

*Gorgon Gas Project, Barrow Island — Environmental Approval —
Statement by Minister for Environment — Motion*

Resumed from an earlier stage of the sitting.

Hon ROBIN CHAPPLE: We need to paint a picture of what Barrow Island is like. There are a couple of small islands at the end of Barrow Island. It is not just a flat island; it is a series of ranges very similar to Cape Range at Ningaloo. It is a very diverse environment, and there are some incredible cast systems on the island in a place called Butler's ridge. I take my hat off to West Australian Petroleum Pty Ltd for the work it did in managing the place in the early days. But, quite clearly, when the proposal to develop the island for the Gorgon development by Chevron Corporation was put forward, it was a completely new step in the direction of Barrow Island. Prior to then, there were on the island about 414 what we refer to as nodding donkeys—that is, oil pumps. There had been leaks and there had been problems associated with those oil pumps, but they were coming to the end of their life. Indeed, the original agreement with WAPET was that WAPET would be allowed on the island to extract the oil; and, as soon as the oil had been extracted, the whole island was to be rehabilitated and returned to an A-class reserve. If we go back to the original debates, not in this chamber but in the other chamber, we will find that really strong commitments were made that once that was over, Barrow Island would never be utilised again. When I say that the oil was coming to its end, that was mainly due to the fact that they were getting so much formation water out of the bores that that water was being pumped back in to extract the last residual amounts of oil.

When Chevron took over from WAPET, it had a declining project on the island, which was supposed to be wrapped up once the oil came to finalisation, and it was then to leave the island. When the Gorgon project presented by Chevron was put before the Environmental Protection Authority and the then Conservation Commission, they released reports on 1 July 2003 identifying that, in their mind, the development should not go ahead. Those proposals were then taken before cabinet. A couple of months later, in around October of the same year, cabinet decided not to listen to the EPA, or, indeed, to the Conservation Commission, and through an act of Parliament, which was a state agreement act, allowed for the development to proceed. I think that was most probably the blackest day of the lot. I say that because clearly at that stage, Chevron and a company called Sasol Chevron, were intending to develop industry on the island, not just the gas field, but downstream processing. Since the permission was granted, the project has been expanded several times, and we are now looking at potentially five trains out there and a massive workforce. So, the risks and the impacts that were identified in the Conservation Commission's report, and, indeed, the EPA's report of July 2003, have also come to fruition. Later I will talk a bit more about what has gone on since then.

But I think it is important to realise the position taken by the then Leader of the Opposition, Hon Colin Barnett. A newspaper article in *The West Australian* of Thursday, 3 July 2003 states —

Opposition Leader Colin Barnett said that he was not convinced by Chevron Texaco's arguments and believed it would still be economic to build a liquefied natural gas plant on the mainland.

“The main additional cost is a pipeline to pump the gas to the mainland—that is not \$1 billion,” he said.

Chevron Texaco had underestimated the continuing operating cost of having a major project on Barrow Island, with the limitations associated with it being a Class A nature reserve.

Mr Barnett said WA stood to reap a bigger economic windfall by locating an LNG plant on the mainland with the undeveloped Maitland estate, south of the Burrup Peninsula, his preferred option.

What he identified also in that article was that the project would have downstream processing, whether it be on Barrow Island or on the mainland. His comments were that the Maitland industrial estate was a far better option, because that had unlimited space, whereas the space on Barrow Island was constrained by the environment and the values of the place. An article in *The West Australian* of 20 October 2003, shortly after the decision was made by the then government to develop the Gorgon gas development on Barrow Island, states —

State Opposition Leader Colin Barnett will try to force the \$11 billion Gorgon Gas development from environmentally sensitive Barrow Island on the mainland if he becomes Premier at the next election.

Mr Barnett told *The West Australian* yesterday —

That is, the day before Monday, 20 October —

he would try to convince the Federal Government and developers to spend an extra \$1 billion to build the project's main plant at Maitland, south of Karratha, creating the nation's biggest industrial estate.

The move would attract up to 20 associated chemical operations which would boost the Karratha township and generate local jobs.

So it was quite clear then to Hon Colin Barnett that not only were we looking at a project to develop gas, which is now occurring on Barrow Island, but that at some stage there would be downstream processing. It is my understanding of the gas industry that downstream development will occur, and more than likely it will occur on Barrow Island. So, the limitations of the current impact are going to be expanded quite significantly into the future.

