

**REPORT ON PROCEEDINGS BEFORE**

**PORTFOLIO COMMITTEE NO. 4 – LEGAL AFFAIRS**

**INQUIRY INTO MUSEUMS AND GALLERIES**

**CORRECTED**

**At Macquarie Room, Parliament House, Sydney on Monday, 11 February 2019**

**The Committee met at 11.02 a.m.**

**PRESENT**

The Hon. Robert Borsak (Chair)

The Hon. Scott Farlow

The Hon. Trevor Khan

The Hon. Shaoquett Moselmane

The Hon. Walt Secord

Mr David Shoebridge

The Hon. Natalie Ward



**The CHAIR:** Welcome to the thirteenth hearing of Portfolio Committee No. 4—Legal Affairs inquiry into museums and galleries in New South Wales. Before I commence, I acknowledge the Gadigal people who are the traditional custodians of this land and I pay respects to the elders past and present of the Eora nation, and extend that respect to other Aboriginal people present. Today the Committee will hear from a former employee of the Museum of Applied Arts and Sciences, the architect of the Powerhouse Museum, followed by representatives from the Powerhouse Museum Alliance and the Department of Planning and Environment.

Before we commence I would like to make some brief comments about the procedures for today's hearing. Today's hearing is open to the public and is being broadcast live by the Parliament's website. A transcript of today's hearing will be placed on the Committee's website when it becomes available. In accordance with the broadcast guidelines, I inform members of the media who are here or who may be joining us that while Committee members and witnesses may be filmed or recorded, people in the public gallery should not be the primary focus of any filming or photography. I also remind media representatives that they must take responsibility for what they publish about the Committee's proceedings.

It is important to remember that parliamentary privilege does not apply to what witnesses may say outside of their evidence at this hearing. So I urge witnesses to be careful about any comments you may make to the media or to others after you complete your evidence, as such comments would not be protected by parliamentary privilege if another person decided to take action for defamation. The guidelines for the broadcast of proceedings are available from the secretariat.

There may be some questions that a witness could answer only if they had more time or with certain documents at hand. In those circumstances witnesses are advised that they can take a question on notice and provide an answer within three days. Any messages should be delivered to Committee members through Committee staff. To aid the audibility of this hearing I remind both Committee members and witnesses to speak into the microphones. In addition, several seats have been reserved near loud speakers for persons in the public gallery who may have hearing difficulties. Finally would everyone turn their mobile phones to silent for the duration of the hearing.

**BRADFORD LEE BAKER**, a former employee of the Museum of Applied Arts and Sciences, sworn and examined

**The CHAIR:** Do you want to make an opening statement?

**Mr BAKER:** Yes. I thank the Committee for the opportunity to speak today. From September 1983 I was employed by the museum originally as project co-ordinator for the in-house design team in the development and building of the Powerhouse Museum project. For the next 25 years I was the manager of exhibition development and design at the Powerhouse Museum and the programs and projects that my team constructed included more than 500 interactive, immersive and touring exhibitions. From 2015 to 2018 I was the Manager of Exhibitions and Events at the Museum of Australian Democracy in old Parliament House in Canberra.

I am here today because I understand that one of the major catalysts for the Government's decision to dismantle the Powerhouse Museum in Ultimo to relocate to a new museum in Parramatta was the basis of the October 2014 final business case for the renewal of the Powerhouse Museum report. However, in my view that report contained some crucial inaccuracies and some false assumptions. Firstly, the report stated that since 1988 the museum has not had a significant upgrade or capital investment—that is simply not true. The current permanent galleries bear little resemblance to the original exhibitions that opened in 1988 because we regularly replaced both the content and, in many cases, the entire gallery, and we had to because as technology and society changed so too would the content of the exhibitions need to change. However, I note that over the past 10 years this program appears to have largely stalled. I am assuming that it is due mainly to lack of resources.

The report also stated that the museum is not fit-for-purpose and has never met museum environment and collection management standards. That is also false and also a challenge to the hundreds of professional staff and consultants who created and maintained an exceptional world-class museum. The Powerhouse Museum was the vanguard of contemporary museums in Australia. We set standards well beyond that of any similar cultural institution. This is not simply my opinion, it was publicly stated by people including: Dame Margaret Weston, then Director of the London Science Museum; Irena Redimtseva, the Director of the Kremlin Museums, Moscow; and Yevyeni Venizelos, Hellenic Ministry of Culture for Greece; and I could go on but hopefully you get the picture. These people would not have lent us their priceless treasures for display at the powerhouse if they did not absolutely believe we could manage them to the highest international standards.

In 2000, Bill and Melinda Gates lent to the museum Leonardo Da Vinci's original handwritten diary about water, the Codex Leicester, a priceless and fragile work both handwritten and illustrated in his own way. To borrow this work, the museum had to meet stringent environmental standards and display requirements. Not only did we do that but it was also monitored live over the internet from Munich in Germany. The report mentioned declining visitor figures prior to the 2014 period but it failed to mention that between 2009 and 2013 large parts of the museum were a construction site and many major galleries were closed and many other exhibitions were removed. It is actually the main reason I chose to leave after 29 years; I did not agree with the direction that management were taking at the time. I guess the results speak for themselves or we would not be having this discussion today.

The most significant failure of the report in my opinion is, however, that it underestimates the significance of staff reductions and restructuring which have taken a great deal of corporate knowledge, technical skills and most importantly the personal connections of people around the museum industry both nationally and internationally. The issue is not simply one about failing infrastructure. Indeed, the report significantly underestimates the value of the extraordinary buildings that the Powerhouse Museum has. However, the people are an organisation's greatest asset and I believe that they have been, to a large degree, poorly served. Some people have criticised opponents of the move as being as simply eastern suburbs elite who care little about Western Sydney.

**The Hon. WALT SECORD:** The Premier said that.

**Mr BAKER:** For the full 30 years that I worked at the Powerhouse Museum I travelled every day by State Rail from Woy Woy on the Central Coast where I still live with my children and grandchildren. I totally support the concept that Western Sydney should have their own major cultural institution—but, mind you, I could probably put a very good argument why the Central Coast deserves one as well. I do not see that in order to provide a major cultural facility in Parramatta it must require the dismantling of the Powerhouse Museum in Ultimo. Imagine if we were talking about a new Opera House for Parramatta, would we immediately assume we had to demolish the one on Sydney Harbour to recycle the staff and equipment and sell the site to a developer to pay for the move?

**The CHAIR:** Probably.

**Mr BAKER:** I am sure that the land values at Bennelong Point would vastly exceed the value of the Ultimo site, but I do not think anyone would seriously consider such a move. The proposal in the 2014 report that to renew and refurbish the current museum would cost \$350 million—now I believe escalated to about \$500 million—is predicated on major demolition and construction of whole new buildings on the site, or many of the significant buildings on the site. There was no serious attempt to seek to maximise the existing infrastructure by effective building and services refurbishment and major new exhibitions.

I ask members to imagine they ran a movie theatre complex but that they ran out of money and could not continue to buy new movies and therefore kept showing reruns. Inevitably ticket sales would fall. Would their immediate decision be to dismantle the cinema and move it somewhere else? No, they would simply find better and new films. That is what the Powerhouse Museum needs: investment not relocation. The primary strength of the museum's collection is that it facilitates research and exhibitions of everything that people make. This diversity of content is what provides its great strength. It is unique in many aspects of the world of museums. Popular culture, social history, science and technology, design and fashion together provide the opportunity to create an immersive visitor experience with the very high educational value of the State's collection.

I will end on a controversial note. Soccer and rugby league are both referred to as "football". They share some similarities, but they also have very specific differences. One could not imagine Manchester United asking the coach of Melbourne Storm to take over managing United's soccer team. It is the same with the differences between art galleries and museums. I strongly recommend that any future development of the museum be undertaken by experienced museum professionals. Thank you for listening to me, and I am happy to take questions from the Committee.

**Mr DAVID SHOEBRIDGE:** Thank you for your contribution on the extremely informed submission made by Ms Sanders. You indicate that part of the reason the Powerhouse needs significant investment is that there have been years and years of neglect and poor maintenance. Is that part of the problem?

**Mr BAKER:** I can only look at the evidence, which is that a number of galleries now there have not been changed in a long time. I am talking about more than 10 years. Generally according to museum standards, a permanent gallery would have a seven- to 10-year lifespan. As I said, the reason is simply not just that the objects themselves become at risk in terms of conservation but also that the subject matters change. I am sure people can appreciate that the day you open a computer exhibition the exhibits are already obsolete, and after 10 years they are artefacts. Absolutely change has occurred over a long time. However, what I am observing, having visited the museum recently, is that some galleries appear not to have had significant change for quite a long period.

**Mr DAVID SHOEBRIDGE:** You also talk about the maintenance backlog and the impact of staff redundancies over time.

**Mr BAKER:** Yes.

**Mr DAVID SHOEBRIDGE:** Do you believe that the \$350 million, and now \$500 million, price tag for refurbishing the Powerhouse is realistic?

**Mr BAKER:** No, in my opinion the vast majority of that money is about knocking down existing buildings and constructing new buildings. I do not believe the report went very far at all in looking at what could be done to stabilise and refresh the existing building structure. Most importantly, as I mentioned with the movie theatre example, it was about the films. This is about the exhibitions and providing high-quality and new exhibitions that will bring the public back into the museum.

**Mr DAVID SHOEBRIDGE:** You suggest that in fact staged capital funding in the order of \$150 million, together with an increase in recurrent funds commensurate with a level of specific specialist staff, is needed for the museum. That is the kind of funding needed to return the Powerhouse to its glory. Is that right?

**Mr BAKER:** Spread over a considerable period, yes. I believe the figures in the 2014 report, which are in the order of \$350 million, focus on the building itself and its refurbishment, and replacement of major building infrastructure. We have proven time and again over 25 years that the Powerhouse buildings are more than capable of holding high-quality, international-standard museum exhibitions. It is not about the buildings themselves; it is about the resources provided to make the changes necessary to bring in new galleries and new exhibitions with new ideas. I do not see in the report that they went very far in exploring those options.

**Mr DAVID SHOEBRIDGE:** Someone described the 2014 report as a vanity project involving knocking down and constructing a shiny new building rather than a considered view of the potential of the existing buildings at the Powerhouse. What do you say to that?

**Mr BAKER:** I do not know about the term "vanity". However, from my point of view, I can certainly see that there would be great benefit in looking carefully at what exactly needs to be upgraded in the existing

buildings and what level of maintenance would be required to sustain that long term. Again, I keep coming back to the fact that it is the exhibitions and not necessarily the buildings that bring in the public. It is about investing in high-quality exhibitions. That would make a significant difference.

**The Hon. WALT SECORD:** It has been put to me that this is simply a property deal. What is your response to that—that is, that this is an attempt by the Government to get its hands on the Ultimo site?

**Mr BAKER:** I am not a politician, so I do not want to comment on the Government's motivation. However, and again from my point of view, it does not seem logical that the first thing you would do is demolish the museum and move it when there is an issue with maintaining the current facility.

**The Hon. SHAOQUETT MOSELMANE:** Is there a belief that the current museum building has reached its use-by date? Have the directors or the executive come to that conclusion?

**Mr BAKER:** I will reverse that question. I know that when we created the museum in the early 1980s we talked about it having a 100-year lifespan. We designed, developed, constructed and installed it with huge care and precision to ensure that all the systems put in place would have high longevity. If we are talking about a building that was developed in the mid-1980s having a 100-year lifespan and after 30 years we are saying it is past its use-by date, I cannot see those two things as being compatible.

**The Hon. WALT SECORD:** Can I take you on that point? From my time of being a chief of staff, buildings are usually built for 30- to 40-year life spans. That is my understanding of commercial buildings. To build something for 100 years ... How do you feel when you read or hear that people say that the building is clapped-out and hundreds of millions of dollars will be needed to restore it?

**Mr BAKER:** There are parts of that building itself that go back to the late 1890s. To say that it is not capable of surviving, I think it is already proven that it is. As I said, I worked at Old Parliament House in Canberra for three years. That building was constructed in 1927. It is still in remarkably excellent condition. It is going through a refurbishment currently because of services and other upgrades but no-one would assume that it is older than 30 years and, therefore, we should pull it down and remove it.

**Mr DAVID SHOEBRIDGE:** You have just walked through our mid-19<sup>th</sup> century building that is still being used for its intended purpose to get here, have you not?

**Mr BAKER:** Correct.

**Mr DAVID SHOEBRIDGE:** So it is proof positive.

**Mr BAKER:** Yes.

**The Hon. WALT SECORD:** What do you say to those who say that the building has reached its use-by date? Are they fibbing?

