



Katherine Marchment – Hearing Transcript

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

10 March 2017

Darwin Convention Centre, Darwin

Speaker: Katherine Marchment

Katherine Marchment: Okay, the terms of reference refer to scientific evidence. Researching scientific evidence, I notice there is a plethora of scientific evidence with regard to onshore gas resources in the Northern Territory. Unfortunately, I have been unable to reference the same quality and quantity of scientific evidence with regard to water resources, both surface and ground water in the Northern Territory.

For example, how much of our water resources are potable resources? What is the full mapping of our surface and ground water resources? What is the quality of different resources in different areas? Given the shale fracking route uses large quantities of water, how much water do we have available for this process in the areas they wish to frack? What would be the impact of this drawdown on other users and the environment in the same areas? How likely is there to be contamination issues, as there have been with this industry in Africa, Ukraine, USA, Queensland and New South Wales, given that the same extraction process is used? Given that there are issues with the disposal of frack waste in all of these areas, what is the current health of our water resources?

In particular, my presentation concentrates on baseline testing. With current knowledge gaps, additional work and a suggested program on how work or research should be prioritised and implemented, I expand on the baseline testing of water, fugitive emissions, geological mapping and social baselines and health.

Included in my references are personal observations from my own experience visiting the Darling Downs and South Burnett districts of Queensland on numerous occasions prior to their being a gas industry, during the construction phase, and post-construction/production phase of this industry in these areas, as I have a relative with a 5,000-acre property at Durong. I have also been involved in actions in the Pilliga with regard to the Santos Narrabri project, as I have a close friend who is a farmer in the area whose property is in the Coonamble district and is bordered on two sides by the Pilliga Forest. Her farm is highly likely to be directly impacted if the Santos Narrabri project goes ahead.



To begin with a question, how it is possible to assess scientific evidence as regards the nature and extent of environmental impacts and risk per terms of reference point one, if the baseline scientific data per terms of reference two, A, B, C and D, is not collected and analysed? In the Northern Territory, the onshore gas activities are subject to the Petroleum Environment Regulations 2016 NT, with the Department of Primary Industry and Resources being the regulatory body responsible for the implementation of these regulations.

Okay. I've had to chop a lot out.

Hon. Justice

Rachel Pepper:

That's all right.

Katherine Marchment: For baseline testing to be valid in an Australian court of law, the baseline testing must be traceable to an accredited testing authority. In the Northern Territory, the only accredited testing authorities are the Department of Primary Industry and Resources Laboratory and Intertek's Northern Territory Environmental Laboratory, NTEL. NTEL is the only laboratory listed which tests for heavy metals and chemicals commonly found where fracking occurs. According to the International Journal of Human and Ecological Risk Assessment and the USA Bureau of Land Management, the most common chemicals found in shale gas fracking fluids are ... I hardly pronounce these ... isopropyl alcohol, 2-butoxyethanol, and ethylene glycol, and in America, BTEX, which is banned in fracking fluids in Australia, but naturally occurring in produce water.

According to the regulations, gas companies operating in the NT have to provide a full list of chemicals they use in fracking fluids, which is then published on DPIP website. According to the website, the link is still to be applied, so at the present time, no companies with fracking licences in the NT have provided a public list of the chemicals they are using in their frack fluids.

Radium and other radioactive components have been tested, and this is citing the American studies above again, 100 to 1000 times safe drinking water levels in shale gas fracking waste. In Queensland, radon gas is released into the atmosphere where fracking occurs. Note the SCU study that Justin referred to, by Dr. Isaac Santos. Radioactive lead 210 is in drinking rainwater tanks of residents in Tara. Residents, along with pets and livestock, are no longer able to drink the water in Tara, and Chinchilla either now. But anyway ...

The onus has been entirely on the landholder or concerned citizen to prove impacts, as baseline studies have not been done with regard to the unconventional gas industry, either in the Australia or the United States. As well, we have regulations requiring baseline testing. Just as well, we have regulations requiring baseline testing in the Northern Territory, right?



Wrong. The regulations also state, "Plans approved prior to the commencement of the regulations will be deemed to be approved plans until the first of December, 2017. That will be all areas currently under licence in the Northern Territory." The regulations came into effect July 2016, and as far as I know, there have been no applications for new exploration licences registered since that time.

