

**COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT AND JUSTICE
STANDING COMMITTEE**

**INQUIRY INTO THE “INSIDE AUSTRALIA” PROJECT AT LAKE
BALLARD (MENZIES)**

**TRANSCRIPT OF EVIDENCE TAKEN
AT PERTH
WEDNESDAY, 14 OCTOBER 2009**

Members

Ms A.J.G. MacTiernan (Chairman)

Mr A.P. Jacob (Deputy Chairman)

Mr I.M. Britza

Mr A.P. O’Gorman

Mr T.G. Stephens

Hearing commenced at 10.11 am

MUIRHEAD, MR RICHARD JAMES
Chief Executive Officer, Tourism WA,
examined:

CRAWFORD, MR STEVE
Director Strategic Policy, Tourism WA,
examined:

HARDY, MR LANCE
Regional Manager, Tourism WA,
examined:

JONES, MS DIANA SUSANNE
Acting Chief Executive Officer, WA Museum,
examined:

DYMOND, MR DREW
Technical Director, Perth International Arts Festival,
examined:

MAGADZA, MS SHELAGH
Artistic Director, Perth International Arts Festival,
examined:

CARBONI, DR STEFANO
Director/CEO, Art Gallery of Western Australia,
examined:

DUFOUR, MR GARY
Deputy Director/Chief Curator, Art Gallery of Western Australia,
examined:

The CHAIRMAN: Folks, thank you all very much for coming in and we very much appreciate it. I will just introduce our committee to you. My name is Alannah MacTiernan, I am the member for Armadale and I chair this group; next is Tom Stephens, the member for Pilbara; next is Tony O’Gorman, the member for Joondalup; and Ian Britza, the member for Morley. Unfortunately, our deputy chair, who is very interested in this topic, is not able to be here with us today but he will no doubt be keenly watching this. This is a formal proceeding of Parliament and all the rules relating to the need to be truthful apply to this committee. Our Hansard people are with us today and they will be taking down the evidence and we will talk a bit about that at the end. This is an open hearing so although there is not a crowd of thousands there listening to this, all of this will be available ultimately on our website. Therefore, consider this to be a public hearing but a hearing that has all the formalities of Parliament. I know we have all these documents; you have completed your formal documentation. I believe copies have been provided to Hansard. If we could just go round and identify your name and position.

Mr Hardy: Lance Hardy, regional manager of Australia’s Golden Outback special projects and I am with Tourism Western Australia; the tourist bureau.

The CHAIRMAN: Can I just clarify that? You are with Australia's Golden Outback but that is an arm of Tourism WA?

Mr Hardy: That is correct, yes.

Mr Muirhead: I think I should clarify that Lance does not work for Australia's Golden Outback, which is a not-for-profit organisation but his region of responsibility is the area we call Australia's golden outback within Tourism WA, and I am the CEO.

Mr Dymond: Drew Dymond and I am the technical director of the Perth International Arts Festival.

The CHAIRMAN: Can I just get some clarification: what is a technical director?

Mr Dymond: I organise all the production and logistics of the festival and in this case I was intimately involved in the installation of the artworks on Lake Ballard and the production process of installing the artwork.

The CHAIRMAN: I will provide you with the context. You have seen the terms of reference of our inquiry. This inquiry commenced when the issue was raised by Hon Tom Stephens, the member for Pilbara, relating to concerns for the future of this installation. We thought that, given part of our area of responsibility included the arts, we should look at this very unique art piece. We are really concerned about its long-term future and how we get the most out of this asset for the people of Western Australia. I will ask Shelagh, and in collaboration with Drew if you could explain where the Perth International Arts Festival saw this going, given that your predecessors were responsible for the vision.