**Mr BAKER:** I would ask them to define exactly what they mean by that and what particular aspect of the building they are referring to. Is it the roof, is it the architecture, is it their services? In which case, is it not more prudent to look at what those requirements are and fix and repair those than to simply throw the baby out with the bathwater?

**The Hon. WALT SECORD:** Mr Baker, you seem to be quite a diplomatic man, but how do you feel when you hear or read about the Government's plans to demolish something that you obviously put a lot of energy, effort and your heart into?

**Mr BAKER:** I have invested 30 years of my life. The main part of my working life has been at that museum. The reason that I stayed there for such a long period of time was because I totally believed in what we were doing. We created a world-class museum, we sustained and maintained that museum to a very high international standard. It is evidenced not by my opinion but by the incredible exhibitions that we both borrowed, developed and toured around the world and also around the State and around Australia. I know that the capability of that facility is extraordinary. To be told that it is past its use-by date and that it was falling apart is not something that I would be prepared to consider.

**The CHAIR:** Mr Baker, would you have any comment in relation to the effect of efficiency dividends on the museums and the structures and collections?

**Mr BAKER:** Over the last few years where I worked at the Powerhouse, efficiency dividends were biting very hard into our ability to change over galleries and to build new exhibitions. It has certainly been a significant factor in the reduction of, or the loss of, highly skilled and experienced staff. Their redundancy programs have been run over the last several years. We have lost incredibly highly skilled staff through the process. My own exhibition development department, which was a team of over 25 staff, is now, I believe, three

or four people. They are the kind of changes that really influence and affect the ability of the museum to maintain high-quality product.

**The Hon. WALT SECORD:** Mr Baker, on some evidence that you have just given about the redundancies and the departures of staff, do you think that has led to a brain drain and why the Government is not getting the advice or counter-advice or the rigour on its decisions and that there is not the brains trust there to say, "Wait a second, Government, I think you are making a mistake here."

**Mr BAKER:** I think certainly there are very few, if any, staff currently still at the museum who were actively involved in the development and planning of it back in the 1980s. They also do not have, therefore, the understanding of why and how of the creation of the museum and to establish such an international, high-quality museum. Museums are a very complex thing and they do take a lot of understanding both in terms of why people come, how to interpret collections and what types of technology are required in order to sustain and maintain visitor attendance to a museum. If you do not have people that know that or people that work with that regularly all the time and who do not have the international connections and networks with other major institutions around the world, then you are certainly going to struggle in trying to appreciate the value of what the museum offers.

**The Hon. WALT SECORD:** How did you react when, out of nowhere, you suddenly got a surprise that the Government was deciding to put a planetarium at the Parramatta site? Were you surprised by that?

**Mr BAKER:** I think planetariums, in my experience—I have not built one, but I have observed their operation in a number of museums around the world—can function well as an independent structure but to say that in some way it will generate higher levels of income or revenue for the museum, I would be highly dubious that that would be the case.

**Mr DAVID SHOEBRIDGE:** On redundancies, you point out that one of the reasons there has been a reduction in visitors to the Powerhouse is that there has been a significant reduction in the number of education staff. What has happened there?

**Mr BAKER:** In the time when I first began at the museum through to probably the mid-2000s, maybe a little bit earlier, we had a very robust team working in the education area. Bringing schoolchildren to the Powerhouse—to any institution—once you take them out of school these days it is like a business. You have to convince the head of the school that you are doing something that is crucial or significant for the benefit of those children and they weigh that up very carefully. Teachers are very busy and very overworked, as I understand from many of my friends who are teachers. If you can make it easy for them to put that case to the principal and say, "Here's the group that I want to take. Here's what they will learn. Here's how it connects to the curriculum and here are the benefits of getting them out there for the day," it makes that process so much easier for the teacher and, therefore, more inviting for them to take part in that.

**Mr DAVID SHOEBRIDGE:** So you need staff who understand the curriculum and create something that adds value to the curriculum.

**Mr BAKER:** Absolutely. You provide them with a kit of paths, which makes it very simple and easy for the teacher to go, "Yes, that's a great idea. Here, Principal, this is what we're doing for the day. Can we take the kids out?"

**Mr DAVID SHOEBRIDGE:** That was working at the Powerhouse. When did it stop working?

**Mr BAKER:** I do not know the detail of that. I was not part of the education department as such but I can certainly see that, with the huge reductions in staff in that area, there would have been a detrimental effect to the program.

**Mr DAVID SHOEBRIDGE:** Some people have suggested that there has been a change in the attitude of the leadership at the museum from a museums skill base—informed museum's perspective—to an art gallery, fine arts perspective. They said that has been very much to the detriment of the museum. What is your perspective on that argument?

**Mr BAKER:** As I said earlier, there is a similarity but a great difference between art galleries and museums. One of the things that museums did extremely well and still do is to create immersive or interactive experiences that help interpret and let the visitor understand not just what they are looking at but why it was created, how it was created, who created it and give them a greater knowledge, therefore, in order for them to appreciate what they are viewing. Many art exhibitions are simply objects on walls. I see that simply but I do understand the immense value of high-quality art. From my point of view, in order to create great exhibitions you need to appreciate that it is about the interpretation for the visitor and putting everything into context that is the significant thing. Many gallery-based exhibitions are a lot cheaper because you are literally just hanging things on walls as opposed to building immersive experiences. By immersive I mean there is an old adage that says,

"I see and I forget; I do and I remember." That was pretty much the philosophy of the museum. We encourage our visitors to do things—to actually touch and gauge, be part of and be immersed in what they are learning. It takes resources and skill to be able to create those interactive experiences for the visitor.

**Mr DAVID SHOEBRIDGE:** How would you describe the role of the board in terms of maintaining the integrity, the standards and the mission of the Powerhouse?

**Mr BAKER:** The boards that I worked with in the past I felt have been incredibly supportive and influential in helping the museum to achieve its goals. I cannot comment on the current board. I am not familiar with their backgrounds or experience.

**The Hon. WALT SECORD:** Mr Baker, I know that time is running out. If you were to make one suggestion or recommendation to this Committee when we do our final report, what would it be regarding the move of the Powerhouse?

**Mr BAKER:** I would strongly recommend you do not need to move the Powerhouse Museum. It simply needs a refresh. I believe that high-quality exhibitions will again bring the punters back to the Ultimo site. One of the good things that 2014 report said was that it is beautifully located in a very active area of Sydney and that it is a great location for a museum or a major cultural facility in partnership with the other major cultural facilities around the centre of Sydney. I strongly support the idea of a cultural centre, a new facility being built in Parramatta. I do not, however, believe that it is conditional on dismantling and moving the Powerhouse Museum.

**Mr DAVID SHOEBRIDGE:** In terms of the site, in some ways the site has improved in its attractiveness since the opening up of the Goods Line and that increased pedestrian flow and access.

**Mr BAKER:** That is true.

**Mr DAVID SHOEBRIDGE:** It is hard to see how the site is called worse. In fact, it is an even better place for the museum than when it was opened, is it not?

**Mr BAKER:** There are significantly more people now situated very close by to the museum who would take greater advantage of it being there, particularly the educational institutions—UTS and the others. Its central location is easy to access. I know: I commuted every day for 30 years.

**The CHAIR:** Any more questions?

**The Hon. WALT SECORD:** No.

**Mr DAVID SHOEBRIDGE:** No.

**The CHAIR:** Thank you, Mr Baker, for coming.

**Mr BAKER:** I would like to thank the Committee. Thank you.

**(The witness withdrew)**



**LIONEL GLENDENNING**, Architect of Record, Powerhouse Museum, on former oath, examined

**The CHAIR:** Thank you very much for coming in, Mr Glendenning. As you have previously appeared before the Committee to give evidence you do not have to take another oath. Would you like to start by making a short opening statement?

**Mr GLENDENNING:** I would. I have a short statement. This preface is a general set of comments and probably reflects my frustration with many of the things you have been listening to over the many weeks of the inquiry. In reviewing the sweep of the parliamentary inquiry's examination of the Powerhouse Museum's ultimate planned move by the Government to Parramatta, a broad pattern emerges in almost every government document, consultant report and statement. A clear and obvious bias towards the promotion and boosting of the proposal colours all of the supportive move content. There has been factually flawed factoids; unprofessional opinions; false statements; inaccurate figures; an ignorance of impacts, particularly flooding, collection risks, expensive implicit relocation costs and astronomic building costs with no alternatives; and a blind attachment to the slogan "Move the Powerhouse Museum." In reality it is a semantic and physical impossibility.

This pattern is clearly at odds with the overwhelming evidence of over 200 papers submitted to the inquiry and the highest professional testimony—you have just heard Brad Baker speaking eloquently about the issues. Witnesses to the inquiry have presented irrefutable facts relating to the 135-year-old Ultimo Powerhouse Museum, its history, value, awards and professional and international standing all being trashed by the property development of 70-storey super towers on both the Ultimo and Parramatta sites. I prepared a paper in response to one document, the Steensen Varming report on the condition of the services in the building. My comments are self explanatory. I am happy to take questions.

**The Hon. WALT SECORD:** Mr Glendenning, how many years of experience do you have in the field that you are referring to?

**Mr GLENDENNING:** 50 years plus. I have been an architect since I was 10 years old—thinking about buildings and making things. I began a career in architecture with the former Public Works Department. I went on to study post graduate level at Harvard University. I did additional degrees in environmental studies. I became a life fellow of the Powerhouse Museum. I have significant professional standing in the profession. I have had a long career in architecture.

**Mr DAVID SHOEBRIDGE:** When you were the architect for the Powerhouse Museum were you designing a building for 10 years, 20 years, 30 years or a century? What was your design brief?

**Mr GLENDENNING:** My design brief was clearly to design a museum and cultural facility that would live beyond our lifetime—a building that would easily survive 100 years. That was predicated on the basis—and I have a really good anecdote to tell you about—of a visit I made to Qantas. The chief engineer took me over a Boeing 747 that was being maintained during one of its major overhauls. I was doing some research into the aluminium skin on the aircraft, related to the IMAX theatre in Darling Harbour. I asked him how long a Boeing 747's lifetime would be. He said, "It will live forever; you just have to maintain it." The answer to your question was that I set out to design a building, along with all the professionals that were working with me, with a 100-year life. To think that at the end of 30 years that 100 years has been reduced to that figure is an absurdity. It really is an absurdity. The robustness of the building is there for all to see. It has been there for 100 years. It is just not a sensible comment to make that the existing facility is not fit for purpose. It is crazy.

**Mr DAVID SHOEBRIDGE:** The idea that our Government would have this sort of throwaway mentality for such an important cultural and historical asset offends many people. As the architect, how do you respond to that sort of throwaway mentality for such a site?

**Mr GLENDENNING:** I think it is symptomatic of the age in a sense and the necessary greed that underpins so much property development today—the excessive scale and dimensions of the city. I call it "toxic planning." We are all on about toxic masculinity but the reality for me is that I look about and everyday I experience toxic planning. The toxic planning is created by the very people who have created the thing that we are experiencing. I find myself in an *Alice in Wonderland* scenario. I quipped the other day that it was "Gladys in Wonderland." It is inconceivable.

**Mr DAVID SHOEBRIDGE:** Although Alice was the hero—that is the distinction.

**Mr GLENDENNING:** Exactly. I realise that my quip was not quite as apposite as I thought it would be. Nevertheless, it struck me that that was the case. I am disappointed. A career in architecture is about the quality of our built environment. It is about creating beautiful experiences for people. In many senses the Powerhouse Museum achieves that, even though it has not been looked after. You heard brilliantly from Brad Baker about

some of the issues that it has faced—efficiency dividends, the loss of competent staff, the trust failing in its duty, and senior directors and managers in the institution seemingly giving up in the face of governments that attempt to make changes that are not good for the museum. The whole situation that has emerged there is rampant. It is a bad thing for society.

**Mr DAVID SHOEBRIDGE:** But there is still a beautiful, fit-for-purpose building at the core of that that can be reinvigorated.

**Mr GLENDENNING:** Absolutely. It won all of the awards—it really did. It was a building that set a new paradigm for museums. During some strange sort of dark night when a storm is approaching I wonder why it has attracted such attention, given that it was such a fabulous, incredible experience for the people of New South Wales. Why is there this desperate need to take it out?

**The CHAIR:** The value of land.

**Mr GLENDENNING:** Correct. You are a man after my own heart in that sense.

**Mr DAVID SHOEBRIDGE:** It goes back to that toxic planning culture.

**Mr GLENDENNING:** It does. It goes back to that very thing that David Williamson wrote about in the *Emerald City*. God help us, it has come to pass—the asset stripping; the belief that somehow the highest and best use is a giant apartment building. I wrote a letter to the *Sydney Morning Herald* some months ago saying that my highest and best use is probably a museum, art gallery or cultural institution. God knows the creative qualities that are embedded in those buildings and in their collections is the thing that gives us our real heart. It gives us our sense of who we are, what we have been and what we may become.