In that regard, the comments of the minister in his ministerial statement indicate that all is well. But I would suggest not. We have just heard an answer in this place in relation to this matter. We then have *The Sunday Times* article headed, “Gorgon death toll: Native animals killed in gas works”. The article begins as follows —

Native animals are being killed almost daily on Barrow Island by workers on the controversial Gorgon gas project.

A range of animals are being killed on Barrow Island. But I will turn just to the fauna of significance that is being killed on Barrow Island. In a report that was presented for the period 2009–10, the number of deaths increased almost exponentially over that year as the development proceeded. The animals ranged from golden bandicoots to spectacled hare-wallabies, and the deaths were associated with clearing work and traffic accidents, but it was mainly the poor old golden bandicoots, along with some turtles, that bore the brunt of the impacts. Some possums and some wallaroos were also killed in that period. But when the ramp-up starts to occur is in the period between January 2011 and July. In that period, things really, really ramped up.

Let us understand how some of these poor animals are dying. Most people know about road kill—we see it on the road—and we have a lot of traffic. People are not supposed to drive after dark on Barrow Island unless there is an emergency situation, and they are supposed to drive at less than 20 kilometres an hour. Because those animals are so unattuned to vehicle movements and have no fear of predation, a vehicle does not create fear in them.

It would be really surprising for people to know that the report I have states that 11 of those animals were crushed by boots in the wet mess. That is not, in my view, accidental. It could be, because I know that the prolific nature of animals on the island means that they are underfoot, but for 11 to be killed—in most cases underfoot in the area of the wet mess—in a period of less than six months is a massive problem. It should not be allowed to go on. Something is crook in Tallarook, because if that is the level of management of Chevron—we have to remember that Department of Environment and Conservation officers are out there as well trying to keep this under control—we have a major problem.

The Greens (WA) also asked a question about why animals were not being relocated to the mainland, as had previously happened, to be managed by the wildlife carers in Karratha. We were told that they were being dealt with on the island, or, where situations required, being euthanased on the island. Let us look at some of the euthanasia that has occurred on the island. Two golden bandicoots and two unfurred pouch young were hit by a car and were then euthanased. Was that the young? Was that the adults? Unless somebody is prepared to care for those animals, then the practice, under the normal rule, is that the small animals are euthanased. How are they being euthanased? It is referred to as “blunt trauma”, which is obviously a whack on the back of the head with a rock or a hammer or something like that. This is the way the environment is being conducted out there on Barrow Island, and I would suggest that it is not acceptable. Industry has been allowed to go to Australia’s ark, and I think it is paying scant disregard to its requirements.

We also are finding dead animals in dustbins, according to this report. How are animals being found dead in dustbins when every animal that dies is supposed to be handed into CALM or reported? Animals are being killed, and because people do not wish to accept responsibility, the animals are being placed in dustbins. My view is that the situation is out of hand, and the Minister for Environment should take serious control of the situation.

It really interested me that dear old Chevron, given this article on page 24 —

[Member’s time expired.]

The CHAIRMAN: Hon Robin Chapple.

Hon ROBIN CHAPPLE: — had run two full-page advertisements on pages 18 and 19.

Point of Order

The CHAIRMAN: Does the Leader of the House have a point of order?

Hon NORMAN MOORE: No; I was seeking the call.

The CHAIRMAN: My apologies. Sorry, Leader of the House, I did not notice that.

Hon NORMAN MOORE: I obviously did not yell out loud enough, but I was seeking the call.

Hon Sally Talbot: You should wear an orange tie!

Hon NORMAN MOORE: I do not have an orange tie; that is why I am not wearing one.

The CHAIRMAN: I gave Hon Robin Chapple the call—my apologies. I apologise profusely; I did not notice you were seeking the call.

Hon NORMAN MOORE: There is an issue about members just continuing to remain standing and having a 45-minute debate, but, anyway, if that is the way you want to do it.

Committee Resumed

The CHAIRMAN: Hon Robin Chapple.

Hon ROBIN CHAPPLE: At the same time as that article on the native animals killed at the gasworks appeared, Chevron placed two major advertisements stating, “Now is the time to invest in the future”, and, “Aren’t we doing a good job with the environment?” I would suggest that that level of advertising is completely misleading.