Ms Magadza: It was a commission as part of Sean Doran's final festival. Originally it was seen as a temporary installation on Lake Ballard. The site was chosen by the artist after an extensive survey of possible sites within Western Australia, and it was chosen for its aesthetic reasons but also its location was part of his original vision in terms of its distance and the journey entailed to get into it. We originally commissioned and installed it intending it to be there probably for about six months, which was our original agreement on the land. Once it was installed, Antony Gormley felt very passionately that the work should remain there, partly because of what it had become once it was installed, but also because of what it represented in terms of the relationship that had been built with the community around it in the making of the work, because the sculptures represented a large portion of the town of Menzies and their participation in the project had been a really integral part to making it. That is where we went from there. The work then went into a period where we maintained it, while we tried to find different solutions for it to remain permanently on Lake Ballard. Finally, after a couple of years, Antony proposed that it be gifted to the state.

The CHAIRMAN: When he proposed that it be gifted to the state, did he have ownership of those figures prior to that?

Ms Magadza: Yes. Antony owned the work from its commission process.

The CHAIRMAN: And that is what led to the deed of transfer? Thank you, Shelagh, for that. Dr Carboni, could you give us your assessment—if you can do this—of the relative artistic merit of this exercise vis-à-vis the other public art of Western Australia?

Dr Carboni: There is no question Antony Gormley is one of the most celebrated artists today on a very international basis, and he is actually growing from strength to strength. I have been here only for about a year, but I had the opportunity to visit Lake Ballard a few weeks ago in order to see the installation itself, and there is no question that from the artistic and art historical point of view it is a great asset for Western Australia. From the artistic quality of the installation, there is no question that it is a good thing for the state.

[10.20 am]

The CHAIRMAN: We just need to clarify this issue because subsequent to the transfer agreement we understand that it has been recorded as an asset of the Art Gallery of Western Australia, but in some sense it does not form part of the state art collection. Can you tell us what the difference is?

Dr Carboni: I can try; probably Gary can do it. The state collection owns a number of works of art that are accessioned and they are directly under our care and total control, if you wish, in terms of conservation et cetera. The installation itself is not technically accessioned and as such is under our care from the conservation point of view—that is what I was trying to say—but it is owned by the state without being part of the collection itself. I do not know if Gary can elaborate a bit?

Mr Dufour: Sure. With regard to the ownership of the object, it was vested in the gallery because of a requirement of the Auditor General's department that all assets of the state need to be vested in an agency that has control of that asset. The Gormley sculpture *Inside Australia* has never been recommended to the board to become part of the state collection. Part of the reasoning for that was, in the deed itself, there is a five-year period to bring the work back to its original condition; we are about one-third of the way through that now. At that five-year period in the deed there is a capacity to reassess the funding for the care of the object to see whether the original funding was adequate and at that point it could be entertained that it would be recommended to go into the collection. Currently, we are repairing about eight or nine this year. Last year we did an assessment of the 48 that existed—three are missing. So, I guess it rests with the gallery, and we are funded for the conservation care of the object at the moment and when it is whole again it could be assessed as to whether or not it would be recommended —

Dr Carboni: What I would like to add is also that we entered into the picture only in 2007, basically, and so we had no involvement in the original installation. Therefore, we are basically trying to catch up with the damage that occurred during the first five-year installation and we are dealing with it as best we can.

The CHAIRMAN: If it got this elevated status of being part of the state art collection, what would be the consequence of that?

Dr Carboni: I believe that as an owned object in the collection—I do not remember if it is in the deed but I read it somewhere—we would have much more control over the works themselves to the point that we could discuss with the artist the removal of the works and placement in a different place, which could even be the Art Gallery of Western Australia. But in that case, of course, you lose entirely the original intent of the work. That is what I believe.

Mr Dufour: I guess I would describe that totally differently. It is the only object in our care that is at great distance from the gallery. We came in after the agreement to accept the gift from Gormley, which had already been signed, and in some senses we became involved almost as a pilot project to see whether we had the capacity between ourselves and the expertise of the Museum to maintain the object, and in some senses to see whether the object was sustainable. They all have fairly significant what is called inherent vice, so they will all need repair over time. Do we have the capacity to do that?