**The Hon. SHAOQUETT MOSELMANE:** In your opening statement you indicated that there is a pattern of clear and obvious bias and you have also said that there are factually flawed, false statements.

**Mr GLENDENNING:** I did not say fraud, I said factoids flawed.

**Mr DAVID SHOEBRIDGE:** Flawed.

**The Hon. WALT SECORD:** You said "inaccurate figures".

**The CHAIR:** "Flawed", not "fraud".

**The Hon. WALT SECORD:** I wrote that down.

**The Hon. SHAOQUETT MOSELMANE:** False statements.

**Mr GLENDENNING:** Yes.

**The Hon. SHAOQUETT MOSELMANE:** Who made those false statements? What are they?

**Mr GLENDENNING:** I think all of the witnesses that have appeared before you for the Government. I think the Minister is the worst offender. And I was shocked at Baird's appearance here. I say this: I probably have no preferred political party, in truth, but his appearance filibustered for 45 minutes and when questioned by one of the Committee he would not answer the question finally "yes" or "no". It was not arrogance but it was dismissive in its sense—

**The Hon. SHAOQUETT MOSELMANE:** Blasé approach.

**Mr GLENDENNING:** A sort of sotto voce "no". It was shocking. It was seriously shocking to me. You are brought up to believe in truth and that ultimately good will triumph. This is a great example of the reverse occurring, and it is serious. We are here today because this is an incredibly serious issue and it goes to the heart of who we are, what architecture means, what the substance of our society is. Buildings are collapsing. Cladding is going up the side. What are we creating? As an old architect—and I have to say an old architect because I am feeling my age—it is disturbing to see the lack of professionalism, the lack of blowback. That is what I am looking for.

I had to almost drag the institute kicking and screaming to issue a statement that they supported the development of two museums—one in Parramatta. No-one disagrees with that. Please ask the people of Parramatta and Western Sydney. Do not tell them that you are going to land an alien spaceship and then label it as a STEAM or a STEM. STEAM and STEM went out with the ark. This is an absurdity. And then locate one of the most priceless collections, one of which is the *Mona Lisa* of the industrial revolution, the Boulton and Watt Engine. I am telling you, that is an Elgin marble. England will ask for it back. They should by rights be given it back if this is how we are going to treat it.

**Mr DAVID SHOEBRIDGE:** As soon as they give the marbles back—

**Mr GLENDENNING:** I like that. Well, be careful. They may well do it. It is priceless. It is the progenitor of the industrial revolution.

**The Hon. SHAOQUETT MOSELMANE:** I want to follow up on Mike Baird as a witness. Did he make any false statements as a witness?

**Mr GLENDENNING:** I think he made a lot of rhetorical statements. I cannot say he made other statements. You might say they were—

**The Hon. SHAOQUETT MOSELMANE:** I do not know. I am just listening to you.

**Mr DAVID SHOEBRIDGE:** I think we will form our own view on it.

**Mr GLENDENNING:** I would not characterise it as unfactual.

**The Hon. WALT SECORD:** He will be suited for his new job.

**Mr GLENDENNING:** Please do not wish that upon us.

**The Hon. WALT SECORD:** You were critical of the board.

**Mr GLENDENNING:** I am very critical of the board.

**The Hon. WALT SECORD:** Take us through that. What are their failures?

**Mr GLENDENNING:** There is a museum Act, right? And again some of your witnesses have come to the Committee and do not appear in any of their evidence or in any of their reports to actually understand that they represent the museum first, not the Government. So when the Government comes along offering this huge bribe, they jumped at it instead of understanding that the precious quality of what they had in Ultimo, a building historic in its nature with award-winning additions, a fantastic collection like no other in the world—that is the extraordinary thing.

I always remember Edmund Capon saying it is a museum of bits and pieces. Well, he is right. He meant it in a pejorative way, but I am telling you the bits and pieces are the detritus of our lives and they matter. They matter, believe me. Great architectural buildings, opera houses, are wonderful, but we do not live in them. We live with this mess that is created in the city of overdeveloped apartments. Canterbury Road is a perfect example. I do not have to go very far to say, "There's the future." I call them the slums of the future when I am giving my lectures. I also use *Blade Runner* as a fine example of what our cities are becoming: Hong Kong, Bangkok and, God help us, Sydney.

**Mr DAVID SHOEBRIDGE:** It is that collection of the detritus of daily life in some ways that is what makes the Powerhouse this unique institution.

**Mr GLENDENNING:** You are so right. It is one of the finest examples of the value of Australiana and other elements where we have interacted with the world and come up smelling roses. There is no doubt there are qualities about the Australian character that are international and that people love and desire and want to know about. God knows our inward visitor numbers are extraordinary. People come here and then they want to stay, let's face it. It's an extraordinary country.

**Mr DAVID SHOEBRIDGE:** Someone suggested to me that the role of the Powerhouse is like that of an archaeologist in real time.

**Mr GLENDENNING:** It is our conscience.

**Mr DAVID SHOEBRIDGE:** Archaeologists sift through the refuse of people a hundred, a thousand or 2,000 years ago to try to create an understanding of culture.

**Mr GLENDENNING:** Quite so.

**Mr DAVID SHOEBRIDGE:** But the Powerhouse is doing that in real time.

**Mr GLENDENNING:** It is, exactly.

**Mr DAVID SHOEBRIDGE:** That is the mission that does not seem to be understood by the Government.

**Mr GLENDENNING:** Quite so. I could not agree more. The reality of the attack on the Powerhouse—and I call it nothing less than that—and the superficiality of some of the comments in regard to how this whole move to Parramatta came about, the politics that suggest it is about cultural equity, no, it is not. It is about cultural envy. It is about cargo cult mentality. The Minister goes out and announces a major project—whoopee. That is

not giving people from Western Sydney access to culture. The Powerhouse is more accessible in its location in Ultimo with the radial system of Sydney than Parramatta will ever be.

**The Hon. WALT SECORD:** What about the so-called international design competition that the Government is—

**Mr GLENDENNING:** Oh, it is a farce.

**The Hon. WALT SECORD:** Tell me a bit about this.

**Mr GLENDENNING:** I spoke to the president of the institute.

**The Hon. WALT SECORD:** I know there is some unrest there.

**Mr GLENDENNING:** Very strong unrest. I spoke to the president, Andrew Nimmo, and he said, "Look, we had to work with the Government to make sure that it would not be a bad design brief."

**The Hon. WALT SECORD:** What did they originally propose?

**Mr GLENDENNING:** When you read the design brief, it is an absurdity: "Captain Cook settled Sydney." Where do you begin?

**Mr DAVID SHOEBRIDGE:** Not there.

**Mr GLENDENNING:** Exactly. I think there are actionable statements within the design brief that could give rise to major claims against the Government, because they underplay some of the risks—both risk to the collection and physical risk in Parramatta. Its accessibility is doubtful. The site is compromised massively by a super tower—as is Ultimo, ultimately. There is a diagram of Ultimo that if it does not make your blood run cold then you are not human.

**Mr DAVID SHOEBRIDGE:** Do you know where this design brief came from or who created the design brief?

**Mr GLENDENNING:** Probably Craig Limkin in the Minister's office, so-called Create NSW. What are they creating? God help us. I would rename them immediately.

**Mr DAVID SHOEBRIDGE:** Given the importance of a premiere cultural institution for the people of Parramatta and given the extraordinary Aboriginal, colonial and migrant history of Parramatta, how would you go about coming up with a design brief for a world-class institution in Parramatta?

**Mr GLENDENNING:** I would start not with the building per se or the architecture. I would start with the people of Western Sydney and what they represent in their own terms, not what we may believe them to be. As you can sense, Western Sydney is a very complex cultural mix. It has its beginnings in prehistory, it has a fabulous colonial history and it has a massive history of immigration. It is the demographic heart of the city. The west is growing astronomically. The central business district, by definition, is the economic and physical centre of the city but the demographic heart of the city is this very complex group of cultures that exist in recent history and it is important to document that history before it is lost. I think they are failing in every sense of the word not to ask the people of Western Sydney to establish a design brief. At the heart of every good project is a clear, precise brief.

The brief that the current design competition has is unwritten. It is quite strange, you read it and there is nothing. They mention the collection as though it is sort of a physical thing that is out there and we will get bits of it and bring it down to Parramatta. That is great, you know, that will be terrific. No museum on the planet has more than say 5 per cent or 10 per cent of its collection on display at any one time. So you are not talking about moving the whole collection to Parramatta. That, again, is this slogan, this move to Parramatta. They are not moving it to Parramatta; they are dismantling it in Sydney and sticking it in storage that is not built yet on the TAFE site at Castle Hill. It is at high risk if you do this. The move itself—you do not just ring a local mover to move this stuff. You do not stick it in a parcel and send it by a pantechicon. Each object in its own right if it is worth having in the collection has to be treated as though it was the most precious object on the planet. That is the remit of the museum and of the curator.

**Mr DAVID SHOEBRIDGE:** What are your concerns if the Government follows through and the design brief produces a design for the museum?

**Mr GLENDENNING:** My concerns are that is half the size of the Powerhouse Museum, that two-thirds of it—less than half of the volume and it does not have the substance or the robustness of the museum. It will be a new thin building—I call modern buildings "thin" buildings. The museum has stood the test of time—as Mr Baker referenced—and it is a building of great substance. They will get the latest architectural fashion; it will

just be a building that screams, "Hey, look at me!" They will probably believe that it is better if it is designed by an overseas architect, which always really cuts through the substance of the best architects in Australia. They are doing great work. I mean you have got Katsalidis down in Tasmania who produces Mona, which is dragging all the punters. So you have got potential for a building of substance. The Powerhouse pulled 20 million visitors in 30 years, you know. It is hard to understand that you can trash a brand like the Powerhouse, which is international. I go to London and they go, "Wow, you designed the Powerhouse! Amazing. We have just done the Tate Modern." I said, "Well we predated that." There are people coming from France, from Germany, from London, from the United States, from China to the Powerhouse. They were even people sneaking up from Victoria to have a look at the Powerhouse when they built their major cultural—

**Mr DAVID SHOEBRIDGE:** Heavily disguised because they do not want to admit to it?

**Mr GLENDENNING:** Exactly. Funny, Brad would ring me saying, "Daryl Jackson is in the lobby" or "Denton Corker are up from Melbourne" and I would say, "Just let them go. Maybe they will learn something." It was interesting to see how powerful—I think it was Stephen Weil from the Getty Leadership Institute who said, "This is the most amazing building, museum on the earth. I want all of my students from the Getty Leadership program to see this." We have had people come through that building—people from France, from the Louvre, from London, all the major museums—who made simple statements like, "How could this be in Australia? How could this happen in Australia?"

**The CHAIR:** Well it will not be for much longer.

**Mr GLENDENNING:** Exactly.

**Mr DAVID SHOEBRIDGE:** Unless something is done.

**Mr GLENDENNING:** You are quite right.

**Mr DAVID SHOEBRIDGE:** You are the architect and you have seen it living now for three decades.

**Mr GLENDENNING:** Yes.

**Mr DAVID SHOEBRIDGE:** As the architect how would you describe the building and its history now? It is often described as not fit for purpose, tired, old but how would you describe it?

**Mr GLENDENNING:** I think often we like buying new cars, we like buying things that glitter and sparkle and there is the trap. Underpinning all of our deep sense of humanity—I call it our collective memory—our collective memory is built on the substance of the urban environment. The great power of the Powerhouse Museum was at the time the quite revolutionary idea that you could convert those vast volumes of the derelict Powerhouse, which someone had already attempted—I think the State Rail Authority had attempted to demolish the building but they couldn't, it was so robust and strong. The chimneys were felled like trees and they damaged the roof but it survived all of that. It represents for people who visit, you see them, they walk into the lobby and smile, and they leave feeling good about themselves.

I think it is the essence of the project that the buildings as they exist contain a sense of substance and longevity, and to trash that after 30 years on a pretext where the professional people that I worked with—and they were many and they were all brilliant: Dave Rowe went on to lecture at Sydney University, Peter Matthews ran a very successful electrical consultancy, Barry Webb, a famous lighting designer in Australia—have all gone on to significant careers in the professional areas of expertise and they all worked on the Powerhouse. Not only that, it was built by the Public Works department and it had standards. Not only did those standards apply to building materials, processes and construction methodology, they also came down to contracts and delivery of projects on time and on budget. As I watch the current so-called—this magic word—"infrastructure process" play out I tell you, whoever is in government for the next four to 10 years has got a few issues to deal with, not the least of which is the light rail and the current so-called negotiations on a claim of \$2 billion from the contractor.