Petroleum activities are also exempt from the application of the Water Act and the Federal Water Trigger. What exactly is the scientific evidence available to determine impacts and risks in the territory if under current legislation, gas companies operating under licence across huge expanses of the Northern Territory are not required to provide a ...

My advice, therefore, on additional work or research per item two is that based on data per item two is collected prior to the completion of the inquiry so that levels of risk acceptable for the NT per item three and item one can be determined to assess the scientific evidence in the NT. It is self-evident that we need scientific evidence in the NT to make that assessment.

I'm repeating myself here. Currently I can find no baseline data provided by gas operators or government for the DPIR as per the regulations for flat fluids. I can find plenty of data from gas companies and government as to how big our gas reserves are in the NT, as well as how profitable it is likely to be, but nothing published by the Northern Territory government or gas companies concerning any environmental or risk assessment studies in their tenements. As per item two, baseline data is needed to determine impacts and cumulative impacts. Until we have that information, how is the environmental and other risks associated with fracking in the Northern Territory determined?

A strong argument for the implementation of baseline data collection as mandatory for companies which currently hold exploration and production licences in the Northern Territory before they fracked, is the lived, impacted experience of landholders in Queensland and New South Wales. Even for areas where wells have been fracked, it would be wise to collect baseline data to see whether impacts get worse over time. Impacted landholders are trying to prove these companies responsible for the impacts they've been experiencing since the development of the gas industry in their area. This is relevant to this inquiry, as many of the same companies, such as SANTOS and Origin Energy, now want to frack the territory. If their work practises have been unacceptable to residents living in fracking areas in other states, I have a great deal of concern about the way they will conduct their business in the Northern Territory.

Companies such as QDC, Arrow, BG, SANTOS, and Origin have had a huge number of complaints and allegations made against them, including bullying of landholders, intimidation of locals by gas workers, excessive rubbish thrown on road verges by gas workers, dangerous driving by gas workers,



frightening and endangering locals, including the local school bus driver, ripping down of boundary fences without permission, weed contamination, illegal dumping of frack water onto roads and into creeks, contamination of ground and surface water and rainwater tanks, contamination of the town water supplies for Tara and Chinchilla, noise pollution, particularly from heavy machinery, traffic movements, and compressor stations, which they're still getting complaint about, light pollution, health impacts from flaring and venting, health impacts from the vapours emitted from the evaporation ponds ... and this has been hugely contentious, because it's not being included in emissions to the National Pollutions Inventory, and I know someone that lives about 500 metres from one, so, okay ...

... excessive numbers of dead wildlife around ponds, and Kenya Processing Plant, particularly birds, air pollution causing sickness and death of stock, sorry, fugitive emissions causing sickness from industry infrastructure, such as wells and pipelines and compression stations, contamination of soil.

Without accredited baseline testing, the residents have been unable to prove their case against the gas companies regarding most of these complaints and allegations. Under current laws, the onus is on the landowner to prove the gas companies are at fault for the problems that they have been experiencing since these companies started operating in their area. A vivid example of this is that stretches of the Condamine River can be set alight. The problems in the Condamine River were first brought to the attention of the public when a farmer with land adjacent to the river rang the ABC in distress describing the water, the river as bubbling like a spa. He also went on to say he'd never seen anything like it in his lifetime, and as far as he knew, it wasn't something that had ever occurred before. The bubbling in the river started after QGC fracked wells in the area, I think a kilometre away they were.

However, due to the lack of baseline studies, QGC used the, "It was like that when we got here," defence, calling the excessive methane in the river a natural occurrence or natural fugitive emissions. It has then become an extremely expensive and protracted legal and environmental exercise for the landholder and DRM to prove QGC, now BG, responsible. Five years later, no compensation has been forthcoming, no remediation has been attempted, and QGC has not been required to shut down the gas operations in that area.

Professor Damian Barrett, the CSIRO's lead researcher into unconventional gas, has been monitoring the Condamine gas seeps. He has confirmed the bubbling has intensified over time. The Queensland government told the ABC in 2016 that it doesn't have sufficient information to identify the cause of the leaks. The Condamine is an essential water source for dry land farmers in Queensland and flows directly into our main river system, the Murray-Darling Basin. It is an environmental disaster of epic proportions, and nothing is being done.



