



## ***Darwin – Katherine Marchment***

*Please be advised that this transcript was produced from a video recording. As such, the quality and accuracy of this transcript cannot be guaranteed and the Inquiry is not liable for any errors.*

**06 February 2018**

**Darwin Convention Centre, Darwin**

**Speaker: Katherine Marchment**

Katherine Marchment: I'm Katherine Marchment. I'm appearing on behalf of myself but I should also tell you that I have started in work with a communication organisation called NT Baseline Testing and we're currently doing baseline testing in the Northern Territory at the Roper River at the moment of water. And I've developed the templates for that and gathered together the scientists and that, that will back that so that we have accreditation as well.

Firstly I'd like to acknowledge the Larrakia people on whose land we meet, and pay my respects to the elders, past and present. I would like to thank the panel for the time and effort you've put in to produce such a comprehensive report, and especially for the online submission library that members of the public have been able to reference. That's been awesome, thanks. I'll just go through a few points. Social impact, in the Northern Territory we have a small population within a large area of land we call home. The Northern Territory is my home. We are like gas molecules in a bottle which are released into a room, we stretch out to fit the space we're in. Like humans go from a small room to a large room, we stand roughly equidistant from each other so filling the larger spaces further.

We have a small population but we stretch out to fill a large area of land and we're adapted to that. For us, a 300 kilometre drive is just down the road. That's true, Katherine is just like, next town. It's nothing to us, to ... and for people from Borroloola and Maningrida, drive 12 hours, it's normal for us. Whereas for someone down south that's a major holiday. So I'd just like to make this point that although we're a small population in a large area, we use all of that area. We have our own territories. A pastoralist may own 700 square kilometres of land and live there with his family, an Aboriginal person may have a couple of thousand square kilometres of tribal lands with their family. It's home and over generations of living there all that land is walked. All that land is used for both business and pleasure and survival. Everything wild and domestic works together so that everyone is fed. Everything is depending on each other.

I see the ... we are dependent on each other, both wild and domestic animals, I have lived on communities and out bush, the crows are our watchdogs, they let us know when humans they're not used to are coming into the area. Stuff like that. We know all the territories of the geckos in our houses, oh yeah that little baby one sits over there, that's there. We're very



integrated into our environment and we have to be for our survival. So our friends aren't just other human beings. They're ... 20 dogs. One dog does the work of 20 men on a cattle station. They're our friends, they're our work partners. The plants tell us what the weather is going to be like. We need that environment, we're part of that environment. These gas companies, they plan to cover the land with a massive grid of wells, pipes, roads, compressor stations, processing plants and other infrastructure as well as man camps for FIFOs. They'll utterly change the environment where people live as they're not just dependent on current ecosystems, they're part of those ecosystems.

The gas industry in the N.T. threatens our very survival. But what I'd really like to talk about mostly is baseline testing and I know that that has been touched on quite a bit today. My first presentation to the inquiry concentrated on baseline testing and what has come out of that is a recommendation that baseline assessments be done by an independent body set up by government. Now there's some problems that I see with this. Baseline assessments are being the assessment of the available data and it's not the same as baseline testing, which is the collection of data. The inquiry itself has admitted that they're lacking in hard data for a true assessment of risk, especially in respect to water.

Two, as has been noted by the inquiry, the government department, the Department of Primary Industries and Resources that has been charged with regulating the industry is also responsible for promoting the industry. Thus a conflict of interest and not independent. Three. Also gas field residents in Queensland have not been happy with the so-called independent testing done by Durham and the GasFields Commission. Due to the close relationships with the industry, and the perception that the employees of Durham and bodies such as the CSIRO have been funded by the industry and are seemingly reluctant to find results that point to the gas industry causing impacts on residents. The most outrageous being the claim that the oily substance found on their cars and water tanks was caused by [inaudible], rather than from condensate from the flaring that was happening right next to them.

Also, as I mentioned before, the onus of proof, according to Australian law is on the landholder. Thus meaning that the testing done, if not done or directly commissioned by the landholder is unlikely to stand up in court. There is a much cheaper, easier solution to the problem that we're currently doing in the Northern Territory through my community organisation NT Baseline Testing, which would satisfy the courts that the testing is landholder initiated, independent and accredited. NT Baseline Testing is being done in the Northern Territory, we're doing it on the Roper River which is landholder initiated, paid for by the landholder and donations through NT Baseline Testing, been having fundraisers for that. As the testing is initiated by the landholder, it passes the requirement that the landholder proves impacts and they're onsite with us while we're doing the testing, make sure that we're doing the right thing.