Mr A.P. O'GORMAN: Shelagh, in your description earlier on you said it was a temporary project. Can you just clarify that? If it was supposed to be temporary, what was supposed to happen to it at the end of the six-month period?

Ms Magadza: Originally, we would have taken sculptures off the lake. All the permissions in terms of lease et cetera were for a set period of time. Antony would have retained ownership of every sculpture but what became of them after that would have been his decision.

Mr A.P. O'GORMAN: And now it is decided that it is a permanent fixture as such and the state has to upkeep that.

Ms Magadza: Yes.

Mr A.P. O’GORMAN: What is the sort of damage that you are talking about that is inherent?

Dr Carboni: There are a number of different issues related to the installation itself. First of all, it is physical damage to the works because, especially in the past—now I think it is a bit better—cars, four-wheel drives and especially motorcycles love to go onto the lake and use the sculptures as a focal point in order to do their gigs, I guess. The result is that some of the sculptures were physically damaged for this reason. The other basic problem with the conservation of these works is that—I do not know exactly why because Antony —

Mr Dufour: I can describe it. Basically, in the production of the sculptures, when you cast an object you then anneal an object to realign the molecular structure. The annealing process in these sculptures, from testing we did with the cooperation of the WA Museum, would indicate that the annealing was too short. That gives a very brittle crystal structure that is prone to fracturing at the weakest component. In those sculptures the weakest component are the ankles, and so 13 have fractured at the ankle. All of those have now been repaired but the other—my math is bad—38 have that same risk and so in the conservation care you would need to decide whether you would extract them for annealing or wait for the damage and then extract them for repair and annealing.

Mr I.M. BRITZA: Drew, when they were put in first, were they put in on the basis that they could be coming out fairly shortly—it was not like a permanent attitude?

Mr Dymond: Yes, that was the intention at the start, so the foundations of them are designed with only a six-month period in mind. I believe the foundations are still standing up okay.

Mr I.M. BRITZA: Can you tell me what that is actually?

Mr Dymond: The foundations are effectively a mild steel plate with two spikes that go further down than the plate—about 1.2 metres—into the ground.

Mr I.M. BRITZA: To make it permanent, what would you have to do?

Mr Dymond: I do not know; that would be the source of, you know, expert advice —

Mr Dufour: I can answer that. One of the great and pleasant surprises of going to look at the objects in terms of conservation was that they are holding up extraordinarily well because there is low oxygen in the lake itself. As a salt-pan lake there is very little oxygen, which means there is very little rust. What they do need is lateral stability so that they stay vertical but that is far more minor. We had originally anticipated having to replace all the bases thinking that they would have rusted out, but they have not.

The CHAIRMAN: Have you spoken to the artist about making some modifications that would enable them to get that greater stability?

Mr Dufour: Yes. We are in contact with him regularly.

The CHAIRMAN: And is he agreeing to some —

Mr Dufour: When you contact him, you put forward proposals and I would say in all cases he has been very amenable to all of the suggestions.

Dr Carboni: Also, as Gary said before, one of the problems was the lack of annealing the sculptures. I think more than two or three of them now have been annealed, so that they are much more stable from the molecular point of view. That was done with the agreement of the artist, of course, so in the longer term, if all of them are going to be annealed, the actual life of the sculptures is certainly going to be afforded for future generations.

[10.30 am]

The CHAIRMAN: What does this annealing consist of?

Mr Dufour: When you cast an object, the metal cools at different rates. After that, you reheat it and then you cool it consistently over three or four hours, reducing the heat incrementally. That process was reduced originally to only a 10-minute process.

Dr Carboni: That makes it very brittle.

Mr Dufour: That makes it very brittle.

The CHAIRMAN: What do you do when you are redoing these things?

Mr Dufour: Each of the sculptures goes into a fairly high-temperature oven for four hours.

The CHAIRMAN: Does it maintain its shape during that time.