Another example in Queensland, as the unconventional gas industry rolled out, landholders were advised that baseline testing was unnecessary, because baseline testing couldn't stop the effects of contamination as it occurred, and it was too expensive. What they were not told was that without baseline testing, it was almost impossible to prove corporate liability, difficult to get operations suspended, difficult to isolate contamination to the source, and if impacts did occur, it was prohibitively expensive for landholders to fight for compensation. The precautionary principle has not been applied.

For residents of the Tara estates experience health problems which they attribute to a gas field being built across residential estates where they lived. They are also having problems proving the gas companies are at fault for the health problems they are experiencing. Doctor Geralyn McCarron did a study of these residents in a paper published called, "Symptomology of a Gas Field." The residents' symptoms were consistent with reported effects of toxins declared by the gas companies as emissions to the National Pollutants Inventory. There appears to be a strong causal link between gas company operations and the health problems. However, without baseline testing of health or baseline air testing, the gas companies have again been able to use the, "It was like that when we got here," defence, and avoid their responsibility toward people that have been impacted.

The health problems have been severe and frightening, such as bleeding from the nose and ears ... Sorry.

Hon. Justice

Rachel Pepper:

It's all right. Do you need to take a moment?

Katherine Marchment: Sorry, I'm just ... Such as bleeding from the nose and ears, fits, convulsions, neurological problems, migraines, blackouts, and severe rashes akin to chemical burns. I'm sorry. I've seen these health problems firsthand, so it's difficult ...

Hon. Justice

Rachel Pepper:

There's some water there if you need to take some water.

Katherine Marchment: All right. Some of the most vocal, like Debbie Orr, have had their blocks purchased by the gas companies and were forced to sign confidentiality agreements in order to move their kids to safety. Others have simply given up and walked away. Some, like John Jenkyn, are trapped where they are, and can only gather video and written evidence of their own suffering and the environmental devastation happening around them. In Queensland, in federal parliaments, these people have been referred to as collateral damage. They have simply been abandoned to their own devices, left to die.



They live in a sacrifice zone for an industry that they didn't ask for and which they don't benefit from.

Baseline testing for health can be done through Medicare. Hair tests are done for analysis of heavy metals exposure. Blood tests are done to detect the presence of other common chemicals used in or emitted by fracking. Urine tests are done to determine exposure to BTEX. However, when I was in Queensland, I was live-in carer for a woman who had worked in the petro industry and was now experiencing health problems. One of her doctors was denied the right to bulk bill his patient's testing for heavy metals and blood and urine testing for other indicators of petrochemical exposure. The reason given by Queensland Health was that he was ordering too many tests.

The gas workers and residents of the gas fields no longer able to work because of their health can't afford to pay full price for the tests they need to obtain diagnosis and apply for worker's compensation. Given the nature of petrochemical illnesses, often they feel too sick to want to stress themselves with legal action. They just want their health to improve.

Another knowledge gap per item one, how the gas companies use the water will impact those living within these licence areas as well as the environment within the areas. Has testing and recording been made of the average pressures found in water bores in the licence areas over a few years previous cycles as one of the baselines for impacts on groundwater? Loss of pressure, bores drying up, and bores becoming gassy have been the experiences of landholders in Queensland since the gas industry. According to regulations, the gas companies need to provide DPIR with sustainable water use and allocation planning. I think a copy of this plan needs to be provided also to residents within the licence zone, as there are people directly impacted by the water use of these companies.

There also needs to be baseline studies per issue two. If geological and fault line mapping is not completed, how can the industry be sure they can frack safely? Given that the horizontal fracking occurs over kilometres, how can they be sure where the fracks go? How can they be sure if their operations will not affect interconnectivity of aquifers? How can they be sure they won't have well blowouts caused by unmapped fault lines?

Per items four and five, the exploration and production licences in the Northern Territory cover 90 percent of the land mass. It would be impossible for the current number of employees of the only accredited authorities in the Northern Territory to conduct significant baseline studies over this area, in the short time this inquiry is conducted, or within a time frame that would be acceptable to either the gas companies or the residents.

Apart from going to the expense of bringing accredited specialists to the Northern Territory from other states or overseas, one solution to this



dilemma is to train and employ residents living in and around the licence areas in the application and use of baseline testing kits and to contract them to the DPIR to do the testing so that they are accredited. A water testing kit purchased over the Internet costs only about 320 bucks to test for heavy metals such as lead, mercury, and cadmium, which are commonly found in high concentrations in water near fracking operations in the United States and Queensland. It is very similar to using a home pool testing kit. It is a kit that does not need a high level of literacy or training to use, which would make it ideal for use in areas under licence where literacy levels are low, such as on aboriginal communities.