And so the field work is actually being sponsored by scientists and I have a field worker with me as well as the landholders as witnesses to make sure that we are doing that field work according to the scientific method that we've been given, which is basically keeping the samples in laboratory condition from collection till it gets to the laboratory and given the distances here that's actually quite a process. Keeping it within that temperature range that we are told to keep it in and also the way we collect it, the way it's sampled, all of that and I have laboratory notes for that, field lab notes for that as well with witnesses.

Accredited labs ... scientists even ... the testing we have done in the NT has followed the instructions by qualified science to the letter. Thus in passing the accreditation test, this is very similar to the process that gas and mining companies currently use when doing their testing, where the field workers don't have to be scientists themselves but have to do the work according to instruction given. Thus the testing will stand up in court as well as being accredited and independent. The only problem that we've come across with what we're doing with NT Baseline Testing is the cost. This is not cheap. It costs for the consulting scientist, it costs money ... to develop the template for what we're going to test for in the water. It costs money to do the fieldwork. It costs money to keep those samples in laboratory conditions and get them back to the lab in Darwin within the timeframe specified. All of this has to be done. It costs time to write up all the notes. So I haven't been pulling a wage for that, but I bloody should because I've put bloody hours and hours into it.

Normal wages here are \$200 a day but we simply didn't have enough money so I just couldn't pay myself. I pay my fieldworker; I couldn't pay me. So what I recommend is a change in the recommendations because this work is currently being done, and it can be done under the current system by the landholder simply putting in a receipt of the costs to the Department of Primary Industries and Resources through their current accounts department. And we've also done some testing on an Aboriginal community. Now they didn't have any money so that was fully done through fundraising and the thing with that is, landholders and Aboriginal communities are considering this baseline testing quite urgent, it has been bought up a lot. That's why we're not waiting around for government. We're not waiting around for industry, we're doing it now.

My suggestion there is that for communities that just simply don't have the cash, and can prove that, especially if they're all on bloody Centrelink, is that they put in a quote to DPIR, which pays us to do the testing and then we just acquit it. Simple operation and it doesn't require the setting up of a whole new department, it doesn't require a whole heap of people coming up down south, I'm working with an extremely good scientist in New South Wales, and he has been initiating citizen based science over the last few years, so we'll be doing bores next using his work. His specialisation is groundwater ecosystems so we're doing chemical testing of the surface water, but bore water, given the little critters in the water, groundwater ecosystems change the quickest. Living things change the quickest, when something is new, is introduced into the system.



So we've determined that baseline testing of bores using the stygofauna is probably the best way to go and it doesn't have to be transported live. It's about numbers in the water, so it's very similar fieldwork to the chemical testing that we're already doing. We're self-starters here in the NT and we do want to protect our water and I propose that these gas companies know the pollutants that go into the water. They know how it changes. They've been operating in Queensland for long enough to know that. I don't support the speaker from APPEA earlier who said that they can do construction and baseline testing at the same time. To me that doesn't make sense. But if we're going to get baselines then it has to be uninterrupted with roads, it has to be uninterrupted with construction, uninterrupted with drilling otherwise it's not a baseline. That's a fact. So that statement just simply didn't make sense to me. A baseline is a baseline as in, we get the baselines before we start.

I do realise that baseline testing is over a period of time in that you can't just take one test and say that's a baseline. So again our main problems with this is money. So we're staggering it over the year to try and cope with that, but to get a minimal baseline is at least three tests in the same area. That's like a minimum. Because two points isn't a line, but three you can get the baseline, that's basic maths. So this is what we're doing here, so I'm asking the inquiry if they could add that to the recommendations, that rather than ... we're already got budgetary problems in the Northern Territory, I don't see how we can afford to set up a whole government department apart from the fact that there is queries about the close relationship between our government and the gas industry anyway. So that's where I'm going with that.

This is completely different to what I've written down, by the way. But anyway, I'll keep going. When talking about independent bodies, in Queensland, [Beumont] from Kogan could set his bore water on fire, yet he was told that DERM, that's the Department of Environment and Resources Management there, the GasFields Commissions, that his water had no flammable gas in it. And was perfectly safe to drink. Even though he'd burned his grandkids in the bathtub and his cattle wouldn't touch it. And he could set it on fire. So the independent commission that just couldn't find anything wrong with the flammable well that wasn't according to them flammable, was ... we have in the Northern Territory given our ... well basically have developed a relationship with the Queenslanders as a resource for what's about to hit us. So we've talked to these people and gone, oh my god, really? Oh my god, you've got that video on YouTube, that happened to you? We get that.