For the Leader of the House’s benefit, I will not stay on my feet much longer, but I also wanted to quickly touch on the flora problems on the island. I am just looking for the question that was asked on that. I do not have it to hand, but, in essence, earlier this year we asked some questions about invasive species. Invasive species are the very, very issue that the Environmental Protection Authority and the Conservation Commission of Western Australia held the most fear about. That was the original reason given in 2003 for those two agencies being opposed to the development. Unfortunately, I cannot find the figures, but there have been something around 15 critical introductions to the island. I think there were some eight major invasions on the island, and another 15 minor or less important invasions. We have to remember that this island has been so well protected that, to stop invasive species, even passing ships or pleasure craft have not been allowed to land, but the flora is now severely threatened.

Notwithstanding what the minister said about the government congratulating itself on what was going on, it is my firm belief that we are slowly seeing the death of an island that I hold dear—an island I was privileged to visit when it was in a relatively pristine condition.

Hon NORMAN MOORE: I did not realise I had such a soft voice!

I have listened to Hon Robin Chapple, on not only this occasion, but also others, talk about the death of things; he completed his speech by talking about the death of Barrow Island. This level of exaggeration on a regular basis by the Greens (WA) is becoming infectious. I think the honourable member caught it from Senator Christine Milne, who said that the carbon tax was going to save the Great Barrier Reef. She knows, Hon Robin Chapple knows and I know that that is a total and absolute exaggeration that has no substance whatsoever. We watch Greens members of Parliament and green activists in this country continuing to exaggerate the environmental effects of any activity that human beings undertake anywhere. They exaggerate to the extent that they frighten people to the point at which there is totally unjustified serious concern about the environment in some sections of the community.

The member mentioned that the then opposition took the view that the Gorgon liquefied natural gas project should be onshore, not on Barrow Island; however, what he did not do in his speech was to then spend some time informing the chamber which government in fact brought in the Barrow Island Act.

Hon Robin Chapple interjected.

Hon NORMAN MOORE: Hon Robin Chapple said “the government”; he did not say “the Labor government, led by Dr Gallop”. Geoff Gallop was the Premier who stopped people from developing a resort at Ningaloo Reef to get some environmental credentials, and then went ahead with the development of Barrow Island for the LNG plant. I thought the member might have spent a little time in his speech reflecting upon the government that was responsible for Barrow Island being developed.

He mentioned the views of the then opposition leader, Colin Barnett.

However, for the sake of the chamber, that comment was made by Hon Colin Barnett when he was Leader of the Opposition between 2001 and 2005; he was not Leader of the Opposition after that. The decision was taken by the then Labor government to go to Barrow Island, and that development went ahead under a Labor government.

What this government did—which was the purpose of the ministerial statement we are discussing today, which was made in 2009—was outline the very stringent environmental conditions that the then Minister for Environment, Hon Donna Faragher, in conjunction with the federal minister, who I think was Tony Burke at the time, imposed upon this project. The member has read out a list of fatalities of fauna on the island that is contained in some report. I do not know what the report is. I would be very interested to have a look at it, and I

am sure that the Minister for Environment would want to do the same. But there are reports and there are reports. I do not always believe everything that I read in *The Sunday Times*, just as I do not always believe everything that I read in *The West Australian* or hear on the ABC, because sometimes it is not all that accurate. However, if we look at the conditions attached to this project, we see that there is \$60 million for turtle protection—\$60 million to protect turtles on Barrow Island. Part of that is for, as is mentioned in the statement, management of light emissions so the light does not shine in their eyes. Perhaps we could have provided them with sunglasses; it might have cost a bit less than that! But that is a very facetious remark.

Hon Sally Talbot: You're not really as green as they say you are.

Hon NORMAN MOORE: I do not know who thinks I am green, but anyway —

Hon Sue Ellery: Nobody. That's the point you were making!

Hon NORMAN MOORE: The point I am seeking to make is that the current government, which signed off on the environmental approvals that are now being criticised by the honourable member, put very strict environmental conditions on this project. But let us understand one thing about this project: it contains one of the most significant environmental and CO₂ emissions projects in the history of the world, which is the geosequestration of about half its carbon dioxide—a very, very significant environmental program that was put in place by the previous Labor government, which I am sure Hon Sally Talbot was a party to because she was, I think, the parliamentary secretary to the environment minister. I applaud that government for taking that initiative. But where do the Greens come from? They say, “We can't possibly do that. We're totally opposed to geosequestration of CO₂ because somehow or other it is environmentally unacceptable.” So what they are saying is that it is better for it to go into the atmosphere than for it to go underground. I do not quite understand the Greens other than to say that if somebody solves the problem of greenhouse gas emissions, it will give the Greens nothing to do.