A basic baseline testing kit for surface water and air would only cost about 1,000 bucks per kit. It would consist of a GPS, a water testing kit, a gas detector calibrator for methane, radon, and other flammable gases commonly found near fracking operations, and a Geiger counter. My proposal is for regulation to be enacted retrospectively, that companies that hold a licence over an area provide baseline testing kits of this type to every resident living within the licence area, and pay for DPIR, NTEL, or another accredited agency to train and accredit these residents. Some residents already have this training and skills. These residents, as well as earning testing accreditation, need to receive accreditation to be trainers as well so the programme can be expanded.

Those who live in the licence areas would easily be able to do the baseline testing themselves, and they would have a much more compelling motivation to do so than any other stakeholder. They just need the training and accreditation. This would save on expensive fly-in/fly-out consultants and would enable the baseline testing to cover a much larger area. Results could be sent to an independent database. The Environment Centre NT is independent, employs a database manager, and has offered to take on this role. They also have the database capacity to track and work with a large number of residents. A process like this would facilitate independence and trust, and save the DPIR and thus the taxpayer a lot of money, as the DPIR would be able to pay a lower award based on the fact that the testers would have less qualifications.

As part of the Queensland experience, employees and contractors of the gas companies have been accredited, as well as DRM employees and contractors, for testing of water and air. This has not worked out too well for the landholders. A few examples. Testing of a farmer's water bore by the Queensland Gas Compliance Unit was found to have no flammable gas levels and to be safe for drinking, even though it produced a chemical burn on his grandchildren, the cattle wouldn't touch it, and the farmer was able to set the bore alight. There's dated video evidence of this.

On the Tara-Chinchilla Road, an oily, corrosive substance was landing on roofs and vehicles that the landholders attributed to flaring by Origin Energy. The testers said it was caused by lerps.



Hon. Justice
Rachel Pepper: Sorry?

Katherine Marchment: Insects.

Hon. Justice
Rachel Pepper: Oh, thank you.

Katherine Marchment: All right? Insects shitting out of trees. Subsequent, independent testing by landowners found the substance to be petrochemical in origin and likely to be a result of faulty flaring practises by Origin. In both these instances, there are video and photographic evidence of landowner claims, and I can provide you

Hon. Justice
Rachel Pepper: Thank you.

Katherine Marchment: ... with these. For residents of the Tara estates, their testing was done on days when the wind was high and the flaring stopped, with the testers very kindly informing the gas companies of the days that they were arriving to do the testing.

Okay. Baseline testing across the territory by accredited residents is advantageous to the Northern Territory government, as it gives us a map of the current environmental health of the Northern Territory, which helps with the planning of other industries such as agriculture and tourism. If an incident does occur, it can be identified and isolated much more quickly, saving money and time. This type of monitoring would help the Northern Territory government improve industry regulations and standards. It would also be beneficial to commercial operations other than the oil and gas industry in the Northern Territory. Pastoralists would acquire information which would help them in maximising the commercial benefits of their property. They would also have more chance of receiving compensation for fracking damage done to their land and business, should any incidents occur.

Aboriginal people would benefit, as it would increase their technical knowledge and better enable them to manage their land and resources. A side benefit is that baseline testing is a valuable avenue of employment that has the potential for future development and study in a real capacity in industry. It is no make-work scheme such as picking up rubbish, but a real career path opportunity with added benefit it complies with the cultural values of caring for country, so it is likely to have more appeal to the people that live there.



It would benefit the gas industry, as this is a way for them to finally be able to prove that their operations are as safe as they insist they are. If there is no significant deviation from baselines over the life of their wells, they will have a case to argue that bans and moratoriums be lifted in other parts of Australia and the world, giving them new opportunities. Baseline would give them the opportunity to constantly monitor and improve safe industry practise and would give them a commercial edge over their competitors. They would be leading the way for the whole industry, as there are no known baseline studies tailored to this industry completed anywhere else in the world. Thank you.

Hon. Justice

Rachel Pepper: Thank you very much, Ms. Marchment, for your compelling presentation. You've referred in your presentation to a number of different scientific facts and a number of different examples. Are you going to provide those to the inquiry in due course?

Katherine Marchment: Yes, okay.

Hon. Justice

Rachel Pepper: That would be very useful.

