

INITIATIVE MEASURE 256

Official ballot title:*

PROHIBITING CERTAIN NONREFUNDABLE BEVERAGE RECEPTACLES

An act prohibiting the sale or distribution of beer or any other malt beverage, or of any nonalcoholic mineral water, soda water, or other carbonated or uncarbonated beverage (commonly known as soft drinks) for consumption in this state in cans, bottles, jugs, tubs, vessels or other receptacles not having a refund value of at least five cents for each such container.

*Ballot Title as issued by the Attorney General.

Statement **FOR**

The Problem and the Facts:

Americans waste over 110 million beverage containers daily. Washingtonians throw away about 2 million bottles and cans each day. Washington taxpayers spend well over \$1,000,000 annually collecting litter. Beverage containers are 80% of the permanent litter. The deposit system works when used—a Mt. Vernon bank offered two cents each and received 550,000 containers in one day (July, 1970).

The Solution:

"We are convinced that the best answer to solid waste is recycling—finding a way to use the material again. . . ."

Ellison L. Hazard, President
Continental Can Company
May 11, 1970

"IT'S WORKING! . . . Reynolds has working proof with its anti-litter aluminum can recycling program . . . helping to clean up our streets and conserve our nation's resources. . . ."

Reynolds Aluminum Company
Time; Sports Illustrated;
June, 1970

". . . the returnable Coca-Cola bottle is . . . durable, practical and very economical because it can make as many as 50 round trips in its useful life. The returnable Coca-Cola bottle is ecologically sound as well. Because, when a bottle keeps moving it is less likely to find its way into . . . the highways, beaches, and parks.

Coca-Cola ad,
April 22, 1970

"Requiring a 5 cent deposit on every bottle or can . . . certainly will attract the attention of youngsters . . . who won't see bottles or cans in those ditches but just so many nickels."

Adele Ferguson
Bremerton Sun, May 25, 1970

The Cost:

"Wouldn't you rather borrow our bottle than buy it?"

Coca-Cola Bottling Company, 1970
"Pepsi Costs Less in Returnable Bottles."
Pepsi-Cola Billboard, 1970

Vote "Yes" for Initiative 256:

Responsibility for a safe and beautiful Northwest rests with industry, retailers, and consumers. Excessive waste and ugliness have been tolerated too long. Vote YES!

"The 1970s absolutely must be the years when America pays its debt to . . . our living environment. It is literally now or never."

Richard M. Nixon, 1970

Vote YES!

Committee appointed to compose statement **FOR** Initiative Measure No. 256:

ROBERT H. KELLER, JR., Sponsor, Bellingham; RICHARD G. MARQUARDT, State Senator, Seattle; NAT WASHINGTON, State Senator, Ephrata.

Advisory Committee: HOWARD E. NELSON, Secretary, Washington State Sportsmen's Council; MRS. JOE E. WOLFF, President, Washington Federation of Garden Clubs; BILL CLEMENT, Owner, Al's Savewell Food Stores; JACK ROBERTSON, President, Washington State Environmental Council; A. LARS NELSON, Master, Washington State Grange.

The Law as it now exists:

There is no law in this state requiring that the sale or distribution of beer, malt beverages or non-alcoholic beverages be in refundable containers.

Effect of Initiative Measure No. 256

if approved into Law:

The proposed act would require that beer or other malt beverages or soft drinks distributed or sold for off-premise consumption be in a container having a refund value of at least five cents. Violations of the act would constitute a misdemeanor. Use of containers in violation of the act would be a public nuisance and would be subject to abatement as such. Also, the state and local boards of health are authorized to suspend "appropriate licenses."

Note: Complete text of Initiative Measure No. 256 appears on page 22.

Statement **AGAINST**

Five Good Reasons to Vote Against Initiative 256

1. It won't work.

Deposits on beverage containers, which are only a small part of the litter problem in the first place, have never discouraged littering and there is no reason to think they will now.

2. It is unreasonable, unrealistic and leaves vital questions unanswered.

Why require deposits on paper cups with soft drinks in them but not on paper cups with coffee in them? Why on grocery cartons of soft drinks but not on the same cartons of milk? Why on fruit juice cans and not on vegetable juice cans? Where are deposits collected? Where are refunds given? Who collects all the cans that are of no value to anybody after they are used? And who pays for hauling them away to the garbage dump?

3. It unfairly penalizes people who don't litter.

Citizens who use garbage cans and litter barrels would have to save their trash and cart it someplace for refunds.

4. It threatens another devastating blow to Washington's economy.

The result would be higher prices, lower sales, reduced employment and reduced tax revenue for needed services. The people should not have to pay the consequences for a measure whose ineffectiveness is predictable.

5. It discriminates against certain products and the people who buy them.

In fact, in a paradox that is hard to understand, it is especially aimed at products that NOW are available in deposit containers by customer choice.