**Mr DAVID SHOEBRIDGE:** Bring back the Department of Public Works.

**Mr GLENDENNING:** Now in my experience a \$2 billion claim represents a payment of about \$1.5 billion. That is what they are heading towards. They say it is, "\$500 million or \$600 million we are negotiating" but I do not believe it is not going to be settled for less than a billion dollars—maybe \$1.5 billion. That is on a contract of \$4 billion or something; it is just ridiculous. WestConnex and all these projects are going to come in over budget.

**The Hon. SHAOQUETT MOSELMANE:** What do you say to the view that if the museum was not moved to Parramatta then Parramatta is being provided with a second-rate or second-class museum? I think that was—

**The Hon. WALT SECORD:** It was the Premier. The Premier said it was eastern suburbs elites.

**Mr GLENDENNING:** I know, all of those things. I mean, it is the famous reply of Christine Keeler, "They would, wouldn't they?" It is what they do. It is the counter or the riposte to someone who cannot sustain an argument, that is all it is, and it is a cheap shot.

**The Hon. SHAOQUETT MOSELMANE:** It is a fake argument really.

**Mr DAVID SHOEBRIDGE:** This takes us back to the design brief. If this was a government that genuinely cared about producing something relevant to Parramatta, you would not have come up with a design brief that starts with Captain Cook's discovery of a settlement at Parramatta would you?

**Mr GLENDENNING:** Exactly and describes a STEM [science, technology, engineering and mathematics] museum using bits of a collection they have pinched and stolen from Ultimo. I mean, the cargo cult mentality is staggering. The belief that you can uproot a major cultural institution, it beggars belief that it was based on a Premier who made an announcement without any clear depth of understanding of what was on, based on a cultural ambassador—

**The Hon. WALT SECORD:** Called—

**Mr GLENDENNING:** MacGregor.

**The Hon. WALT SECORD:** It was Liz Ann MacGregor, Museum of Contemporary Art Director.

**Mr GLENDENNING:** Who when making the statement—I read her evidence, that she had not read the museum study that produced that astronomical number, which by the way was \$300 million, not \$500 million that the Minister keeps using, to replace the building in Sydney. As we have described—not myself, many others—the replacement is not necessary. You are not replacing the Powerhouse at Ultimo; you would refresh it over a period of time. You would begin with a managed program of new exhibitions, upgrading the building, upgrading some services, which are all very state-of-the-art. You are talking—I have said in the report that I have written here on the Steensen Varming statement, they are talking about control, they are talking about temperature measurement, they are talking about changing from analogue to digital. All I say is, "Wow! Go for it." We do it every day.

It is like upgrading the 747 I was talking about at the end of the major service. Of course, they replace the old altimeters and the parts. This is part and parcel of managing a complex, 24-hour a day, seven-days-a-week, 365-days a year facility that manages the best quality collection and standards in the country.

**Mr DAVID SHOEBRIDGE:** We have not been directed to any formal report at any point that suggests any of the galleries do not meet environmental and other controls necessary for their collections.

**Mr GLENDENNING:** Correct, exactly, and that is what my opening statement was about the nonsense that the reports represent. If I was back teaching architecture and a student did this for Architecture 101, I would simply fail the report. They are full of statements that do not make sense, facts that are wrong. They do not consider options. For the Powerhouse, when it began, we looked at about eight different options and locations. Ultimately, the Powerhouse in Ultimo was the closest to the existing infrastructure that supported the museum in its location, which is educational and all the other facilities in a cultural group going out to Eveleigh and beyond, to the airport and internationally. Good luck with Parramatta.

**Mr DAVID SHOEBRIDGE:** I think Parramatta can be extraordinary.

**Mr GLENDENNING:** I agree.

**Mr DAVID SHOEBRIDGE:** If you were the architect now and you had the opportunity of the Goods Line opening and the changes around the site at Ultimo, would you see that as a threat to the museum or that, with appropriate modest expenditure, that could become an amazing opportunity?

**Mr GLENDENNING:** I could not agree more. You have just spent a fortune upgrading Darling Harbour, with its 40 million visitors a year. The spin-off in numbers coming to the museum would be staggering. The Goods Line allows direct access by foot with pedestrian movement in a pleasant environment. Central and the tram and bus stops are nearby. It is the perfect location. I have heard people from a place like Dubbo say that it is easier for them to get to Ultimo than it is to get to Parramatta. The other thing about this massive expenditure, \$1.2 billion, is that the regions miss out. No-one else understands that the cultural budget is—

**The Hon. WALT SECORD:** No, the regions are getting \$25 million a year under this Government.

**Mr GLENDENNING:** I think someone in the room has calculated that that spread across all the regional museums and galleries equates to around \$2,000 or \$3,000 max each.

**Mr DAVID SHOEBRIDGE:** You and, I think, most of the public see a fabulous site for an even better museum.

**Mr GLENDENNING:** Exactly.

**Mr DAVID SHOEBRIDGE:** But I think there are other people who just see a massive property deal waiting to happen. That is Sydney all over, is it not?

**Mr GLENDENNING:** It is true, very true.

**The CHAIR:** Thank you for your evidence today.

**Mr GLENDENNING:** I was going to be very calm and quiet. It is hard to deal with the real issues.

**(The witness withdrew)**

**JENNIFER SANDERS**, Member, Powerhouse Museum Alliance, on former oath, examined

**NICK PAPPAS**, Member, Powerhouse Museum Alliance and former President, Museum of Applied Arts and Sciences Trust, on former oath, examined

**The CHAIR:** I welcome our next witnesses, who are from the Powerhouse Museum Alliance and I remind them that as they have both previously appeared before this Committee to give evidence, they will be examined on their former oath. Would either or both of you like to make a short opening statement?

**Mr PAPPAS:** I have a brief statement. As I think you will recall, I was a trustee between 1999 and 2010 and for eight years in that period served as President of the Board of Trustees. I delivered a submission on 10 August 2016 that went into my concerns about the manner in which the trust had acted during the relevant period. I observed, in that submission, that the statutory framework provided that the trust had vested in it control and management of all property of the museum—in other words, it was charged with the long-term oversight of the museum's interests. For these reasons, the trust was not intended to be a vehicle for government intervention or influence. Finally, I observed that both the collection and the place of the museum are fundamental, intertwined since the Technological Museum opened in 1893. In short, the Powerhouse is a product of both its place and its collection and cannot be severed from both.

Since my submission, these observations have come into even sharper focus. The lack of interrogation by the trust of the business case—if, indeed it could be called that—the amateurish design competition search statement with patent errors which I would have thought almost too embarrassing to recite and, just last month, January 2019, the appointment of new trustees who are, in my respectful submission, highly unsuitable trustees—

**The Hon. WALT SECORD:** Property developers.

**Mr PAPPAS:** —to fortify the move—and I mean specifically Chief Executive Officer of Dexus, David Borger, a former Lord Mayor of Parramatta and the staunchest advocate of the move—nothing betrays the Government's cynical view of the trust's role than these controversial and, I would say, brazen appointments. From what I had initially described as meek compliance with the whims of government, we now have a trust comprised of staunch advocates of the destruction of a 135-year-old institution. In my view, the Government could not have acted with more disdain towards the Powerhouse's legacy and its place on the cultural landscape of Sydney.

When I became trust president in 2003, I followed in the footsteps of chairs of the calibre of Jim Spigelman and Marco Belgiorno-Zegna, we all understood only too clearly that we were vested, as chairs, with a heavy responsibility to ensure that the legacy of the institution was protected as much from government as from the private sector. That was our role and we understood it all too well. Regrettably, since then we have watched as the trust has instead become a meek, obsequious, even fawning vassal of government and of the property developers. I close my submission with a short paragraph, which I would like to repeat:

Museums are not departmental offices that can be abruptly shifted holus bolus to new localities for reasons of efficiency or savings, or even for reasons more mischievous. Rather, they are our secular shrines where we silently reflect on human endeavour. And, over time, their attachment to their place becomes as significant as the collections they house.

This is the case with the Powerhouse Museum. Thank you.

**Ms SANDERS:** Thank you for the opportunity to speak with you again and I thank the Committee for your work over what I am sure is one of the longer inquiries that has happened. Because of that work, we now have a body of evidence before us that the people of New South Wales have not seen before, and I am referring specifically for the extended final business case that the Government prepared and to the museum's 2014 business case. I am a member of the Powerhouse Museum Alliance, but I have had 40 years experience in the museum and cultural sector, of which 30 years was at the Powerhouse. For 20 of those years I was a member of the senior executive service and I had direct control over many of those areas that have been criticised in a number of these reports: collections, exhibitions, education, library, programs that went regional, regional services, Migration Heritage Centre. Therefore, when there was the opportunity to read these reports I have to say I was incandescent with rage.

But there is good news and there is bad news. The good news is that the Powerhouse Museum can be renewed for far less than the Government announced in April last year, when the *Daily Telegraph*—remember the people of New South Wales had not yet seen this secret report—trumpeted that the Powerhouse was not a fixer upper and that it would cost \$500 million to renew it. Our analysis, of which you have before you, has shown that this is far from the case. The bad news is that if this is the state of analysis that is operating within this State's public sector, whether it be the 2014 MAAS report or the Government's business case for the Powerhouse Museum then the public sector is in deep strife.



I spent years with Gerry Gleeson at the helm. Gerry Gleeson also joined the board of the Powerhouse Museum when he left and I can assure you that these documents would not have seen the light of day. They are totally unprofessional and they have got no sense of what they should be covering in terms of the scopes of arguments—no options et cetera. You have got the picture. It is no wonder that so many projects are imploding, going over budget and over schedule. I will now gather myself.

I would now like to make a few points about the MAAS 2014 business base. The submission has analysis by myself and my four former senior colleagues. We have heard from Brad. There is also Judith Coombes who was Head of Strategic Collections, Christina Sumner, a very important principal curator and Rob Webb who was property manager for many years. It is apparently this bid which spurred former Premier Baird's announcement that they would do the impossible: move the Powerhouse to Parramatta for \$200 million, now at a cost of at least 1.2 and close to 1.5. Commissioned in March 2014 this case has developed in the context of the Government's June 2014 announcement that it would spend \$600 million on cultural infrastructure, as well as \$600 million on stadia.

This \$600 million dangled like a carrot on a stick before New South Wales cultural entities vying to maximise the dollars for their bailiwicks with little thought given to a coherent, value-for-money approach. The preparation of this case was clearly driven by an executive group who clearly have very little experience of museums and of museum planning and exhibition development. Exhibitions aligned to audiences. They apparently also had next to no knowledge of the Powerhouse Museum, its history, its achievements as a leading State cultural institution and its international standing. The result, a litany of ignorant assertions, unsubstantiated claims, exaggerations and superficial analysis resulting in grandiose schemes.

A key manager who provided information for the case has told me that they were instructed by the executive to exaggerate any minor problems so that the case could be made for as much money as possible. The case is dismissive, perhaps due to ignorance of the outstanding record of the Powerhouse Museum which you have heard Brad speak of today and which is in the papers. The Powerhouse has 19.5 million visitation alone, 800,000 in the first three months, 2.1 million in the next 12 months. And this visitation was despite the imposition of admission charges in September 1991 which saw admissions drop by about half by a Liberal Government.<sup>1</sup>

The case also fails to properly acknowledge that one of the main causes for a lack of patronage is a 40 per cent decrease in the number of permanent exhibitions since the Powerhouse opened in 1988. It ignores and dismisses the distinctive strengths of the Powerhouse Museum: landmark heritage adaption, award-winning contemporary design, 1,800 square metre exhibition space in the Wran Building, huge display spaces and volumes with no columns, 70,000 cubic metres, exhibition spaces of 21,800 metres compared with 11½ at the Parramatta Museum, the proximity of the Harwood Building Collection store, more efficient operation, safe object movement, secure objects, better care and access to the collection, workshops, library, archives, not just for staff but for researchers and public programs.

As you have heard from Brad Baker and others, the Powerhouse Museum can be renewed through a considered program of capital works, an invigorated audience focused exhibition program and a long overdue maintenance program for less than quarter of the \$500 million that the Government asserted it would cost through the *Daily Telegraph*. Percy Allan, former New South Wales Treasury Secretary, recently said he just wants politicians to return to the old ways of doing things, committing to an evidence based policy making process, run more by public servants and less by political cabals. You have just heard my view of public servants running this process but, nonetheless, to political cabals you could add business cabals and property developer cabals.