One thing I would like set up with DPIR because we also talk to each other, is that there has been quite a bit of water testing done especially by the large pastoral companies in the Northern Territory, as well as the stuff that I am doing specifically related to fracking with NT Baseline Testing and we should have an open source database that we can all use, especially if we're doing citizen science. And the landholders are absolutely essential in this process because they know the best spot to test the river, and the rest of it. I don't know if I'll go through this next section, it's about my mistrust of the inquiry



itself, basically. And I think I'll leave it written rather than putting it on camera, because I don't want to be disrespectful. But there are real misgivings.

And jump straight to regulatory capture. I've got to say I didn't read the full report and appendixes, I read the summary, the time frame over Christmas, it was just too hard, it was too hard for me to read a 400 page report and do everything that I've been doing. So forgive me if I put some things in that particular section that you might find offensive, or that I'm wrong. Okay. Regulatory capture. During a quick search of Google I found a number of articles from all over the world, mainly from energy companies which cite the need for robust regulation, or robust regulatory regime. What I've not found is reference to actual robust regulations where the regulations have been successful in making this industry safe. So for all this talk of robust regulation, to me is yet more industry spin. Imagine my disappointment to see the inquiry spouting exactly the same line, the robust regulation, I'm kinda like, really? This has been since 2005 they've been talking about this, in the USA, in Europe, in the UK, in the Northern Territory, in Western Australia, in New South Wales, in Queensland. It's all talk and no action. Robust regulation.

And I don't even know what robust regulation looks like. I really don't. As for ... it was talked about in New South Wales, the robust regulation thing, and ... with the regulations in New South Wales, where's the enforcement? Santos was fined only \$1500 for contaminating an aquifer. Contamination that was brought to the attention of the regulator by a local farmer. Local farmers that have been locking on and protesting in the Peligo have been fined more than that. For a huge multinational company, to be fined \$1500 for contaminating an aquifer is an insult, I'm sorry. I've put a number of references here that go back to 2012 about robust regulation saying, yes, it'll be safe with robust regulations but the results show different to me. So I have no trust in that, none.

There's the regulation and then there's the ever growing list of the harm compiled by Pennsylvania resident Jenny Lisak, it's up to 22,144 people with verifiable harm done to them with this industry. This is significant in any population and very significant given that fracking occurs in the less populated areas of the USA. This is what we're facing in the NT, which kind of came up in the last presentation and, like, oh, it doesn't matter if it's not much. Just one thing, there's the well published Halliburton loophole where Dick Cheney gained an exemption for the industry of the Clean Water Act. This loophole ... in 2005, this loophole in the USA is yet to be closed. I have grave concerns about this because Halliburton is one of the biggest, if not our biggest defence and infrastructure contractors here in the NT. They are also the primary contractor for fracking operations in the NT, are we prepared to let them poison our water because we think we can't afford to lose their business? There's that side of it too. The pressure that's put on governments to keep the budget balanced.

And then we got our GST pulled, I found \$450,000,000 in this year's budget alone in direct and indirect subsidies to the frackers. How is that ... I can't



even ... What we were told in Queensland was that shale gases, CSG is different to shale gas, we'll be right, that gas land movie is about shale gas, CSG is a lot safer. And then since the disasters in Queensland, what we're being told in the Northern Territory is, oh, that's CSG in Queensland, that's the bad stuff, this shale stuff is safe. Well, I'll go back to the USA and go, hang on a minute, I remember that line. So I don't believe that this industry is safe at all because they've yet to prove it. They're yet to prove that the risk can be managed. It's all theoretical robust regulation, we're yet to see it on any continent.

I'll just finish up. And also with regard to regulatory capture, Jeremy Buckingham published an article that made it to the Sydney Morning Herald, called the revolving door between miners and government. And that include the frackers. And then our own ex-chief minister Adam Giles, straight after he ... got booted out as Chief Minister went to work for Gina Rinehart. Our trust in government and industry, we think they're in bed too close together. The Northern Territory's current chief of staff, Alf Leonardi, is openly pro-fracking. What does that say? I could go on. Do you want me to finish now because there's-

Hon. Justice Pepper: You have exceeded your allocated 15 minutes, yes, but-

Katherine Marchment: I thought I had a half an hour allocation. Have I only been allocated 15 minutes? Sorry.