Hon Robin Chapple: The problem is, minister, that nobody has actually dealt with the costs associated with geosequestration and the energy required for geosequestration.

Hon NORMAN MOORE: All I can say to the honourable member is that one of these generations he might be the minister making a decision about these things, and what I can guarantee will happen is that nothing will happen, because we have a party that does nothing. We have a decision initiated by the last Labor government to put this project on Barrow Island, which contained a requirement to geosequester millions of tonnes of CO₂ as a program to reduce emissions going into the atmosphere and which received the support of the opposition. Indeed, I spent some time investigating geosequestration in other parts of the world and came to the conclusion that it is a very, very good program and there should be more of it. Indeed, Western Australia is carrying out a feasibility study in conjunction with the commonwealth Labor government, supported by Martin Ferguson, to look at geosequestration in the south west of Western Australia for the Perdaman Industries project and for those alumina refineries in the south west, because it is an engineering solution to greenhouse gas emissions that has worked elsewhere in the world, and presumably it will work here. But again the Greens just say, “No, you can't do that. You can't make any effort to have an engineering solution; you've just got to have things like carbon taxes so you actually close industry down and get rid of jobs”, which is why I cannot understand the Labor Party, because the Labor Party used to stand for people having jobs, for industry, for people improving their standard of living and for people improving their salaries and their working conditions. However, it is now in bed with a party that jumps for joy at the prospect of putting a whole heap of people out of jobs, and it is in conjunction with the federal Labor government, which I find quite extraordinary. I just wonder how ministers such as Tony Burke, Martin Ferguson and those other federal ministers who actually want some industry in this country can live with the decisions that they are having to make.

That is a bit of an aside, but I want to make the point very clearly that this project on Barrow Island, which is worth \$43 billion—the biggest project in Australia's history—will provide energy for millions of people in the world whose standard of living we are hoping to improve, and fundamental to that is energy, and all we have from the Greens is, “You shouldn't have done it in the first place and you're messing it up now.”

Hon Robin Chapple: Exactly.

Hon NORMAN MOORE: That is the sum total of where they come from, and that is something that I find extraordinarily irritating as I sit here day after day listening to Greens members of Parliament saying, “You shouldn't be doing anything.” I really get a bit worried for the Labor Party because it is in the same bed, and in fact it is jettisoning its own former base—people who want jobs and work and industry to be developed and to grow our economy. That is what it used to stand for. Now I do not see much of that happening in reality.

This is a very good project indeed. It will deliver significant amounts of revenue to the federal government through petroleum resource rent taxes, and provide significant amounts of energy for China and other parts of

the world that are seeking to raise the standard of living of their citizens so that they can have a lifestyle that we would regard as simply normal in this country. I cannot understand the Greens, who would like to see people around the world go without the energy they need to lift themselves out of poverty. That ought to be our first objective. However, for some reason the Greens put other issues ahead of human wellbeing, and that is what irritates me significantly. That is why I am standing now and saying that this government has, through this statement that we are debating today, put in place very, very stringent environmental conditions to ensure that we get the best environmental outcomes in this project.