Mr Dufour: Yes, it does. That was the first test with the artist. We agreed that we would recast an object if it failed because we felt that annealing was a very important part to give it long-term stability, so he agreed with that. He allowed us to anneal one and there was no problem with it. The metal was then tested and the molecular structure is now as it should be; I guess that would be the best way to describe it.

Mr A.P. O’GORMAN: What has been the cost of doing all this since it has been handed over to the state and upgraded?

Dr Carboni: We have a yearly budget for the five years that are included in the deed.

Mr Dufour: It is approximately \$80 000 a year from recurrent funding for the care of the object. An additional budget of \$250 000 was granted at the time of the deed, which is capital funding, for the replacement objects. The recurrent funding is for the annual care of the object. We put a work plan together each year of how many we will tackle, and the capital funding is for those circumstances when an object has been perhaps stolen or gone missing in some way. This year, we are recasting two with capital funding.

The CHAIRMAN: I note in the agreement that there is an obligation on the purchaser, which is the state of Western Australia, to insure the work against loss and damage—the usual risks. Has that actually happened?

Mr Dufour: Yes, they are insured under RiskCover.

Mr T.G. STEPHENS: The transfer was at no charge to the Parliament.

Dr Carboni: One pound. It was a gift.

Mr T.G. STEPHENS: Is there an assessed value?

Mr Dufour: Heavens! I am sure there is. I do not know that a value has been placed on it. I know that single figures, for example, have a value in excess of \$100 000 each. Single figures have sold extensively throughout the world, so, if you multiply that out.

Dr Carboni: And the value is in the installation itself, so it is very difficult to quantify.

Mr T.G. STEPHENS: Is the value of the items that were transferred to the National Gallery of Victoria publicly known?

Dr Carboni: This is one of those —

Ms Magadza: They are \$600 000. They acquired six sculptures and they paid \$600 000 for them.

Mr T.G. STEPHENS: That was purchased from PIAF.

Ms Magadza: We manufactured them, but they were purchased directly from the artist.

The CHAIRMAN: But that was used to cover the cost of all the structures, effectively.

Ms Magadza: Yes.

The CHAIRMAN: Have you any idea what the National Gallery of Victoria has valued the six objects at?

Ms Magadza: Based on what Stefano said they are selling for in Europe, they would sell for substantially more.

Mr A.P. O’GORMAN: When you talk about what is selling in Europe, are these from Lake Ballard also being sold in Europe or are they replications?

Ms Magadza: No. Similar single cultures by Antony Gormley sell for in the region of \$150 000.

Dr Carboni: Yes, the art is really raising very quickly.

Mr A.P. O’GORMAN: So once you get past the five years and the budget has been allocated, what do you anticipate is needed to keep this around for the next 50 to 100 years?

Mr Dufour: The long-term goal for the project?

Mr A.P. O’GORMAN: Yes—cost-wise.

Mr Dufour: Cost-wise, I would think it might come down to perhaps \$50 000 a year. The ultimate goal really, if they are back in good condition, would be to have someone in Lake Ballard trained to care for them. Having one in the regions, even from a conservation perspective, you are looking at training someone to have a thorough understanding of one type of metal in one circumstance—someone who could on a monthly basis survey the sculptures. One of the costs involved in caring for it from Perth is the cost of going back and forth to collect the sculptures for treatment. Ultimately, if it is in good shape at the end of five years, which we anticipate it will be, then we envisage a greater community involvement in its long-term care.

Dr Carboni: A big factor is of course also the protection of the site. Costs would be higher if some of the sculptures were stolen or damaged to the point where they had to be recast.

The CHAIRMAN: Do you have personnel in the Kalgoorlie region?

Ms Jones: We have a branch museum in Kalgoorlie but it is very small stuff so we have one curator or five front-of-house people, so they are people who show visitors around—visitor service people.

The CHAIRMAN: Could your curator be someone who could be trained in these maintenance areas?