Hon. Justice Pepper: My apologies, it is half an hour.

Katherine Marchment: Oh that's cool, that's why I started rushing through...

Hon. Justice Pepper: No, no, no, no, my apologies.

Katherine Marchment: Well I'll just -

Hon. Justice Pepper: No, no, take, on that basis you've got another ten minutes, so please-

Katherine Marchment: Anyway, I'll just got through to the end. The NT News put an editorial on the 13th of December 2013, I've got 13, it's actually ... 2017, it was just last year, so better correct that mistake. 2017 said give fracking the green light, openly biased, pro-fracking. Currently one of their former journalists is in court with them regarding allegations that the Northern Territory News prints as instructed by their biggest advertisers under the guise of reporting and that some of that reporting has been factually incorrect. In other words, cash for comment. Their biggest advertisers in 2017 have been APPEA and the Northern Territory Government.

In 2017 ... this is where I put the budget ... approximately 450 million was allocated to industry. This is during the year, we have a moratorium on fracking so they're spending more on the frackers in this year than they're spent in the previous five years before that according to the figures from the Australian Institute. We've got a massive deficit. I went through that budget with Nicole Madison, I went through that budget line by line to pull that



stuff out, because those little bit here, little bit there, is hidden everywhere, I tell you, it was quite a process trying to add up all that money and find it everywhere. But that's the rough figure I came to.

Finally I'd like to say that this process and in particular this submission has been very difficult for me, given our media's blatant pro-frack bias, and the fact that the inquiry is being paid by a government that appears to have a pro-frack bias with pressure being put on them, and by the federal government to pull the trigger. Malcolm Turnbull said that to Michael Gunner. It's ... made me lose faith in the inquiry, a lot of faith in the inquiry's independence partially due to these things and I've spoken to a number of people, I'd say, are you going to present and they'd say, oh, no it's a waste of time, the result's already been pre-determined. So I'm not completely saying that you have to work within the terms of reference and quite frankly I think that the terms of reference that you've been given are ... you can't ... is there any way that you can say the risks are too high, do you have to go, because it's more like a, how can we frack, instead of should we frack, terms of reference.

So how do you get out of that as panel members if you go, okay, this is too high. What have you got left? Robust regulation which has been the fallback for people trying to get out of rotten terms of reference since 2013 ... I've missed out a whole lot of things. Look, on a positive note, I'd like to that I really appreciate the obviously long hours and hard work that has gone into preparing this draft final report that you guys have put in. I really do appreciate that. Especially the fact that you have basically tried to reach out to as many Territorians as possible so that we can have a say. I appreciate too. And I'd like to thank you for listening.

Hon. Justice Pepper: Thank you, and I know you have put a submission in so thank you very much for that as well.

Katherine Marchment: It's basically this, so it's a little bit-

Hon. Justice Pepper: No, no, that's good, I was aware of that and I think you've ... references-

Katherine Marchment: The submission includes the internet links.

Hon. Justice Pepper: Good. Okay, that was going to be my next question, thank you.

Katherine Marchment: Yeah, so, which makes it a bit easier. And they've come out on my printer in blue and purple so it's pretty easy-

Hon. Justice Pepper: Good, excellent, thank you. I just wanted to make a couple of comments. At the risk of sounding too defensive, but whilst from what I've read in the media there's certainly been pressure exerted on the Territory government. I can assure you that there has been no pressure whatsoever exerted on this inquiry. We have maintained our independence throughout this process and will continue to do so. In fact, we've had no communications with government along those lines whatsoever other than through the normal



submission process, so we certainly haven't felt any pressure as a result of what may be happening in Canberra.

Katherine Marchment: I might add that that's possibly the media as well, there was a financial review article with a picture of you, quoting you with, it was written in a very pro-industry way and possibly that could have been a bit of media spin on what your actual comments might have been to the financial review.