Katherine Marchment: Yeah. I'll provide the reference.

Hon. Justice

Rachel Pepper: Yeah, provide [crosstalk 00:26:14]

Katherine Marchment: Did you want me to provide just the references, or did you ...

Hon. Justice

Rachel Pepper: Just the references, to the extent that you have referred to, for example, some documented video footage, and things like that.

Katherine Marchment: Yeah, no, that was undertaken by the residents, and I do have access to the video document. The scientific papers are straight off Google stuff.

Hon. Justice

Rachel Pepper: Sure, sure, sure. No, that's fine. To the extent that you want us to take into account, for example ...

Katherine Marchment: Yeah, no, I do know these people personally, so I will be able to. I know that Brian Monk's stuff, a lot of it's been pulled off the Internet, but because I know him I'll just tell him to email it to me.

Hon. Justice

Rachel Pepper: That's all right. Just bear in mind that anything you give to the inquiry will be published on our website.



Katherine Marchment: Brilliant! This is what these people want. This is the thing. This is why I'm here today, because, I think it might have come across in my thing, these people don't have a voice. Look, I didn't tell you about all the bullshit and lies by Queensland Health, and like, how they've been obstructed and their problems been covered up at every turn by the Queensland government. It's been so corrupt, and it's been very difficult for them, because they've not just been fighting the gas companies, they've been fighting their own government. This is what I mean by they're just left to die out there.

Hon. Justice

Rachel Pepper: Thank you for that. Any questions? Yes, Professor Hart.

Prof. Barry Hart: The questions that you put down about water, you had a good list of those, your concerns, and also-

Katherine Marchment: If some of them get answered during this inquiry, great, but those are my questions, yeah.

Prof. Barry Hart: Yeah, I know, but I just thought they were a good set of questions. I mean, many of them we've got in mind to do. You've got them written down there.

Katherine Marchment: Yes.

Prof. Barry Hart: Can we get hold of those, because I really want to make certain that I tick them off.

Katherine Marchment: Okay...

Prof. Barry Hart: We've got ... Both on the water, you must have had a dozen questions, issues, and you had a number also on the technical aspects of fracking, how far, what's it going to do, et cetera, et cetera, those also. We need to-

Katherine Marchment: Give a list of those questions.

Prof. Barry Hart: ... addressing those.

Katherine Marchment: Yes.

Prof. Barry Hart: The other one was also, those kits you talked about ...

Katherine Marchment: The what? Those? Yeah. Well, this is what people in Queensland have been using and putting on video to show ... Because I've learned a bit from the locals. Admittedly, I only went up there twice a year to do land markings. I wasn't like, writing it, but I did see a lot of stuff up there that made me cry,



and I definitely saw the rubbish on the verges, and the dangerous driving, and stuff like that, and the complete disregard for locals by industry workers that drive out from Brisbane and other places, yeah. It was awful. That was in the construction phase. Now it's gone a lot quieter, but they're still having problems with the infrastructure, the venting, and the health problems, and the noise. A lot of the noise they had was about the trucks and machinery. Now it's about these compressor stations and the reverse osmosis plant at Kenya.

Hon. Justice

Rachel Pepper: You're obviously ... This might be a shortcut to you having to give us lots of extra written material, but are you able to ... You've provided your written submission on the twenty-seventh of February, and you're to be commended by getting it in so early.

Katherine Marchment: I want to make a couple of amendments-

Hon. Justice

Rachel Pepper: All right.

Katherine Marchment: ... to that particular one, but I've been preparing for this.

Hon. Justice

Rachel Pepper: That's fine. You've read out from something here. Are you willing to provide that to the inquiry as well?

Katherine Marchment: Oh, this one?

Hon. Justice

Rachel Pepper: Yes. You could just email that to us, and that way you don't have to ... I think that'll shortcut-

Prof. Barry Hart: Yeah, oh yeah. [crosstalk 00:30:19]

Hon. Justice

Rachel Pepper: ... Professor Hart's request for ...

Katherine Marchment: With the amendments, I've got them listed down, so just per paragraph, whatever ...

Hon. Justice

Rachel Pepper: Or alternatively, you can just send us the document that you read out from.

Katherine Marchment: Okay.

Prof. Barry Hart: That's easier.

Hon. Justice



Rachel Pepper: That would be fine. You can just hit the forward button to our address.