As I said before, we must bear in mind that when we were the opposition and the Labor Party was the government, we did not want this project on Barrow Island. That was not necessarily for environmental reasons, because we believe the environment on Barrow Island can be managed. The honourable member does not but I do. We wanted the project on the mainland so that it could be part of an extension of an industrial complex at Maitland, and it could have been a cornerstone of a chemical industry. However we were informed at the time that it would cost \$A1 billion more to bring it onshore, and that would have made it unviable. We sat down with the federal minister at the time, Ian Macfarlane, and we were advised by the state Labor government then that, as far as it was concerned, it was prepared to put the project on Barrow Island because it would lose it if it had to go on the mainland. So that is how it came about. For the member to start suggesting that this is just the beginning of an industrial complex on Barrow Island is again a figment of the member's imagination, because the talk about Maitland was about using it as a cornerstone, if it could become such, to develop industries off, because land was available, and at Karratha there was the energy, the salt, the water and all the rest that was needed for a chemical industry, which we have long thought was appropriate for that part of the world. However, to suggest that somehow or other there is going to be that sort of industry on Barrow Island is again, as I said, a figment of the member's imagination. It reminds me of the arguments being used about James Price Point in the Kimberley. We are being told that that is the beginning of the industrialisation of the Kimberley, as if the whole of the Kimberley is going to be covered by petrochemical plants, LNG plants, steel mills, coalmines and the whole works. I can just see it now: the member has this image in his mind of the Ruhr in Germany or the Midlands in the United Kingdom that this is what the Kimberley will look like. The Greens keep portraying this view that somehow or other the Kimberley will be destroyed, just as the member suggested Barrow Island will be destroyed, and it will die. That comes back to my original comment at the very beginning of this little tirade, if I can use that word, that the Greens spend their lives telling people what they want them to hear, which often bears no relationship to reality or the truth. I draw the member's attention to a book I read recently, which I am sure the member read, called *Confessions of a Greenpeace Dropout*. It is written by a founder of Greenpeace who tells it as it is. That book should be compulsory reading for every politician in this country because it demonstrates once and for all that the tactics used by the Greens here are the same tactics used by Greenpeace—namely, just frighten the hell out of people, exaggerate, go over the top, talk about death and the destruction of human beings, habitat and the environment. If they keep telling people that, they will eventually go along with it because people will believe that it has some skerrick of truth. The bottom line is that vast amounts of what is being said are not true. I really do feel sad for the Labor Party because it has been sucked in by all this and reckons that being in government with the Greens is better than not being in government at all so it will just go along with what the Greens trot out. I simply repeat that the classic exaggeration of all time was Senator Christine Milne's statement when the carbon tax was announced by the Prime Minister, albeit she said we were not going to have one, that this will save the Great Barrier Reef. Does Hon Robin Chapple think our carbon tax will save the Great Barrier Reef?

Hon Robin Chapple: I think it will go a long way —

Hon NORMAN MOORE: How?

Hon Robin Chapple: — to minimising the impact in the future.

Hon NORMAN MOORE: How will it save the Great Barrier Reef?

Hon Robin Chapple: If you were in the chamber last night, you would have heard what I had to say about —

Hon NORMAN MOORE: I heard what the member said; do not worry, I listen to every word the member says. That is why I felt the need to get up today. Hon Robin Chapple, tell me how that is going to happen. This country produces about 1.6 per cent of the world's greenhouse gases, and if we do not reduce that at all—because under the carbon tax it is not going to be reduced, as the member knows full well—how will that affect the climate of Australia to the point that it will save the Great Barrier Reef? It will not; it is a gross exaggeration and the member knows it, I know it and the Labor Party knows it too. Therefore, let us start talking about things in a rational, commonsense way. Let us look at the member's report about what is happening at Barrow Island and let us stop talking about the death of the island. It is that emotive language that the member lives off. Let us as a government, through the Minister for Environment, ensure that Chevron is abiding by its environmental conditions on Barrow Island.

Hon Robin Chapple: That's what we're after; we want them to abide by them.

Hon NORMAN MOORE: That is exactly right, but do not come into this place and say that we are killing the island. If the member wants to talk about killing the island, talk to Hon Sally Talbot because she started it—well, her government did. Did Hon Sally Talbot support it?

Hon Ljiljanna Ravlich: You never accept responsibility for anything, do you?

Hon NORMAN MOORE: Did Hon Sally Talbot support it?

Hon Sally Talbot: I'm waiting for you to sit down so that I can say something.

Hon NORMAN MOORE: The member has plenty of time.

I think it is an absolute outrage that Hon Ljiljanna Ravlich should come into the chamber now and make some comments when she has no idea what we have been talking about.

Hon Ljiljanna Ravlich: Barrow Island.

Hon Liz Behjat: That's her usual form!

Hon NORMAN MOORE: Hon Ljiljanna Ravlich did not understand that she, as a government, did what Hon Robin Chapple said is destroying Barrow Island.

Hon Ljiljanna Ravlich: Well, that's your view, we don't share it.

