

communication. However, there are instances in which the law requires a signature, but that signature does not have the function of indicating the signing party's approval of the information contained in the electronic communication; for example, notarisation or attestation by a Commissioner for Oaths. The bill remedies this problem by recognising that the notion of a 'signature' does not necessarily imply a party's approval of the entire content of the communication to which the signature is attached.

Time and Place of Dispatch and Receipt of Electronic Communications: the bill also amends the current default rules for time and place of dispatch and receipt of electronic communications. For example, the amendments provide that the time of dispatch of an electronic communication is the time when the electronic communication leaves an information system, and the time of receipt of an electronic communication is the time when the electronic communication becomes capable of being retrieved by the addressee at an electronic address.

Overall, adopting the amendments contained in the model bill will serve to:

- modernise the Territory's laws on e-commerce so that they reflect internationally-recognised legal standards and enhance cross-border online commerce;
- increase certainty for international trade by electronic means and, thereby, encourage further growth and electronic contracting; and
- confirm the Territory's commitment to facilitating electronic communications in international trade transactions as reflected in free trade agreements.

The bill will ensure the Territory's electronic transactions legislation reflects current international standards.

Madam Speaker, I commend the bill to honourable members and I table a copy of the explanatory statement.

Debate adjourned.

ENVIRONMENT PROTECTION (BEVERAGE CONTAINERS AND PLASTIC BAGS) BILL (Serial 136)

Continued from 24 November 2010.

Mr CHANDLER (Brennan): Madam Speaker, the Country Liberals support recycling and the concept of container deposit legislation. However,

I will not just provide an open acceptance of this particular model as proposed by the minister and this government - as this government appears to just expect from the opposition - for a whole lot of reasons I will detail.

First, in opposition in a Westminster system of government, we have a responsibility to scrutinise government proposals, to investigate legislation, point out faults, review options and, where it is felt necessary or prudent, provide alternatives and, in some cases, amendments to legislation. We do not just run a tick-and-flick operation for government; we take our job seriously, as Territorians expect that is what we should do in opposition. What the government expected us to do is akin to buying a car without bothering to look under the bonnet. In all fairness, who in this room would buy a car without looking under the bonnet or kicking the tyres?

I need to stress again that the Country Liberals went into the 2008 election with a promise to introduce a CDL program. That does not necessarily mean we would have chosen this particular model proposed by government. I must admit, when I first learnt this legislation was to be brought forward, I thought to myself: 'This will be a no-brainer. Well done to the minister for bringing this forward. How can I help?', as from the Country Liberals' and my point of view, we all supported the concept behind container deposit legislation, or at least in the outcomes promised for our environment after the implementation.

I am so glad I started to take the time, as I should have, to investigate the process further. The journey thus far has been like a game of tennis: the heads swinging left and right, trying to keep up with the ball, keep up with the game being played out by government, industry and, of course, our environmentalists. All have had their own barrows to push, their own agendas, and I took on the role of trying to find some level of truth in all of it, and common sense.

One of the most basic concerns I have with this legislation is it is underpinned by regulations which we have not seen. The mechanics have not been ironed out, costings have not been provided, but this government seems to expect this side of the House to simply sign off and offer its absolute support without the need for any scrutiny whatsoever.

Minister, I have some real questions for you that, hopefully, you can answer - no rhetoric, no politics, no spin, just simple and straightforward answers to my questions. You might ask why I cannot trust this minister, this government; why I have to play the devil's advocate on legislation which, on the surface, as many as 80% of the community support. I will tell you why. I am in