Katherine Marchment: Well, in my talk I actually got rid of chunks of it-

Hon. Justice

Rachel Pepper: Perfect, that's fine, that's fine.

Katherine Marchment: ... to stick within the 20 minutes.

Hon. Justice

Rachel Pepper: Well in that case, that's perfect. Just send us that, and whatever additional material and references you want us to consider. That would be terrific. Thank you.

Katherine Marchment: Yeah, no worries. No, I ... Thank you for giving me so much of your time. It's the first time I'm in this [crosstalk 00:30:56]

Hon. Justice

Rachel Pepper: Were there any other questions?

Hon. Justice

Rachel Pepper: Yes, Doctor Jones.

Dr. David Jones: Couple of questions. You were referring to the link on the department's website was supposed to point to disclosure, and you said it's not active.

Katherine Marchment: Yeah, it says that on the link. "Link not active."

Dr. David Jones: Thank you.

Katherine Marchment: There's been nothing ... Look, if there has been baseline studies or any other studies of water or the environment or anything done by the gas companies, could it please be made public? That is one thing that's of concern to me, that they've made public everything about the gas, oh, hundreds of pages of references and mapping and everything else, and all that stuff, so could they actually please make public any kind of studies that they have done about the environment they intend to operate in? It would be much appreciated.

Dr. David Jones: The other question I had was your comment about rainwater in rainwater tanks. I think it was in Tara, you said?

Katherine Marchment: Yeah, that's a real issue.

Dr. David Jones: Could no longer be drunk owing to the presence of lead 210?

Katherine Marchment: Yes, and apparently that's caused from one of the breakdowns of radon. There's an article about that. I'll actually link you to that as well.



Hon. Justice

Rachel Pepper: Thank you.

Dr. David Jones: That's certainly a radiological decay product, an ultimate decay product, but do you have any evidence for the actual measurements of lead 210 in that water?

Katherine Marchment: No, no I don't have measurements, but I know people that do. Again, these I'm talking about ... Okay, so I'll try and get hold of that.

Prof. Barry Hart: Very good.

Katherine Marchment: Links for the lead ... Yeah. Yeah, I'll have to be doing a bit of ringing around to get that.

Hon. Justice

Rachel Pepper: Anyone else?

Prof. Barry Hart: No thank you.

Hon. Justice

Rachel Pepper: There's just one thing I did want to just perhaps deal with in your ... I appreciate that you've changed your written submission on the twenty-seventh of February, but-

Katherine Marchment: There's only a couple of little things, little amendments I want to make-

Hon. Justice

Rachel Pepper: That's fine. Just on page two, up towards the top, you said that you were raising concern I guess about the independence of the inquiry and panel, because we were going to be having regard to the 2014 Hawke Report-

Katherine Marchment: Sorry! Well I was actually going to cut that out.

Hon. Justice

Rachel Pepper: Were you?

Katherine Marchment: Because it's not really that relevant. Like, I had to talk to someone about that. That was just me putting in a dig at Doctor Hawke, and that is not relevant.

Hon. Justice

Rachel Pepper: No, no, well-

Katherine Marchment: It's true that he does have directorships of those two companies, but it's not relevant to this panel, because you're not connected to him.



Hon. Justice
Rachel Pepper: That's right.

Prof. Barry Hart: That's true.

Hon. Justice
Rachel Pepper: And I just wanted to assure you that he's not our, as you say, "main independent reference," by any means. We-

Katherine Marchment: That's what it said in the notes, but-

Hon. Justice
Rachel Pepper: Yeah, we're to have-

Katherine Marchment: I'm sorry.

Hon. Justice
Rachel Pepper: No, no. That's all right.

Katherine Marchment: Just ditch that. That was one paragraph I was just going to strike out.

Hon. Justice
Rachel Pepper: Okay, that's all right. But we will be having regard to other reports-

Katherine Marchment: It's just a bit of nastiness from me.

Hon. Justice
Rachel Pepper: The whole report, we're going to be having regard to the reports in WA, Queensland, Tasmania, Victoria, New South Wales. We will be having regard to all those reports.

Katherine Marchment: No, since this process has gone on, that's why I wanted to just strike out that paragraph-

Hon. Justice
Rachel Pepper: Thank you very much.

Katherine Marchment: ... as an amendment, yeah.

Hon. Justice
Rachel Pepper: Do that right now. Thank you very much. Thank you very much Ms. Marchment for coming on today and presenting your material. Thank you.