie to his demise with a meat pie. The last line reminds me of the bottle-oh when it talks about "Ernie's ghostly gold tops a-rattling in their crate". However, back to more pertinent issues in regard to this motion.

A member interjected.

Hon JIM CHOWN: No, I will not sing it. Those bottle-ohs did a great service to the community by collecting all sorts of bottles. They had a significant commercial incentive to do so. In those days we had little cameo producers of drinks such as and Weaver and Lock, and Gest. Coca-Cola was around as well, and of course the Swan Brewery was the only brewery, apart from a couple in Kalgoorlie, that was operating in the state. Nowadays we have a plethora of producers of beverages of all kinds in various containers from glass and plastic to cartons. Obviously, over a number of years state governments have looked at the issue of a 10c refund for beverage containers. In fact, in 2007 the last Labor administration set up a stakeholder advisory group to look at this. The stakeholder advisory group did a cost-benefit analysis on the 10c deposit scheme. The relevant word is "deposit"; that is, the industry charges the 10c, which the consumer pays when they buy a drink. It was found that there would be an impact of \$38 million on the community to operate such a scheme. If we bring that forward and apply the consumer price index, it would now be a \$45 million to \$50 million impact on the community. As such, it could be viewed as a form of tax. It would certainly lift the cost of living.

Hon Robin Chapple; Hon Donna Faragher; Hon Dr Sally Talbot; Hon Col Holt; Hon Ljiljana Ravlich; Hon Max Trenorden; Hon James Chown; Hon Alyssa Hayden; Deputy President

That is one of my concerns. In fact, the advisory analysis stated that even if someone redeemed their 10c deposit on every beverage container, they would still be short by \$16 to \$18 per annum, and if they did not redeem too many of them, the shortfall would be \$30 to \$100 per person per annum. I am on Hon Max Trenorden's side here. We have a scheme that operates very well in the recycling industry. In fact, the majority of local councils have recycling bins. Like Hon Max Trenorden's wife, my wife is absolutely rampant at me at times for putting the wrong container in the wrong bin or for not ensuring that the bottle top comes off when it goes in the recycling bin. If we are serious about recycling these sorts of containers, the recycling industry needs to look at their processes to ensure that the recycled goods go back to the manufacturers to be molten down and recycled back into society as containers.

I would be concerned if we took it on this issue on a state basis, because most manufacturers of these beverages are now large national and international companies. There are compliance issues and there is an issue of the cost on a state-by-state basis—for example, the South Australian scheme. As Hon Donna Faragher stated, the Council of Australian Governments is reviewing this; I think the review is due in late 2012. As a state, we would be irresponsible if we did not look at that review and support a national deposit scheme that would at least defray some of the significant costs involved.

HON ALYSSA HAYDEN (East Metropolitan) [11.24 am]: I rise to speak against Hon Robin Chapple's motion. Although I agree with him in part that there is a need for a recycling scheme for containers, I feel the motion falls a little short. As Hon Jim Chown and Hon Donna Faragher have stated, there needs to be more of a national approach than a state approach.

I must confess that as a very young girl, I looked forward to going to my grandparents' place and raiding the bottle collection that they stored at the side of the house. My brother and I thought we had a great scheme, the great train robbery of the year, whereby we would take two bottles and go down to the deli on the corner. However, our grandparents were well aware of our scheme and had their eyes on us the whole time! We would each take a bottle down to the local deli, hand over our two bottles—I think we were getting 5c a bottle at the time—and get the largest bag of lollies we could for our 10c. We would then sneak back and sit in the mulberry tree and eat the lollies until we were sick.

Hon Jim Chown: Did you ever go back around the shop and get those bottles back?

Hon ALYSSA HAYDEN: I only stole from my grandparents; I did not steal from the deli itself. I do not think that today's scheme of a return of 5c or even 10c on a bottle would result in the same motivation which it did back in the early 1970s and which was shared by my grandparents, my brother and me. The size of the bag of lollies that we got for our 10c does not compare with what we would get now for 10c; we would be lucky to get two very small individual lollies. I do not think the motivation would be the same. As Hon Jim Chown touched on, if this refund scheme went through, the cost of \$38.5 million would be a burden on Western Australian taxpayers. I believe it would be counterproductive to the purpose of the 10c refund. It is my understanding that the proposed container deposit scheme, if effective, would reduce the waste sent to landfill by only 30 000 tonnes to 40 000 tonnes. Considering that 5.4 million tonnes of waste currently goes to landfill, it is obvious that we need to focus on a broader solution rather than on a smaller contributor to a larger issue.

If we introduce our own state legislation and try to tackle it as a state, there is no doubt that there will be an impact on our national beverage and container companies. We can only conclude that forcing them to comply with different laws applying in each state across the country will increase their costs, and of course their costs will be passed on to the consumers in the way of our soft drinks and our milk containers. Not only will our community be burdened by the extra \$38.5 million —

Hon Sally Talbot: Where is the evidence of that?

Hon ALYSSA HAYDEN: I am glad the member asked. The evidence has come out of a report by a former minister, Hon Dr Judy Edwards, in 2006. There was an advisory group on a container deposit scheme. This is actually from the report; it would be a burden on Western Australia taxpayers of \$38.5 million.

Hon Sally Talbot: Who are you quoting?

Hon ALYSSA HAYDEN: That is out of the report.

Hon Sally Talbot: But who are they quoting?

Hon ALYSSA HAYDEN: The member would have to ask Hon Dr Judy Edwards who she is quoting.

Hon Sally Talbot: I know the answer, you see. That's wrong.

Hon ALYSSA HAYDEN: It comes out of this report that it was \$38.5 million.

Hon Robin Chapple; Hon Donna Faragher; Hon Dr Sally Talbot; Hon Col Holt; Hon Ljiljana Ravlich; Hon
Max Trenorden; Hon James Chown; Hon Alyssa Hayden; Deputy President

Hon Sally Talbot: It is referring to other reports. You have to get that right.

Hon ALYSSA HAYDEN: I believe I have got that right. However, a state approach is not the way to go. As has been mentioned by a couple of speakers, the Council of Australian Governments is in the middle of investigating a national recycling scheme. I look forward to seeing that outcome and hope that it leads to national legislation and that all states take that on. In closing, I ask members not to support this motion and look at this as a bigger and broader issue of recycling that is required to be tackled at the national level.

HON ROBIN CHAPPLE (Mining and Pastoral) [11.29 am] — in reply: Very briefly, I do not have much time to respond; in fact, I will run out of time. An important point to make is that discussions at the national level have been going on for years, and indications are that the discussions might even be receding at this time. It is up to a state somewhere to take leadership. We do not want the South Australian model; we want a better model.

Motion lapsed, pursuant to temporary orders.

The DEPUTY PRESIDENT (Hon Col Holt): I give my sincere apologies to Hon Robin Chapple for not allowing him enough time to reply. I made a bit of a blue there.