Hon. Justice Pepper: I've given no separate interview to the Financial Review, I can't comment whether or not the Financial review has been present at some of the larger-

Katherine Marchment: I have that as a link-

Hon. Justice Pepper: Yeah, I'm aware of the article apart from looking at the photo and thinking, gee, I was a lot thinner then, I haven't ... as I said, the only ... if the Financial Review has been present during some of the larger media scrums, for want of a better word, so be it, I don't know. But I certainly haven't given any separate interview with the Financial Review, the AFR, so I can't comment on what they're written, as I said. That's the first thing. The second thing was, again, I can only reiterate what I've said before, that this result has very much not been predetermined.

Katherine Marchment: Thank you. Just one more thing, and I'd just like to put it as a observation as us, as Territorians, we're quite mistrustful of FIFOs, I've had a lot of experience of FIFO workers in town and they're pretty rude and ... they don't have a lot of respect for locals. I had a similar experience in Queensland, as well, and it's kind of like, we're very parochial here, and we kind of do regard you guys are FIFOs, you ... aren't really invested in the Northern Territory, you're not living here -

Hon. Justice Pepper: Dr Ritchie, lives here.

Katherine Marchment: True.

Hon. Justice Pepper: Dr Anderson lives here-

Dr. Alan Anderson: 32 years-

Hon. Justice Pepper: And David Jones, Dr David Jones, has lived here for over 16 years.

Katherine Marchment: Yeah, brilliant. Sorry, so that ... I've got to admit this is just talking around, people talking around town about this issue. So I'm really glad that I'm incorrect on that point. Thank you.

Hon. Justice Pepper: Any, yes, Dr Jones, of 16 years of living here, has a question-

Dr. David Jones: I was intrigued to hear about your example of citizen science and how that's been implemented. Could you tell us what you're actually looking for in the water for the baseline assessments, and was I correct in hearing you talk about stygofauna in bore water?



Katherine Marchment: Yes, correct. We're actually working with an independent laboratory doing the surface water and that's basically chemical testing and I developed the template for that, so what we're testing for is stuff that's very commonly found in the gas fields and we know what is that given ... what's been found in the water in Queensland and the gas companies going, well, it was like that when we got here, because we didn't have baselines, so we went, okay, well we'll test for that. And price was a real issue, so I had to chop that down a lot further. So the essential things are of course their target gas, methane. We've tested for that. Heavy metals, because that's come up at very high rates in Queensland, we've tested for that. But also as a bit of a baseline we've also tested for common minerals that are found in those areas, a lot of the soils in the Northern Territory are very high in iron, that washes into the stream ... so we put in a bit, salinity, very important because salt is a big problem in the gas fields. The water in the Roper river is actually slightly saline anyway.

I had to come up with what was essential and what was affordable. Radionuclides cost an absolute bloody bomb to test, but we did test for radium 226 and 228, was the most affordable we could, and that is the most common radioactive substance that has increased quite dramatically in the gas fields of Queensland. It's basically it was a basic water test with a couple of added extras according to what has been found in the gas fields. With the stygofauna I'm working with a scientist in New South Wales who has 30 years' experience in that field and his wife has been training field workers for decades, and so with that specialisation I thought, well, apart from the chems, given that little critters die very quickly in changes in their environment, we've decided to do... more groundwater fauna for the bores-

Dr. David Jones: That's actually one of the biggest knowledge gaps in the groundwater community and ecosystems in the NT-

Katherine Marchment: And also he's already done some testing in the Northern Territory and we can draw on that as well, although that will cost us. He's given me a lot of free time and a lot of free information, but he's made it very clear that he's going to have to get paid, for the help he's given us for sure.

Hon. Justice Pepper: Thank you. Any further questions, yes, Dr Anderson?

Dr. Alan Anderson: One-

Hon. Justice Pepper: 32 years-

Katherine Marchment: I'm so glad I'm wrong about this...

Hon. Justice Pepper: I should say there are full CVs although that may not indicate where people live but there are full CVs of all of the panel members of the website.

Dr. Alan Anderson: Just a comment about your fears, how development of a gas industry in the NT might completely transform the landscapes-

Katherine Marchment: I've seen it-



Dr. Alan Anderson: What a problem that would be-

Katherine Marchment: I've seen it, because, you've got to remember with me, I've got family in the gas fields and I remember what that country looked like before there was any gas industry there. And it looks dramatically different now, too me.

Dr. Alan Anderson: In Queensland?

Katherine Marchment: In Queensland.