Ms Jones: In the role they fulfil at the moment, no, but there would have to be another resource.

The CHAIRMAN: Has the art gallery had discussions with the museum about such a person? Obviously to co-locate them —

Mr Dufour: We have probably had more discussions with the town. The shire itself would want to have some sort of interpretation centre in the town, and that would be a goal that it would have, so that people spent some part of their visit in Menzies as well as at the site. Those conversations have been really very general conversations about perhaps a small centre that had a film of the casting process, information about the artist. It would open perhaps three days a week. It is that kind of conversation about what would benefit the town of Menzies most as you roll out the long-term care of the object.

Dr Carboni: I think that the conservator’s role is much stronger in this case than the curatorial role. My understanding is that the person in Kalgoorlie is a curator, not a conservator, right?

Ms Jones: Well, yes, in fact he is a manager and not a curator.

Dr Carboni: Exactly, so you need a high level of technical skills as a proper conservator in order to be able to deal with the situation.

Mr A.P. O’GORMAN: Can you tell us the benefit of having these sculptures out there? Is there an economic benefit? How many visitors do we get out there? Aside from the artistic value—being a brutal capitalist here—what is the benefit of having something like this sitting out in Lake Ballard out in the middle of Australia?

Mr Muirhead: It is difficult to cost it because we are not sure of the exact number of visitors. Firstly, before we talk about the straight number of visitors; it is also a matter of raising the profile of the region. It is an area in one of our tourism regions that is not full of attractions. It does not have a lot of things to do or a lot of things to visit. The addition of the Lake Ballard sculpture *Inside Australia* has been a huge benefit in growing awareness of what we call Australia's golden outback region—the Kalgoorlie-Menzies region. Our estimate is that there are around 10 000 to 20 000 visitors a year to the sculpture; for example, over the past eight years —

The CHAIRMAN: Sorry, can you repeat that number?

Mr Muirhead: We think 10 000 to 20 000 visitors a year to Lake Ballard itself.

Mr A.P. O'GORMAN: How do you estimate that?

The CHAIRMAN: They have got counters, have they not?

Mr Muirhead: It is just estimates from the shire. They are the best estimates we have. We could count it by putting traffic counts in and there may be other ways. To be honest, until we have completed the basic infrastructure, there has been a degree of wariness in encouraging people to go out there. There are several issues: there has been access to the lake. People, both deliberately and inadvertently, have driven on the lake. Inadvertently in a way that some people see tyre tracks going in and assume that is where you go, so they follow the tyre tracks until they realise, "I'm not sure I'm meant to be here." You can see the evidence on the lake of that. As we have heard, some people do it deliberately. We now have bollards in place that prevent some of that—certainly for four-wheel drive vehicles. Other infrastructure such as ablutions are now in place. There is some water out there, some shade and cooking and camping facilities out there. There is a reason now to try to quantify that in greater depth. We are aware anecdotally of people who go specifically to see the sculptures—who travel to Australia to visit the sculptures. There are people who travel for that type of thing.

By the way, in terms of what those numbers mean, for the whole of Australia's Golden Outback—or is it for Kalgoorlie?

[10.40 am]

Mr Crawford: It is just for the subregion of Kalgoorlie-Goldfields from 2001 to 2008. The average figure is around 104 000 visitors pre annum to that subregion, generating some 364 000 visitor nights.

Mr Muirhead: So we think that around 10 per cent to 20 per cent of all visitors to that subregion, on the basis of that 10 000 to 20 000, are going in to look at the sculptures.

Mr T.G. STEPHENS: What is the economic value per visitor?

Mr Muirhead: The economic value per visitor of those you could say on average is around \$120 to \$150 a day, depending on whether they are intrastate, interstate or international. I think it is reasonable to assume that by making a trip out there, people will extend their visit by at least a day or a night—one extra night in the region. So we are working on an overnight expenditure. It would be wrong just to multiply \$110 or \$150 by the 10 000 or 20 000, because some people are going here primarily because of the sculptures—or would not have gone unless they were there—and then might stay three or four nights in Kalgoorlie. We have not actually assessed the economic impact of it.