Instead, the Baird Government's response to this pie-in-the-sky, rolled-gold case, concocted by MAAS, was to announce an un-costed, massively dislocating and destructive project affecting one of the State's most significant cultural institutions with no checking of facts, no seeking of stakeholder views, no exploration of options, no public transparency, a policy fiasco. No case can be made for spending upwards of \$1.5 billion on the misnamed move of the Powerhouse Museum. Given all the wasteful expenditure and unnecessary risk that this would entail, this means that the moneys and effort which would be wasted on the move can be redirected to renewing the Powerhouse Museum at Ultimo and to cultural infrastructure projects which would bring cultural tourism and education dividends of communities in Parramatta, across Western Sydney and throughout New South Wales engaging far wider audiences and preserving and developing our State's cultural heritage rather than trashing it.

---

<sup>1</sup>In correspondence to the committee dated 15 February 2019, Ms Jennifer Sanders requested to clarify her evidence as follows: "The imposition of admission charges under a Liberal Government in September 1991 saw admissions drop by about half".

A note on the 2014 cost of exhibition spaces. In their budgets, there was a budget of refurbishment of \$36.3 million and exhibition renewal \$41 million which totals \$97 million. The bulk of the ask was for \$171 million to demolish and replace the Sulman award-winning building and build a new building. That was the bulk. Therefore, the Government's assertion that \$500 million was needed to fix up the Powerhouse is completely misleading. To cap off this folly, this 2014 grand plan reduces the exhibition galleries of the Powerhouse from 21,800 square metres to 15,820 square metres, of which 3,000 is a roof-top sculpture park on a new residential building on the Harwood building site.

My second submission: this is the Government's extended final business case. With the release of the redacted extended final business case and sundry papers, and the announcement of the international design competition, it is clear the Government is proceeding with its flawed plan. The only change is to assess the potential of an arts and cultural presence on the Powerhouse site. This is tokenistic and culturally superficial. Worse, it is contingent on the destruction of a world-class, award-winning Wran Building and Harwood Building. I have here images of what the museum site would look like if that were to proceed.

This latest thought bubble is particularly insane. The Powerhouse Museum is an established and world-recognised cultural presence on the Ultimo site. In fact, its leadership in the precinct has defined the area as a unique cultural destination fostering creativity in design with a strong educational presence in concert with the neighbouring university. Evicting the museum's collection, including the national and internationally significant, very large technology objects—Catalina Flying Boat, 1785 Boulton Watt No. 1 locomotive, Governor's carriage, et cetera—from the soaring volumes and vast spaces of the Powerhouse, a complicated task, at great cost and risk and with no guarantee of future display, is madness and irresponsible. Why is the Government destroying one of New South Wales's greatest cultural assets only to then try to conjure up the ghost of the magnificent Powerhouse Museum? Why is it wasting so much money on these deeply flawed thought bubbles?

The role and purpose of a great museum is to inspire and to stimulate exploration and thinking, not to tick the boxes of the government of the day. The Powerhouse is the people's museum with an outstanding and unique collection that echoes through the ages and across the world, telling stories through objects and the collection of people who have tested the boundaries, explored new horizons, built new lives in foreign lands, succeeded against the odds, had modest achievements that matter, made world-changing discoveries, pursued beauty, function and form, shared experiences, and searched for better ways to live lives and to have a better world.

Yet the visions and project definitions revealed in these papers are facile marketing speak that could be describing any range of shared public experiences—educational, recreational, leisure, entertainment, performance, crowd sourced, flash mobs et cetera. The gravitas and enduring contribution to our society that has characterised the Powerhouse Museum since 1880 is evaporating under the weight of property development options, real estate deals, economic appraisals et cetera. This plan is a thought bubble that is now rivalling the fat Trump baby balloon—full of hot air and fake news, but grossly more expensive, risky and potentially destructive. It is destructive of our shared cultural heritage and anathema to the people's cultural aspirations expressed by their support of the museum and its collection over 138 years.

As a result of the commitment to transparency and openness by a majority of members of the Legislative Council, 4,500-odd redacted pages of business cases, extended final and summary business cases, supplements, appendices, and reports were unceremoniously tipped into the public debate. This avalanche of papers generated over three years of consultants and public servants with no museum expertise doing well-paid toil with apparently limitless capacity to table statistics, regurgitated government policies and plans, options for massing development opportunities, analyses of real estate opportunities, preliminary budget estimates, governance modelling, planning, due diligence reports, managed and edited records of stakeholder and community consultation, limited risk analyses, speculation of workforce needs, and the most florid spin-doctoring this author has ever encountered for a cultural initiative.

What is most disturbing is the way in which the Government is continuing to pursue, contrary to expert advice—and we have tried for three years—

**The Hon. WALT SECORD:** Ms Sanders, members want to ask questions.

**Ms SANDERS:** I have one more comment to make.

**The Hon. WALT SECORD:** I understand this is very important to you.

**Mr DAVID SHOEBRIDGE:** Are you about to bring it home?

**Ms SANDERS:** Yes, I am.

**The CHAIR:** That is why I let it run.

**Ms SANDERS:** Thank you. It is nothing less than the evisceration and dismemberment one of the world's greatest museum in the mistaken pursuit of a cultural and engineering solution—the David Borger/Liz Ann Macgregor cargo cult solution. It is nothing less than the theft of the Powerhouse Museum to be replaced on a flood-prone riverbank with half a museum of yet to be determined purpose, half the size and with a smaller collection, and its name and reputation being appropriated, both of which are inextricably linked to the museum site and the building. The plan is stealing its purpose, its collection with its unique breadth across time and space, its history, its benefactors, and its supporters. It is the theft of the Powerhouse Museum, which belongs to the people of New South Wales, not to the government of the day.

**The Hon. WALT SECORD:** Ms Sanders, you have been a vocal spokesperson as a member of the Powerhouse Museum Alliance. I have followed your comments, done a bit of research, and have spoken to people who have worked with you and known you. They describe you as "an old-school bureaucrat who stood up to Ministers and who disagreed when she knew it was the right thing to do", and, "She provided advice without fear or favour." What would you have done if a Minister had come into your office with this proposal when you were deputy at the Powerhouse?

**Ms SANDERS:** Thank you for that introduction. I have always prided myself on providing frank and fearless advice. I would have said then exactly what I have said today; I would have said that there were better solutions. We have tried saying that; I tried saying it to Mike Baird when he was Premier. We have been positive and optimistic and we have been full of ideas for Parramatta, Western Sydney and regional New South Wales. Those ideas all involved consultation. I do have excellent knowledge of those areas because, as I said, I managed the museum's regional programs and the immigration and heritage centre. I know those areas and I know that the people in them have desires they want to see expressed in cultural institutions. Frank and fearless advice seems to have gone down the tubes.

**Mr DAVID SHOEBRIDGE:** The board is headed by a vice-chancellor and it has a director of commercial property, a chief executive officer of finance and sports, a chief executive officer of an air purifier manufacturer, a chief executive officer of finance and real estate enterprise, a chartered accountant, a former Minister for Roads, a former editor-in-chief of a fashion magazine and, to add a bit of balance, a current teacher. Do you think the makeup of the board is appropriate for a cultural institution? There is chief executive officer after chief executive officer after chief executive officer.

**Mr PAPPAS:** Clearly not. While I was president of the board of trustees I was always in close consultation with the Minister about new appointments. There would be dialogue, candidates would be considered and the appointment would match the variegated institution that is the Powerhouse in terms of its subject matter. As I have often quoted Ms Sanders in the past, it is the DNA of our nation, and trustee appointments should reflect that.

**Mr DAVID SHOEBRIDGE:** In your experience on the board, has there been more balance than that previously? For example, have you ever seen so many representatives from the property industry on the board?

**Mr PAPPAS:** Never.

**Mr DAVID SHOEBRIDGE:** As of 1 January this year the chief executive officer of Dexu has been on the board. Dexu is a real estate and fund manager. Given the concerns about the nature of the project, how do you respond to that?

**Mr PAPPAS:** It is replete with potential conflict. I imagine he would have to absent himself from most discussions, so you wonder why he is there.

**Mr DAVID SHOEBRIDGE:** He is the former national president of the Property Council of Australia. He has been appointed to the board of the Powerhouse when most of Sydney suspects this is a property deal disguised as a "cultural program". Does that not demonstrate contempt?

**Mr PAPPAS:** I describe it as brazen, and I will leave it at that. I also know what Ms Sanders would have done if she were put in the position put to her a moment ago. She would have gone to the president of the board of trustees and voiced her concerns, and the president would have taken those concerns to the Minister.

**Mr DAVID SHOEBRIDGE:** You have a board to make hard decisions about the direction of an institution and core funding issues. Ms Sanders, if you had a hard issue to decide about the direction of a cultural institution, how confident would you be going to a board with the current membership of this board? How confident would you be of its ability to take the right direction for the Powerhouse?

**Ms SANDERS:** I would have no confidence in that board. In fact, I would not stay at the museum if it had a board like that. You could not work with a board like that. The boards that I had the privilege to work with had members such as Leo Schofield, Fred Millar, Janet McDonald and many others who understood the role of

great cultural institutions and who supported them. It is not that they did not challenge us. We were challenged all the time, and that is what you need, but they supported the role of the museum in the community and they represented the museum to the Government as Mr Pappas did when there was that plan to—

**Mr PAPPAS:** There was the ill-fated plan to merge the Australian Museum with the Powerhouse, which I raised in my last appearance, which was a ridiculous thought bubble that was defeated due to the strong advocacy of the community but also due to the strong advocacy of the trust.

**The Hon. SHAOQUETT MOSELMANE:** If you believe that the current board is not understanding its role and requirement to manage, do you think then that it is not complying with the trusts Act, the Government Act?

**Mr PAPPAS:** Statutory trusts are not set up by accident; they are set up with the specific purpose of having people understand the fiduciary obligations when they take part in trust discussions.

**The Hon. SHAOQUETT MOSELMANE:** Have they met their fiduciary obligations?

**Mr PAPPAS:** I believe they have not.

**The Hon. SHAOQUETT MOSELMANE:** They have not?

**Mr PAPPAS:** They have not.

**The Hon. SHAOQUETT MOSELMANE:** Can you elaborate a little on that? In what way?

**Mr PAPPAS:** For the very reasons I have already stated they have become obsequious followers to the whim of Government, which is not why statutory trusts exist.

**The Hon. WALT SECORD:** Do you believe they have just become cheerleaders for the property deal?

**Mr PAPPAS:** Cheerleaders and fawning participants.

**The Hon. WALT SECORD:** Beneficiaries, maybe.

**Mr PAPPAS:** I will stop there.

**The Hon. TREVOR KHAN:** I would be a bit careful there.

**The Hon. WALT SECORD:** Do you support this, Mr Khan?

**The Hon. TREVOR KHAN:** No, I am saying that the slur that you are making now, by inference, is a slur and inappropriate.

**The Hon. WALT SECORD:** These appointments were made in secret in December just before Christmas.

**The Hon. TREVOR KHAN:** You know what I am getting at.

**The Hon. WALT SECORD:** And you know what I am getting at, too.

**Mr DAVID SHOEBRIDGE:** Mr Pappas, your evidence is that given the nature of their other duties, there is a very real likelihood of a major conflict of interest. That is your evidence.

**Mr PAPPAS:** There is already a potential conflict and that would convert to an actual conflict.

**Mr DAVID SHOEBRIDGE:** It will be hard to see how a bunch of board members who are directly involved in the property industry could not but have an enormous conflict of interest as they start signing the deals for a 70-storey apartment tower at Parramatta and Harris Street. I cannot conceive how you would appoint that board.

**Mr PAPPAS:** I agree completely. They would not be on my board.

**Mr DAVID SHOEBRIDGE:** What is the role of the chair of the board? This is obviously an area you have experience in. As a chair of the board, if the Government says to you, "We're now going to stack the board with the property industry," what is the normal negotiation between the Government and the chair of a board in that situation?

**Mr PAPPAS:** There is a very close relationship traditionally between the chair of the board and the Minister. There is a dialogue that takes place, as I said earlier, in relation to each appointment as a vacancy arises. There are a number of considerations that we would walk through in satisfying ourselves that a particular candidate was suitable. I cannot for the life of me understand how that could have happened in this case.

**Mr DAVID SHOEBRIDGE:** Surely, one part of that is you look at the current make-up of the board and say, "Where are we missing skills and experience?" If you looked at the current board, the most obvious space where there is this complete absence of experience in running a cultural institution. In fact, it appears walking into a cultural institution seems to be part of the problem.

**Mr PAPPAS:** Precisely.

**Mr DAVID SHOEBRIDGE:** It is getting that balance on a board that makes it a functioning board, is it not?

**Mr PAPPAS:** It flies in the face of all governance principles that are now clearly enunciated across the city about how you constitute a board. But added to that is the fiduciary obligation that the board members, in this case, have under the Act, and that they owe to the people of New South Wales. They do not owe that fiduciary obligation to the Government.