Hon NORMAN MOORE: I am just pointing out that the previous government probably made a good decision in the first place based upon the evidence it had at the time. I think the geosequestration and the way in which the environmental conditions were put in place by our government are the best outcomes we can get if that is the only way we are going to get the project—\$43 billion is worth getting, as far as I am concerned; I hope the Labor Party shares that view—and the jobs and all the rest that go with that. As I say, Hon Robin Chapple would quite comfortably and quite happily ensure that project was closed down and, indeed, we covered the landscape with solar panels and windmills to somehow or other provide for the energy needs of the world—come off it.

The CHAIRMAN: I give the call to Hon Sally Talbot but I remind members that the debate finishes with 13 minutes to go, so there is only just over five minutes remaining.

Hon SALLY TALBOT: I just want to make a couple of points, mainly to reassure the Leader of the House that things are not —

Hon Norman Moore: Sorry, forgive me; I thought we had 80 minutes. I do apologise.

Hon SALLY TALBOT: That is okay; five minutes will do me fine.

I want to reassure the Leader of the House that things are not as bleak in the Labor Party as he seems to think. We are quite capable of doing more than one thing at a time, and, more importantly than that, we are also capable of understanding that there can be more than two sides to an argument. Hon Norman Moore is guilty of a very basic year 1 argumentative fallacy—namely, the fallacy of bifurcation, which is when someone says, “If you're not with me, you're against me.” A person says, “We have this on one hand and we have that on the other hand and those are the only two possibilities”; bifurcation literally means cutting things in half. That is not the case, Hon Norman Moore. The Leader of the House and I both agree that the development on Barrow Island is a good thing for Western Australia; we both agree on that.

Hon Norman Moore: Great.

Hon SALLY TALBOT: Hon Robin Chapple and I deeply disagree on lots of things to do with industry policy and a range of other things.

Hon Norman Moore: That is also very encouraging.

Hon SALLY TALBOT: But that is not the point. The Leader of the House has just used up a lot of time giving his point of view, so let me put my point of view.

Hon Norman Moore: I'm sorry.

Hon SALLY TALBOT: My point of view is that this is not about saying that people either accept what is happening with the killing of native fauna on Barrow Island or they are against the industry. This is about looking at the situation and deciding whether the system is working. That is what I hoped Hon Norman Moore was going to address because that is what his colleague the Minister for Environment clearly either refuses to address or is incapable of addressing. When the Minister for Environment saw this data about the number of animals being killed, why did he not try to do something about it? Why did the minister not take action? I want to know from the government, although I do not imagine that only I want the answer, whether it thinks the

system is working. Does the government think that the company and the Department of Environment and Conservation are doing everything they should to prevent this happening? That is the key question. We are not working in a vacuum; six DEC officers are stationed permanently on Barrow Island. That is probably more DEC surveillance per head of population than any other area in Western Australia.

Hon Norman Moore: Anywhere on earth probably!

Hon SALLY TALBOT: Anywhere on earth—quite right. There are six DEC officers on Barrow Island. My question from the beginning of this issue being raised has been: What is the government doing? Does the government think it is okay? Is the government's argument that where we have industrial development we will inevitably get a certain number of deaths and that this was all factored in at the beginning or does the government think that there is more to be done? As Hon Norman Moore knows, given that the reports required under the ministerial conditions are not made public, we have nothing to go on other than what the government tells us. The government is telling us that the measures—we heard this from Hon Helen Morton responding on behalf of the minister this afternoon—are subject to review and refinement as required. Given that Barrow Island has restrictions on vehicle movements, such as not after dark except unless necessary and that when they do move around I understand on some parts of the island 40-kilometre-an-hour speed limits are in place, is that enough? The answer surely has to be no; it is not. If vehicles are being driven at 40 kilometres an hour but so many native animals are still being killed, the drivers are going too fast. The government could have got on the front foot with this issue right from the beginning. The moment this issue was raised, the government could have got on the front foot if it had come out and said, "There's a problem and this is what we're going to do to address it." Instead, in the other place, the Minister for Environment, who has to be one of the most harebrained unfocused people we have ever heard respond to these kind of things, pulled out a briefing note and read out stuff about how there are a lot of animals dying, but it is no threat to animals. We had to ask more questions to find out what on earth he was talking about because of his blustering way and his trying to hide behind all this nonsense. Hon Norman Moore walks into this place and says that we either cop what is happening or close the industry down. That is not the point. Given that there are six DEC officers on Barrow Island, is the system working? What level of animal death is acceptable?

Question put and passed.