*Committee appointed to compose statement **AGAINST** Initiative Measure No. 256:*

MERV HENDERSON, Secretary-Treasurer, Retail Clerks' Union, Local #1105, Seattle; E. T. (MOOSE) JONES, President, King County Labor Council; WES ROBINSON, Director, Citizens Against Initiative #256, 10039 N.E. 28th Place, Bellevue.

COMPLETE TEXT OF

INITIATIVE MEASURE

251

Ballot Title as issued by the Attorney General:

STATE TAXATION— TO REGULATE IMPOSITION

An initiative declaring that existing taxes imposed by the state of Washington shall not be increased and that no new or additional taxes shall be imposed by the state of Washington.

*Be it enacted by the people
of the State of Washington:*

Section 1. From and after the effective date of this Act, notwithstanding any provisions of the law to the contrary, the rate or rates of any and all taxes presently imposed by the State of Washington shall not be increased; none of the taxes presently imposed by the State of Washington shall be extended to new and/or additional classifications of persons, objects or transactions; no new and/or additional taxes of any kind shall be imposed by the State of Washington.

The prohibition against tax rate and/or base increases contained in this Act shall apply to taxes levied by the State of Washington under the provisions of RCW 28.47.440, Chapter 48.14 RCW, Chapter 54.28 RCW, RCW 66.24.210, RCW 66.24.290, Chapter 67.08 RCW, Chapter 67.16 RCW, Chapter 73.32 RCW, Chapter 73.33 RCW, RCW 74.04.150, Title 82 RCW, Title 83 RCW, Chapter 84.52 RCW.

Initiative Measure No. 251 filed in the office of the Secretary of State as of March 12, 1970.

Sponsors filed 135,648 supporting signatures as of July 3, 1970.

Signatures found sufficient. Measure then certified to the November 3, 1970 state general election ballot for approval or rejection by the voters.

COMPLETE TEXT OF

INITIATIVE MEASURE

256

Ballot Title as issued by the Attorney General:

PROHIBITING CERTAIN NONREFUNDABLE BEVERAGE RECEPTACLES

An act prohibiting the sale or distribution of beer or any other malt beverage, or of any

nonalcoholic mineral water, soda water, or other carbonated or uncarbonated beverage (commonly known as soft drinks) for consumption in this state in cans, bottles, jugs, tubs, vessels or other receptacles not having a refund value of at least five cents for each such container.

*Be it enacted by the people
of the State of Washington:*

Section 1. The accumulation of broken bottles and discarded cans poses a threat to our health and to our State's scenic landscape and beaches. Such litter is a symptom of a much larger problem: that of the shortsighted allocation of limited natural resources.

This measure is enacted in the exercise of the police power of this State for the purpose of protecting and preserving the health, safety and future of its citizens through the intelligent use of resources.

Section 2. For the purposes of this act "container" shall mean any can, bottle, jug, tub, vessel, or other receptacle, however denominated, of alcoholic or nonalcoholic beverages.

Section 3. No person shall distribute, sell, or offer for sale, beer or any other malt beverage for consumption in this state in a container which does not have a refund value of at least five cents for each such container.

Section 4. (1) No person shall distribute, sell, or offer for sale any nonalcoholic beverage for consumption in this state in a container which does not have a refund value of at least five cents for each such container.

(2) As used in this section "nonalcoholic beverage" means any mineral waters, soda waters, or any other carbonated or uncarbonated beverage not containing alcohol that is commonly known as a soft drink.

Section 5. After the effective date of this Act, every beverage container described in Sections 3 and 4 of this Act shall bear a stamp or label clearly indicating the refund value of the container.

Section 6. (1) The local or State Boards of Health under the powers of RCW 43.20.050, RCW 43.20.190, RCW 43.20.010, and RCW 70.05.060, may revoke or suspend the appropriate licenses of any person who violates the provisions of this Act.

(2) In addition to revocation of licenses, any violation of this Act shall be a misdemeanor.

(3) Use of containers in violation of this Act is a public nuisance and may be abated as such.

Section 7. This Act shall be known and may be cited as the "Keep America Beautiful Act."

Section 8. If any provision of this Act or its application to any person or circumstance is held invalid, the remainder of the Act, or the application of the provision to other persons or circumstances is not affected.

Section 9. (1) Nothing in this Act applies to containers distributed, sold, or offered for sale before the effective date.

(2) This Act applies only to beer or any other malt beverage and to nonalcoholic beverages sold for off premise consumption.

(3) This Act shall take effect April 1, 1971.

Initiative Measure No. 256 filed in the office of the Secretary of State as of April 23, 1970.

Sponsors filed 188,102 supporting signatures as of July 2, 1970.

Signatures found sufficient. Measure then certified to the November 3, 1970 state general election ballot for approval or rejection by the voters.