**Mr DAVID SHOEBRIDGE:** Ms Sanders, you said you could not work with the current board. Could you perhaps speak about the design brief and what role you would have expected the current board, or a previous board, to have had in signing off on something as important as the design brief?

**Ms SANDERS:** My question is: Did they sign off on the design brief? As far as I can work out, the board is being removed from this whole exercise. It is only Professor Glover who, in another interesting situation, is vice-chancellor of Western Sydney University, who of course, is going to benefit from the Powerhouse Museum in Parramatta. I am not even sure that the board has had involvement in that design brief. It would be great if the inquiry could plumb the depths of that relationship, such as it might be.

**Mr DAVID SHOEBRIDGE:** This may have to be our final day of hearing, I think.

**Ms SANDERS:** Yes, that would be a relief, actually.

**The CHAIR:** It is a very, very deep well and it is very, very dark down there. It is very hard for us to shed some light, let alone plumb the depths of depravity that is going on here.

**Mr DAVID SHOEBRIDGE:** You have been intimately involved in the operation of the Powerhouse for many years. You know what is needed to make it work. What do you say about the design brief that has gone out?

**Ms SANDERS:** The design brief is vacant. It is vacant. It is the trophy building—that horrible phrase "iconic building". That is what all of it is about. There is no heart; there is no soul. It is a ploy. It is a ploy by the Minister to keep the story going. It is up there: Powerhouse Museum international design competition announced. Then you look at it and you think, "Designing what?" Yet, we had discussions with the Minister, options for arts and cultural precinct on that Riverbank site, options for Female Factory, options for development across Western Sydney. Barney had a great opportunity. Minister Ayres and the Premier could be out there now with Barney Glover opening Science, Technology, Engineering, and Mathematics, and Science, Technology, Engineering, Art, and Mathematics centres across Western Sydney. I wrote suggestions myself. Campbelltown, link with the botanic Gardens, link with the Powerhouse Museum, link with Western Sydney University; explore agriculture, sustainability, biotechnology. No, vacant land, because the Powerhouse site is seen as vacant land.

**Mr DAVID SHOEBRIDGE:** The current Powerhouse site?

**Ms SANDERS:** That is what it is about. I can be talking: People on the street, friends, neighbours, they all say, "It's got to be about a property deal." I had always preferred not to believe that, to believe that somewhere there was some kernel of a cultural idea that was worth following. This last avalanche of papers has destroyed that completely.

**Mr DAVID SHOEBRIDGE:** I think we have all been searching for what actually explains it—

**Ms SANDERS:** Absolutely.

**Mr DAVID SHOEBRIDGE:** —and desperately unable to. It reminds me of an episode from *Fawlty Towers*: Lifting the silver tureen and looking for the duck—there is nothing there.

**Ms SANDERS:** What is most disheartening is that the options were there. As the Premier said to me, when again with Andrew Grant we met with her three times, put forward options and ways it could be done—more cost-effective, better timing, better community involvement—"Well, if the Government's got this money, we'll spend it." I said, "I think taxpayers—"

**The Hon. NATALIE WARD:** Sorry to interrupt you there: Who did you say you met with?

**Ms SANDERS:** The Premier.

**The Hon. NATALIE WARD:** Sorry, I thought you said Andrew Grant.

**Ms SANDERS:** No, Andrew Grant was in the discussion.

**The Hon. NATALIE WARD:** In the discussion?

**Ms SANDERS:** Yes. I said, "Taxpayers will have a view on that."

**Mr DAVID SHOEBRIDGE:** What do you make of the idea of placing a planetarium as the central tenet of the relocated Powerhouse?

**Ms SANDERS:** It is interesting, is not it, because planetaria can be fantastic. If you are ever in New York and you can go through the Rose Center for Earth and Space, go there. It is funded by the Rose family to the tune of, I do not know, \$300-odd million, whatever. It is eye-popping, and you have a much better understanding of the world and where we live. Meanwhile, at Powerhouse Museum in the boiler hall, there was one of the best exhibitions about space that you would see in any museum in the world representing America, Russia, China, Australia and France. It had the Saturn rocket engine that was part of the test engine, important in the National Aeronautics and Space Administration history. The curator who is a specialist in that area was restructured out of the museum. Here we are, about to launch an Australian Space Centre. I have forgotten which State it is in; you fellows will know. It is going to be dismantled.

**Mr DAVID SHOEBRIDGE:** Interestingly, the community has had a freedom of information request response provided to it about the one community consultation event held by Elton Consulting at Parramatta and not a single resident who was consulted said they wanted a planetarium. Where do you think the idea of a planetarium has come from? Perhaps we need to visit a planetarium to find out.

**Ms SANDERS:** I was at that consultation. It was a very managed process. Elton Consulting—I do not know where they are from but they are clearly managers of public responses. Yes, you are right, what did come up was, of course, a fantastic gallery so they could see brilliant exhibitions. They wanted to look at their history, contemporary cultural diversity, indigenous history, female factory sites—there were lots of fantastic ideas that are not reflected in what is happening at Parramatta.

**The CHAIR:** Thank you very much for coming.

**Ms SANDERS:** Thank you.

**(The witnesses withdrew.)**

**CRAIG LIMKIN**, Executive Director, Cultural Infrastructure Program Management Office, Arts, Screen and Culture Division, Department of Planning and Environment, on former oath, examined

**The CHAIR:** Welcome and thank you very much for coming. I remind you that you appeared previously before the Committee to give evidence and you will be examined on your former oath. Would you like to start with a short opening statement?

**Mr LIMKIN:** Culture matters, as it captures and inspires global imagination. The Sydney Opera House and its iconic design, which blends art and technology, symbolises Sydney's confidence as a modern international city. It is Australia's first modern example of the power of cultural infrastructure. The Government's vision for Create NSW is to make New South Wales a place for every story. We work to develop and support a vibrant, accessible and thriving sector. Key to this is the delivery of cultural infrastructure precincts and cutting edge cultural infrastructure. Create Infrastructure continues to work in partnership with organisations to provide a coordinated approach to planning and the delivery of cultural infrastructure. To ensure the future investment by the New South Wales Government in cultural infrastructure the Government asked my team to develop the Cultural Infrastructure Plan 2025+.

The plan, the first of its kind for New South Wales, provides a strategic framework to support the New South Wales Government to work across departments, with local governments, the cultural sector and the community to deliver for the State. Importantly, the plan uses an all encompassing approach that will consider a whole spectrum of cultural infrastructure that will be needed to deliver across New South Wales. Using the Infrastructure NSW Cultural Infrastructure Strategy 2016 as the basis and starting point, the plan builds a holistic strategy around a set of priorities and actions informed by extensive State-wide consultation for both the community and the cultural sector. The plan is also informed by an evidence base of new research undertaken by Create NSW. A particularly important element of this is extensive cultural infrastructure mapping that covers the entire State. This mapping will ensure the planning can be carefully and strategically undertaken to meet the cultural infrastructure needs for New South Wales and allows a more strategic alignment with the work of the Greater Sydney Commission.

The data underpinning our mapping is a resource that we will share with local governments and the sector to inform their own decisions. Today I would like to table a copy of the plan for the Committee. Following the April 2018 announcement by the Government on the relocation of the Powerhouse Museum to Western Sydney the Government has been progressing with the acquisition of the riverbank site in Parramatta, as well as developing an international design competition to secure the best design team. The Government is continuing to take all necessary steps outlined in the heads of agreement with the City of Parramatta. A copy of the heads of agreements is provided on the project website. After working closely with the New South Wales Government Architect and MAAS, Create Infrastructure recently launched a two-stage international design competition for the new museum. Since the launch of the competition there has been a significant amount of interest in the competition. To date, the website visitors have come from 109 countries, and the total number of page views reached nearly 30,000. According to Malcolm Reading Consultants, this is the second-highest interest since the Guggenheim Helsinki Design Competition.

Stage one of the design competition will close on 18 March 2019. The focus of stage one of the competition is the capability of design teams. Applications for the design teams will be assessed by a panel that is chaired by Naomi Milgrom AO and will include David Gianotten and Wendy Lewin. Proposals and designs for the new museum are not required until stage two, which will not commence until late 2019. An international design excellence competition is being run with the purpose of developing an exceptional architecture outcome: a building that meets world-class standards and industry expectations. The process will return a range of options to ensure the best outcome for the people of New South Wales. The competition process has also been endorsed by the Australian Institute of Architects. Culture matters and support for a culture of creativity is essential for New South Wales to succeed in global innovation and economy. But for culture to truly flourish it needs a home where it can be created, shared and enjoyed. Cultural infrastructure is one way we can ensure culture matters. Through greater investment in cultural infrastructure cities will not only be more liveable, productive and sustainable, but will also influence individual wellbeing. Thank you for the opportunity to address the Committee today. I look forward to answering your questions.

**The Hon. NATALIE WARD:** Thank you, Mr Limkin. There is a number of controversial issues in this inquiry, there is no doubt about that, but one idea that seems to unify us is the importance of culture. You spoke of cultural mapping. Could you elaborate on that and the work that has been done in cultural mapping for the Committee?

**Mr LIMKIN:** The cultural mapping that has been undertaken basically maps all of the cultural sites for New South Wales. It includes libraries, theatres, galleries and performance spaces. This is the first time that we could find that the data set has actually been created.

**The Hon. NATALIE WARD:** So it is more comprehensive than just one specific area?

**Mr LIMKIN:** Yes. It is a full State map. Also, in the cultural infrastructure plan there are individual LGAs—the Hunter, Shoalhaven, the Illawarra, Western Parklands—according to the planning regions. Communities will be able to see their own area. If you want to look up Newcastle you will be able to see what is in Newcastle. What will be online shortly will be the ability to interact—you will be able to turn off libraries, for example. That will probably be up in the next couple of weeks. I am tremendously proud of the work the team has done. As I said, this is a great step forward to actually help the State make the right investment decisions.

**The Hon. NATALIE WARD:** An earlier witness referred to the Central Coast. It is pleasing to hear you mention something around Newcastle. It is in conjunction with LGAs. Is that correct?

**Mr LIMKIN:** Yes. So when you see the actual plan—

**The Hon. WALT SECORD:** Okay, I have been patient. This will be our last opportunity to ask the Government questions. It is nice to have Dorothy Dixers but this is a serious issue. Come on. This is our last opportunity to question the Government and you are asking Dorothy Dixers.

**The CHAIR:** Order! She is entitled to ask a Dorothy Dixer. We can run overtime.

**The Hon. WALT SECORD:** I move that we extend—

**The CHAIR:** Hang on, I want to hear—

**The Hon. WALT SECORD:** This is serious. This is our last opportunity to ask the Government questions and she is filibustering.

**The CHAIR:** Order! Order! Point taken.

**The Hon. NATALIE WARD:** Point of order. I believe I have been courteous and patient throughout the hearing today. I would like the opportunity to ask the questions I would like to ask. I would appreciate the opportunity to continue. I have some questions I am interested in.

**The CHAIR:** Please ask the questions. Let us get an answer. If we need extra time to do all of this we will carry on.

**The Hon. NATALIE WARD:** In that cultural mapping exercise you have engaged with LJs and councils.

**Mr LIMKIN:** Yes.

**The Hon. NATALIE WARD:** To your knowledge has such an exercise been undertaken ever before to look at a statewide cultural project? And then I will come to the Ultimo site.

**Mr LIMKIN:** No. To the best of my knowledge there is no evidence that this mapping has occurred before. And just on your point, we did do consultation in 15 locations across regional and metropolitan, with almost 400 cultural sector members and 1,500 community members. So we did try to provide everyone an opportunity to put some voice into this.

**The Hon. NATALIE WARD:** Could you tell us about the cost of refurbishing Ultimo and the work that might be involved in the patch-up project? There has been significant evidence today about—I do not wish to summarise the evidence, but in a sense that it should stay and that should be easily done. Is that the case?

**Mr LIMKIN:** As part of the Ultimo strategic business case that was undertaken by my team, the costs, which the Committee has, for option 2, which was a refresh of the museum site accounted for \$524 million. Obviously that—

**The Hon. SHAOQUETT MOSELMANE:** And this is a refresh?

**The CHAIR:** Order!

**The Hon. SCOTT FARLOW:** Let him answer the question.

**Mr LIMKIN:** That was done 12 months ago and so obviously escalation on top of that. Escalation in the current market is running at about 5.6 per cent of construction costs and so you would have to add that on top of that, so probably about \$550 million.