Dr. Alan Anderson: That fear is very widespread one and for good reason and one of the key objectives in our risk analysis is to ensure that that doesn't happen. And I'm just wondering whether you have any experience with the gas fields that already occur in the NT, down south, in Mereenie and Palm Valley-

Katherine Marchment: I have skirted Mereenie, I have used their roads to get to Palm Valley, but I haven't actually been smack in the Mereenie oil fields, I've basically gone from Hermannsburg to Palm Valley using the Mereenie roads.

Dr. Alan Anderson: Okay.

Katherine Marchment: And that was quite a while ago. My parents were remote area teachers so we moved around the Territory a lot, so that's when they were working in the southern part of the Northern Territory.

Dr. Alan Anderson: I just raised that as an example where I think it doesn't have to lead to a dramatic landscape transformation in the sense, we visited Mereenie and that was one of the things that surprised us, actually, how little obvious landscape change-

Katherine Marchment: I guess I'm just going off my experience of the south west Queensland gas fields where the change in the environment has been massive. It's nothing like what it was before, at all. At all.

Hon. Justice Pepper: I think that's a fair point, and I suppose, just perhaps another observation is that when did our visit at Mereenie, that is quite an established gas field, so the rehabilitation has occurred, the vegetation has come back. That's not, I'm sure the case, with the Queensland, which is a much ... a lot of those fields are a lot less mature.

Katherine Marchment: Well, also you've got remember with Mereenie, when I was last there, they weren't doing slickwater hydraulic horizontal fracking at Mereenie, so when I went through that area it was conventional gas, which means that there was whole lot of infrastructure and stuff that comes with unconventional gas that wasn't there. I'm just ... like massive holding ponds, actually that's really a point, I still want to know what's in those ponds. I've asked at every presentation and I'm asking it again this one, I want to know what's in that pond. I want to know the emissions that are coming off them and I want to know what may spill into our wetlands. You said you went to [inaudible] but you can't have, you must have gone to [inaudible]. You can't have gone-



Hon. Justice Pepper: I'm sorry are you talking about Queensland, or-

Katherine Marchment: This is when you did your field trip. You can't possibly have gone to [inaudible] because you went ... I know that John Jenkins met you in [inaudible] and he lived at that time, he's got out of the gas fields now, thank god, but he lived at that time smack next to [inaudible], and ... you said you hadn't seen a holding pond, those ponds, there's like four or five ponds next to [inaudible] that are massive. You can't miss them. And I'm thinking you must have been to a different processing plant, because it doesn't explain it. If you didn't go down that road you can't have been to [inaudible]-

Dr. David Jones: We went to a process station but we saw the big ponds from the air when we were taking off from that area.

Hon. Justice Pepper: We have certainly seen some of the larger ponds, absolutely.

Katherine Marchment: They're massive.

Hon. Justice Pepper: And they're large.

Dr. David Jones: They are huge.

Katherine Marchment: And there is really something not good coming off them. And that, the fact the emissions of those ponds are never mentioned but they're such a big part of the landscape, and I'm sure personally that that was contributing to making people sick ... but the thing is, no data, then ... This is how they've gone, oh well, there's no data on it, so it doesn't exist and this how they operate in Queensland, I'm kind of going ... mmm, well get the data then. Get the data, and ... a bit of water testing of those ponds would be a good thing I'd reckon. I still think, reckon that would be a really good thing, get someone to take some samples and put it through an independent lab as exactly what's in those bloody ponds.

Hon. Justice Pepper: As I said at the moment in the draft final recommendation is against ponds. It's towards tanks.

Katherine Marchment: But even so, I still want to know what's in that water. I don't feel comfortable, we've got this water coming up, how to dispose of it, and the rest of it, don't we want to know what's in it? It just to me that makes sense.

Hon. Justice Pepper: I understand that submission. Any further questions. Well again, thank you very much, Miss Marchment, for coming again, doing your detailed presentation again to the inquiry. One of the things that's marked this inquiry is the considerable effort, amazing amount of effort that people have ... basically undertaken in order to prepare and present to the inquiry, both at the public hearings and also at the community forums as well. And it's been one of the fantastic aspects, I think, for us anyway, as a panel of this inquiry and you are no exception in that regard, so thank you very much.



Katherine Marchment: Look, thank you for listening to me through this whole process, and sorry if I'm a bit angry but I have an emotional thing about this as well as just studying it. So please forgive me for some of my emotional responses.

Hon. Justice Pepper: No need for forgiveness whatsoever. Thank you. And that concludes the public hearings in Darwin. Thank you very much.