The CHAIRMAN: When we travelled out there, we found two things. The first is that when we talked to people in the Menzies pub, there were tourists there who had actually not known that the sculptures were there before they went there, but they were absolutely captivated. So as you would imagine, gradually a word-of-mouth thing is starting to build. The other thing we found is that the sculptures have a way of drawing you into the landscape so that you actually become much more engaged with the landscape of the region, and that has a longer term drawing effect.

Mr Muirhead: Absolutely. Our view is that once the infrastructure is completed—and I believe there is a possibility that Antony Gormley will come out and relaunch —

The CHAIRMAN: He is talking about doing that in February, is he not?

Dr Carboni: I think it will be later.

The CHAIRMAN: Someone has sent him the temperature charts, have they!

Mr I.M. BRITZA: He would be very grateful for that, too!

Mr Muirhead: We think that will be a relaunch, and that awareness will grow. Australia's Golden Outback—the body I mentioned earlier—has direct responsibility for marketing and promoting the region. There have been some issues in terms of the use of three-dimensional images for marketing, because Antony controls all the three-dimensional rights and has to give permission under the two-dimensional rights.

The CHAIRMAN: What is the two-dimensional?

Mr Muirhead: A picture.

The CHAIRMAN: So the three-dimensional rights belong to him, so you cannot do little mini sculptures?

Mr Muirhead: No. So there is no revenue to be earned from that at the current time

The CHAIRMAN: Just on that point, you have had discussions with him, Tom, but when I had a discussion with him, he said that he was not opposed to the commercialisation. He said that he was more worried about busloads of tourists and about the way you actually bring people to the site, rather than necessarily any piety around the —

Mr Muirhead: The only reason he has retained control is to manage how it is done. He has not refused, as I am aware, any of the two-dimensional images that we have sought to use. The issue around the capitalising on three-dimensional images just has not been explored yet.

Ms Jones: I am sure he would be open to that.

Ms Magadza: He would be open to it. If you take the example of the *Angel of the North*, there are all sort of derivatives from that. Every tourist trap around Newcastle has that.

Mr I.M. BRITZA: I would have liked to have been able to take a little bit away, because after walking around for all that time, it is inspirational, and you come back but you cannot take anything away to remember it by.

The CHAIRMAN: A little snow-shake would be really nice!

Mr T.G. STEPHENS: There is commercialisation of artistic product like that in the Art Gallery. Does that commercialisation of product have an income value for the Art Gallery?

Dr Carboni: Well , certainly we have our shop. That works on promoting different parts of the collection by selling specific books and reproductions and those sorts of things. I do not think that that would be an issue if Antony Gormley would agree to that. We would be happy to do that.

Mr T.G. STEPHENS: Do you make money out of your shop?

Dr Carboni: Sure. Obviously the money that we make in the shop goes back into the operating budget.

Mr T.G. STEPHENS: Your shop is not simply a cost centre for promotion?

Dr Carboni: No. It has a commercial value.

Mr T.G. STEPHENS: It is promotion for your operations?

Dr Carboni: Yes.

Mr T.G. STEPHENS: So commercialisation of an artistic product like this could help contribute towards your cost obligations and meeting your budget?

Dr Carboni: It certainly would. We would have to do some research to see what the actual income would be.

Mr Crawford: It would assist the local community, too.

Mr I.M. BRITZA: I am really pleased. You are telling me that July is definitely more real than February?

Dr Carboni: May.