**The Hon. NATALIE WARD:** In your opinion is that a sensible use of those funds?

**Mr LIMKIN:** My job is to implement government policy of the day. I do not make decisions on resource allocation. What I can say is the work that was undertaken for the Ultimo strategic business case was based on a number of reports that were completed by Steensen Varming and other engineers on looking at the MAAS current site.

**The Hon. NATALIE WARD:** They have not just been invented. People with qualifications have prepared these reports presumably on the basis of some objective work.

**Mr LIMKIN:** The question that was asked of these organisations was: "Please provide advice to the Government on what is the current site analysis of the site and the conditions of the site"—

**The Hon. NATALIE WARD:** And the work involved.

**Mr LIMKIN:** And the work involved.

**Mr DAVID SHOEBRIDGE:** But the core document underpinning that was the 2014 business case and the refurbishment, the knockdown and the rebuild proposed in that business case—is that right?

**Mr LIMKIN:** The 2014 master plan business case that was undertaken by the Museum of Applied Arts and Sciences was an input into that but it was not the driving factor. Obviously we did commission new reports last year to inform a decision. The Steensen Varming report was a brand-new report and it is available on public display.

**Mr DAVID SHOEBRIDGE:** We have had significant evidence suggesting that the extent of demolition and rebuild proposed in both the 2014 report and in the reports that have followed is "mischievous and unnecessary". What do you say to that? Or were you not in a position to stress test the amount of demolition and reconstruction?

**Mr LIMKIN:** As I said, the business case that I prepared looked at a refresh of the museum as is included in the document. That was based on, as I said, the Steensen Varming report and other site assessment reports plus also input from the museum. Obviously the museum is the people who set the vision for the museum and how it would operate, so the exhibition fit-out with changes to that was costed by RLB based on industry best practice, based on the advice from the museum.

**Mr DAVID SHOEBRIDGE:** Did it go to the board?

**Mr LIMKIN:** Did the options go to the board? The board was briefed. So I and my deputy secretary have briefed the board of trustees of the museum multiple times on this project. In addition a representative from the board of trustees has always sat on the project steering committee and the two individual project control groups. The board, to my understanding, provides internal briefings based on that role.

**Mr DAVID SHOEBRIDGE:** Did they sign off on the \$540 million refresh?

**Mr LIMKIN:** You mean the original?

**Mr DAVID SHOEBRIDGE:** No, the one that you have come up with.

**Mr LIMKIN:** The \$524 million?

**Mr DAVID SHOEBRIDGE:** I forgot the inflation on it. Sorry.

**Mr LIMKIN:** I understand. The board was briefed on that option. I would have to go back and check what they actually signed off, because I do not know, but I can tell you they were definitely briefed on that option.

**Mr DAVID SHOEBRIDGE:** How on earth did the former national president of the Property Council of Australia find himself on the board?

**Mr LIMKIN:** The decisions of board appointments are those of the Minister for the Arts and advice from Create NSW. That is a different function within Create NSW so unfortunately I have nothing to do with the appointments or recommendations to boards and I cannot answer that, I am sorry.

**Mr DAVID SHOEBRIDGE:** Are you saying it would have been a recommendation of Create NSW that the former national president of the Property Council of Australia should be appointed to the board at this time, given the extent of unquiet?

**The Hon. TREVOR KHAN:** Do not shout at him.

**The Hon. SCOTT FARLOW:** All he is saying is it has nothing to do with him.

**The CHAIR:** Order! I am sure he can answer the question himself.

**Mr LIMKIN:** As I said, I have no role in the appointments of boards and I cannot comment on that.

**The Hon. SCOTT FARLOW:** There has been some discussion today about the design competition for Parramatta. Could you please go through that process with us and outline what is involved in it and where the motivations came from for what was in the parameters for the design competition?

**The Hon. WALT SECORD:** But before you answer that question I would like to ask another question.

**The Hon. SCOTT FARLOW:** No. It is actually my first question of the day, Walt.

**The CHAIR:** It is Mr Farlow's very first virgin question today and I would like him to have it.

**The Hon. SCOTT FARLOW:** Let me at least have my first question of the day.

**The Hon. NATALIE WARD:** And it flows on from earlier evidence today that the design competition has been light and needs more—

**The Hon. SHAOQUETT MOSELMANE:** We are convinced. He can ask the question.

**The Hon. NATALIE WARD:** There has been significant commentary around the design competition. I think it is a fair question.

**Mr DAVID SHOEBRIDGE:** Let's have someone try to defend it.

**Mr LIMKIN:** The cabinet decision announced in 2018 directed Create Infrastructure to undertake an international design competition to secure the best designer for the new Museum of Applied Arts and Sciences. The competition is known as the Powerhouse Precinct at Parramatta and was launched on 24 January 2019. The competition is a two-stage process. This approach has been agreed by the project steering committee which includes representatives from the Government Architect office, Treasury, Department of Premier and Cabinet, the Museum of Applied Arts and Sciences and Infrastructure NSW. It has been approved by the Minister and the process has been endorsed by the Australian Institute of Architects.

The first stage of the competition is an expression of interest and we are asking firms to submit information on their experience and capability as well as their design approach to the project and proposed creative teams. The effort and detail required to enter this competition at this stage is limited to a range of A4 documents submitted electronically. This is intended to encourage a wide range of firms to enter and reduce costs for competitors. International firms are required to identify an Australian architect to partner with as part of their stage 1 competition. However, Australian architects are free to enter independently if they wish.

The second stage of the competition is when a design response is required to be prepared by the shortlisted firms. Competitors at this stage of the competition are paid and asked to prepare a concept design. This design is typically communicated by a range of posters, technical drawings, artists' impressions and images. Obviously, given that we have an election on 23 March, the exact stage launch of the stage 2 I cannot comment on it. Should an incoming government decide to proceed with the project, it is envisaged that the second stage will be launched later that year.

**The Hon. WALT SECORD:** You just referred to the State election. What will Create NSW infrastructure division be doing in 25 days when we slip into caretaker mode?

**Mr LIMKIN:** Create Infrastructure will be continuing with the decisions of government but obviously following the caretaker conventions at that time. So the design competition closes on 18 March. That decision was taken well before we have entered caretaker. However, there will be no announcement or any assessment done until after the caretaker period is completed.

**Mr DAVID SHOEBRIDGE:** You would have to be quick anyhow, would you not?

**The Hon. WALT SECORD:** What work will continue on the Powerhouse move during the caretaker period?

**Mr LIMKIN:** Is there something direct you are after or is it just in general?

**The Hon. WALT SECORD:** I was going to respond to what your question elicited.

**Mr LIMKIN:** That is fine.

**The Hon. TREVOR KHAN:** Feeling your way through.

**Mr LIMKIN:** Obviously we will prepare for the second stage of the competition. There are a number of internal documents happening. We will continue to collaborate with the Museum of Applied Arts and Sciences

but obviously, as I said, nothing public will go out. The department will continue to follow the caretaker conventions until we have a new government.

**The Hon. WALT SECORD:** Have you changed the official opening date of the new Powerhouse if the Berejiklian Government is re-elected?

**Mr LIMKIN:** The program still remains on track for an opening in 2023.

**The Hon. SHAOQUETT MOSELMANE:** Has the process commenced for the sale of the current Powerhouse building?

**Mr LIMKIN:** Sorry, I missed the question.

**Mr DAVID SHOEBRIDGE:** No contract has been signed for the sale of any part of the site?

**Mr LIMKIN:** There has been no contract signed for the sale of any part of the site.

**Mr DAVID SHOEBRIDGE:** Has there been a contract signed to give an option?

**Mr LIMKIN:** No.

**Mr DAVID SHOEBRIDGE:** Have there been negotiations for an option?

**Mr LIMKIN:** No negotiations are current.

**Mr DAVID SHOEBRIDGE:** Have there previously been negotiations for an option?

**Mr LIMKIN:** I cannot speak before my employment but I can say to you and the Committee that there have been no negotiations since I have been employed.

**Mr DAVID SHOEBRIDGE:** The design brief must have a budget attached to it. What is the budget?

**Mr LIMKIN:** The budget in the design brief says that the base build is \$400 million.

**Mr DAVID SHOEBRIDGE:** What is the current budget for the completion of the project?

**Mr LIMKIN:** The budget remains consistent with the business case that was prepared for the Government and that the Government made a decision on. Obviously the information that you are asking me is actually redacted—parts of it—so I cannot give you more detail.

**Mr DAVID SHOEBRIDGE:** I have looked at the design brief and parts of it look embarrassingly like it was researched from Wikipedia. For example, in the five paragraphs on New South Wales it includes useful information such as: "New South Wales has a largely temperate climate. Summer temperatures in Sydney can hit 40 degrees Celsius but the average summer temperature is approximately 25 degrees Celsius. In recent years heatwave, drought and severe weather events have become more common. Sydney's rainfall is generally highest in June, with an average of 132 millimetres. Annual rainfall in Sydney is approximately 1,215.7 millimetres." Who puts this kind of utter nonsense in a design brief?

**Mr LIMKIN:** We obviously have to meet a number of probity requirements here. Our independent probity adviser recommended to both the Government and Malcom Reading Consultants that basic information should be prepared in the brief for international competitors. This ensures that the State meets all its probity requirements and has a level playing field. Without providing that advice, Mr Shoebridge, we were advised that we could breach probity conventions and the rules of the State on procurement.

**Mr DAVID SHOEBRIDGE:** So without putting a kind of five-paragraph Wikipedia summary of New South Wales, international teams of architects would not be able to tender?

**Mr LIMKIN:** As I have said, I have answered—

**Mr DAVID SHOEBRIDGE:** Surely they would come to Sydney if you accepted a tender from them, you do not have to tell them what the average rainfall is.

**Mr LIMKIN:** As I said, Mr Shoebridge, the probity advice we received was to provide that information. Part of the reason why we are doing this is that short-listed candidates would come to Sydney but we need to ensure we follow the Government's policies for procurement, and we are doing that.

**The Hon. NATALIE WARD:** May I ask about community consultation? There has been some criticism that community consultation has been light on perhaps. Can you outline to what extent there has been community consultation on the Parramatta museum?

**Mr LIMKIN:** Once again, I cannot speak prior to my employment but what I can say is that since my employment we have done a number of community consultations. We have had public meetings, briefings of staff,

volunteer sessions, stakeholder meetings, a lot of individual meetings with key stakeholders, pop-up sessions and online surveys. The consultation focused on what the community wanted to see and to experience at the new Powerhouse Museum in Parramatta and it reached more than 500,000 individuals and businesses. The options selected by the Government included features valued by the community and identified through this consultation process. There will be a range of opportunities for the community and stakeholders to continue to have their say as the life of the project continues—for example, regarding what programs and exhibitions should be shown on this site.

**The Hon. NATALIE WARD:** So there is an opportunity for the community to say that as opposed to being told that by so-called experts? Are you saying that the community can have some input into that?

**Mr LIMKIN:** I am saying that we have consulted with the community. I am saying that we have also consulted with a number of experts as part of this and key stakeholders throughout this process.

**Mr DAVID SHOEBRIDGE:** You would agree with me, would you not, that the most prized thing about the Powerhouse is the collection?

**Mr LIMKIN:** Yes.

**Mr DAVID SHOEBRIDGE:** Surely it would be crucial that the design brief would have to focus on the collection and the context of the collection?

**Mr LIMKIN:** It depends on which state—how you are running the competition. Obviously if you are running a two-stage competition focused on capability at first, it is all about the capability to build an outstanding museum, deliver within the Government's budget, have great urban designs and community connection. The second stage would be a way of focusing on the collection and providing architects with that information.

**Mr DAVID SHOEBRIDGE:** There is an 85 page or 90 page design brief. I am going to read to you the entirety of the description of the collection in that 85 page or 90 page design brief. It says, "The collection now comprises more than 5,000 objects, including a 1785 Boulton and Watt steam engine that featured on the UK £50 note and the Catalina flying boat that made the first flight across the South Pacific to South America in 1951." How did your department allow such a grossly inadequate design brief to ever see the light of day?

**Mr LIMKIN:** As I have said, Mr Shoebridge, I have answered your question originally about the two-stage process.

**Mr DAVID SHOEBRIDGE:** The people of New South Wales prize that collection. The building needs to protect, enhance and display that collection yet it barely gets a mention in the design brief. That is culpably negligent, is it not? That is grossly negligent?

**Mr LIMKIN:** As I said, I have answered your question previously about how we are managing the design brief.

**The Hon. TREVOR KHAN:** Point of order: I normally do not do this but the audience are not participants in this process. This witness is entitled to be heard and given the respect that the other witnesses have been given. I think this should be allowed to go through to its end without what seems to be developing as an increasing participation by the audience.

**The CHAIR:** I uphold the point of order. The audience will stop cheering, heckling and listen to the evidence. Mr Limkin should be given the opportunity to answer questions properly and fully. If that does not happen, I may be forced to clear the room.

**Mr DAVID SHOEBRIDGE:** I characterised it as grossly negligent, amongst other things.

**Mr LIMKIN:** As I said, Mr Shoebridge, I have answered your previous question. I have outlined how the two-stage design competition will ensure that the collection features as part of this process.

**Mr DAVID SHOEBRIDGE:** But protecting, preserving, displaying the collection has to be central from the outset. You are telling me that does not even feature in the design competition you are running to choose the firm. I genuinely do not understand.

**Mr LIMKIN:** As I said earlier, the State is running a two-stage design competition to focus first on the capability of the design team, the urban planning and the base build of the building. The second stage of the design competition where there is potentially only potentially anywhere between six to 10 architectural firms in the process will focus on that. I can assure you that there will be a number of documents as part of that design brief that focus on both the museum's vision, the collection and the future of the new museum in Parramatta.

**Mr DAVID SHOEBRIDGE:** So you get an iconic building, you put some nice windows in it, you do some nice landscaping and then you think about the collection. Is that the process that is going on? And you have got to fit a 70-storey apartment tower on it.

**Mr LIMKIN:** I have answered your question previously.

**The Hon. WALT SECORD:** This is a follow-up to the Hon. Natalie Ward's question. I am beginning to receive representations and concerns about the felling of historic eucalyptus plantation trees at the Castle Hill Discovery Centre. Are you aware of that?

**Mr LIMKIN:** No, I am not aware of it.

**The Hon. WALT SECORD:** You are not aware of that?

**Mr LIMKIN:** The State has not commenced any activities on the site apart from design.

**The Hon. WALT SECORD:** Are the plans for the planetarium still in—

**The Hon. NATALIE WARD:** I did not ask about trees or planetariums.

**The Hon. WALT SECORD:** You were talking about community consultation.

**Mr DAVID SHOEBRIDGE:** It does not flow naturally from your question but you get there eventually.

**The Hon. NATALIE WARD:** So I will get there.

**The Hon. WALT SECORD:** What is the status of the plans for a planetarium at the Parramatta site?

**Mr LIMKIN:** The planetarium is part of the base build. At the moment we are undertaking a design competition to establish teams for the capability of that.

**Mr DAVID SHOEBRIDGE:** To go back to the base build, the \$400 million is the base build, is it not? It is not the soft fit-out, it is not the site acquisition, it is not the work at the existing Powerhouse site, it is just a shell?

**Mr LIMKIN:** That is correct. That is what a base build is. You can run a design competition with that included, but the Government has decided to run its own competition with just the base build.

**The Hon. WALT SECORD:** Is that to keep down the costs in the public arena?

**Mr LIMKIN:** Sorry, I do not understand the question.

**The Hon. WALT SECORD:** If you go with the base build, the figure for construction would be much lower than the overall cost, would it not? That would mean that you could suppress the figures. That is why I asked what is a base build.

**Mr LIMKIN:** No, it is not the intention to suppress any figures. It is more that, based on the advice of Malcolm Reading and in consultation with the museum, the decision of the project steering committee was that running a design competition for the base build was the most effective way for this project.

**Mr DAVID SHOEBRIDGE:** You gave us figures for the base build, which is what you are having a competition for, but the Government will not give a figure for the total cost of the project. I cannot understand why we cannot get a total cost of the project but we can get a cost of the base build, given the base build is going to go out to tender.

**Mr LIMKIN:** The Infrastructure NSW summary articulates what the government contribution to the project is.

**Mr DAVID SHOEBRIDGE:** But the net government contribution. I want to know the gross cost of building the thing.

**Mr LIMKIN:** It is a decision for the Government to release that type of information.

**Mr DAVID SHOEBRIDGE:** Can you explain why it has not been released?

**Mr LIMKIN:** That is a decision of government. My job is to implement government policy, and if they made that decision, my job is not—

**Mr DAVID SHOEBRIDGE:** Part of your job is to help to explain the rationale. Why will the Government not tell us the cost of the project?

**Mr LIMKIN:** I think that is a question you should ask the Minister for Arts or the Government.

**Mr DAVID SHOEBRIDGE:** Did you see the flooding along Parramatta River at the end of November last year? There were torrential floods that went well onto the proposed site.

**Mr LIMKIN:** I am aware of it.

**Mr DAVID SHOEBRIDGE:** What modelling has been done for flooding, given the vision I saw showing flooding as recently as November?

**Mr LIMKIN:** Work on that was done as part of the business case.

**Mr DAVID SHOEBRIDGE:** Since it flooded, has anybody gone back and said that maybe it is not the spot to put the museum because of flooding?

**Mr LIMKIN:** As part of the design competition, you do a reference design that updates a number of permutations in that business case. We are currently in the process of updating information in preparing for a launch of design competition stage two, which is when this information will be needed.

**Mr DAVID SHOEBRIDGE:** Does the \$400 million shell build include the work for additional flood protection measures?

**Mr LIMKIN:** The \$400 million is consistent with the business case that was prepared for a government decision.

**Mr DAVID SHOEBRIDGE:** Before the work was done on additional flooding protection measures?

**Mr LIMKIN:** I think you have misunderstood me. As part of any project, be it the relocation of the Powerhouse Museum, the transport project or anything, throughout the process you constantly update key reports to ensure that the project is being delivered in the most effective way and the most consistent way with government policy and the costs are within the bucket provided by government. That work is ongoing and it will continue all the way through until the project is completed. It is part of the standard project management process.

**The Hon. WALT SECORD:** In response to several questions, you have said that the thing being asked about is a matter for the Minister. When was the last time that you briefed the Minister on the status of the Powerhouse move?

**Mr LIMKIN:** I brief the Minister regularly on the Powerhouse move as well as all the other projects that I manage. We meet with him weekly.

**Mr DAVID SHOEBRIDGE:** I understand that you cannot give us information about who proposed the current round of board members. Please take on notice whether or not they were recommended by your agency, some other agency or the Minister. Can I ask you to take that on notice?

**Mr LIMKIN:** I am happy to take that on notice.

**The Hon. WALT SECORD:** Also on notice, were any reservations or concerns expressed about those appointments?

**Mr LIMKIN:** I will take that on notice.

**The Hon. WALT SECORD:** I know there is a rule of thumb for building that the costs will increase. You mentioned that the refurbishment was \$524 million and you extrapolated 5.6 per cent on costs. When you do a base build, what do you project the final cost would be?

**Mr LIMKIN:** Excluded from that number are escalation and contingency. Escalation is there because of the change in the building market. This is a long project that goes through to 2023, and so there is a change in the building market. Contingency is developed on all projects, not just this project, consistent with the requirements of government policy.

**The Hon. WALT SECORD:** What is your estimation on the escalation or contingency for this project?

**Mr LIMKIN:** I will have to take that on notice, because I am not sure if the Government chose to release that information publicly. I will have to check that.

**The Hon. WALT SECORD:** Are the escalation fees based specifically on this project or a general government view on escalation?

**Mr LIMKIN:** Escalation is calculated by an independent cost planner, who bases it on a number of factors. Those factors include the general change in the building market and, specifically, like-minded projects. They also look at potential changes in the economics over the lifetime, consistent with Treasury's economic projections, to work out whether that will have an impact. It is quite a detailed process. But there is also a process

to look at risk assessment and assign risk based on probability ratings of things occurring. That is all taken into account as well.

**The Hon. WALT SECORD:** In relation to escalation, are projects escalating rapidly or slowly?

**Mr DAVID SHOEBRIDGE:** They are all escalating rapidly, from what I can tell, like WestConnex.

**Mr LIMKIN:** It is dependent on the market. It is based on the market price index.

**The Hon. WALT SECORD:** What about projects of a similar size?

**Mr LIMKIN:** For all projects, the market drives the escalation factors.

**Mr DAVID SHOEBRIDGE:** Did you go to the Elton Consulting consultation in Parramatta?

**Mr LIMKIN:** Yes, I did.

**Mr DAVID SHOEBRIDGE:** Did anybody at all—one person—come forward to say that they wanted a planetarium?

**Mr LIMKIN:** Yes, and I am happy to provide—

**Mr DAVID SHOEBRIDGE:** The GIPA that people have referred to me suggests that nobody there supported a planetarium.

**The CHAIR:** Name them.

**Mr DAVID SHOEBRIDGE:** Who supported the planetarium?

**Mr LIMKIN:** I am happy to take that on notice and provide the Committee with the information.

**Mr DAVID SHOEBRIDGE:** You with there. Who supported the planetarium?

**Mr LIMKIN:** I have answered the question; I have taken it on notice. I do not recall, off the top of my head. However, there was discussion about a planetarium

**Mr DAVID SHOEBRIDGE:** There was a discussion about a planetarium. I am asking if any resident from Parramatta said they wanted a planetarium.

**Mr LIMKIN:** As I said, I am happy to take it on notice and provide the Committee with an answer.

**Mr DAVID SHOEBRIDGE:** Could you also review the GIPA information when providing that answer?

**Mr LIMKIN:** Yes.

**The Hon. WALT SECORD:** How many people in Create NSW are working on the Powerhouse relocation project at the moment?

**Mr LIMKIN:** I will give you an accurate answer and take that on notice. I think at a high level it is about nine people, but a number of people are working on it part-time. Obviously, the museum is also working on it plus there are a number of consultants in Create NSW who are helping us to work on that, such as commercial advice, architecture et cetera. I will take it on notice to provide you with a more accurate answer.

**The Hon. WALT SECORD:** As part of taking that question on notice, can you give me a breakdown of all the groups you articulated as well as an overall figure of the number of people who currently are working on this project in Create NSW?

**Mr LIMKIN:** Yes.

**The Hon. NATALIE WARD:** In addition, I understand that some employees or consultants may be working on different projects as well, so you may wish to delineate whether they are full-time on the Powerhouse project or they are working across a number of projects, or those numbers may not reflect the true number.

**The Hon. WALT SECORD:** If we are going to specify, I would like the entire global salary of all those people working on this. Do you want to go that way, Natalie?

**The Hon. NATALIE WARD:** No.

**The Hon. WALT SECORD:** No, I think it is relevant.

**The Hon. NATALIE WARD:** Mr Chair, I ask that the honourable member not refer to me by my first name and not yell at me across the table.

**The Hon. WALT SECORD:** I am not yelling at you. I am giving you the respect you deserve.

**The Hon. NATALIE WARD:** Thank you. When will that start? I merely ask that there be clarification because it may be inaccurate to report the number of people working on the matter, if they are working across different projects. That is all I ask for clarification.

**Mr DAVID SHOEBRIDGE:** I am sure Mr Limkin will provide us a full and thorough answer. Mr Limkin, will you also possibly provide the amount that this project has cost to date? Now to the extent you can cost the amount of public expenditure—I know that may be hard—but at a minimum you should be able to provide us with the amount that has been spent on consultants and external reports to date.

**The Hon. TREVOR KHAN:** It has to be made clear to the witness that he has three days to answer the questions he takes on notice.

**The Hon. WALT SECORD:** I am very confident that he can comply.

**Mr DAVID SHOEBRIDGE:** I am sure there is a spreadsheet there.

**The CHAIR:** Order! That will come at the end and we will understand.

**Mr DAVID SHOEBRIDGE:** I am sure there is a spreadsheet there that shows the amounts—I mean, every good department keeps a solid budget.

**Mr LIMKIN:** I am happy to take that one on notice. I do not know the figure off the top of my head.

**The Hon. WALT SECORD:** You must have some more questions emailed from Don Harwin.

**The Hon. NATALIE WARD:** You have already had your time.

**The Hon. WALT SECORD:** Along with his sticky, greasy fingers right now crunching it in.

**The CHAIR:** Order!

**The Hon. SHAOQUETT MOSELMANE:** It was not emailed; it was an SMS.

**The Hon. NATALIE WARD:** That is inappropriate. I am entitled to participate and I have gladly done so today. I had some questions which clearly have not take up the time. There was no negative impact.

**The Hon. TREVOR KHAN:** Let us end now.

**Mr DAVID SHOEBRIDGE:** Yes, let us end on a positive note.

**The CHAIR:** It is a positive note because he withdrew that.

**The Hon. WALT SECORD:** No, I did not.

**The CHAIR:** It is too late now; I heard you. Mr Limkin, I note that you took a number of questions on notice. The Committee has resolved that answers to questions taken on notice be returned within three days. The secretariat will contact you in relation to the questions that you have taken on notice.

**(The witness withdrew.)**

**(The Committee adjourned at 13:21.)**