Mr I.M. BRITZA: Okay. The reason I ask that is that after visiting the site, artistically I do not have a problem. However, what was disappointing to me is that it seemed to me that there was no-one who could actually make the final decision. There were several—I do not know whether “stakeholders” is the right word—committees, and this one cannot work without this one, and that one cannot work without that one. They all have to meet here. Kalgoorlie wants to work, but it cannot. It is like “Who the heck do we go to to get help?” We have seen a schematic, or some kind of flowchart. It is not even right to call it a flowchart, because it is all over the place. It is very frustrating. Out of all of this study, if we were able to assist in getting that aspect sorted out, I would be really pleased. I just want to know how you guys work through that. That is the million-dollar question!

Mr Hardy: I attended the first Lake Ballard Advisory Committee meeting not that long ago—only about 12 months ago. That was at the time when the Lake Ballard management plan had been drafted. From that point on, I was a bit confused for about four months on how the structure and the corporate governance worked. I have since been able to rationalise it all, and basically you have the Lake Ballard Management Association. That association is made up of four councillors and four Indigenous representatives. For a quorum to be reached, you need two of the Indigenous representatives and two of the councillor representatives to attend. They have great difficulty in getting a quorum at those meetings, and even speaking to the shire president this morning, his words were, “It’s dysfunctional”. They actually manage the land. Underneath them, we have the advisory group. The advisory group is made up of, I guess, the key stakeholders, and the expertise and recommendations flow through to the management association. The issue is that if you do not have the management association meeting to endorse the recommendations of the advisory group, decisions are not made.

Mr A.P. O’GORMAN: Can you explain why that group is dysfunctional?

Mr Hardy: Which group?

The CHAIRMAN: The Lake Ballard Management Association.

Mr Hardy: Simply because they battle to reach a quorum.

Mr A.P. O’GORMAN: There must be a reason why. If they are on the committee or the association, they are there because they have an interest. Surely if they have an interest, they will make an effort to get there. Is there some other reason?

The CHAIRMAN: It is the Aboriginal groups.

Mr Hardy: It is the Aboriginal groups. Again, I was speaking to the shire CEO this morning. He is not getting any response via phone or via letter, or any communication back from a couple of those Indigenous representatives. So he is endeavouring to ascertain what their current interest is and whether they need to be replaced by another respected elder. So there are some issues there. He is keen to get it working. Having said that, the first advisory meeting that I attended was in about September of last year. To this point, the management association has held only one meeting that has reached a quorum, and that was on 29 September. I suspect that not one person on the management association would have read the new management plan and that probably none of them

would have the background knowledge to understand what some of the key issues are. It can be a little bit frustrating. I mean, I have attended as an observer to provide some leadership to the management association, and I think the shire is keen for me to continue to do that.

[10.50 am]

The CHAIRMAN: But Tourism WA does not actually have a person on the association?

Mr Hardy: We do not.

The CHAIRMAN: That seems to be a problem, then.

Mr T.G. STEPHENS: Shelagh will be commenting on this part.

Ms Magadza: Having attended a few of those meetings myself, I experienced a great deal of frustration at the level of local buy-in. I think it is a clumsily constituted body and I think your point about no clear authority is a very key point, so failure to reach and then act on decisions was inherent. Antony originally wanted to vest this work in the local community but he wanted to give it back to the community. However, the frustration with the way it was being organised made him realise that the work would not really be cared for or recognised at that level, which is why we went up to a state level. The other complicating factor has been often that the CEO in Menzies turns over quite frequently, so the lack of a single person carrying knowledge through from sometimes year to year has been another factor that has slowed a lot down. I think it just needs a much clearer authority vested in someone locally, which partly goes back to the conservation as well. In saying that, I have to say that we have talked about the conservation of sculptures a lot, but the conservation of the land is really an important part because it is a beautiful biosphere. It is a very fragile environment; there are a lot of environmental issues around that lake and its surface that are fantastically interesting and worth promoting and caring for as part of the work itself. But the dysfunction between that and the local body was really quite difficult because CALM also had a lot to add in this regard.

Mr T.G. STEPHENS: I wanted to see, Shelagh, if you wanted to comment on the preliminary thoughts that I have in reference to the structure. The Aboriginal community especially seems to have moved from a situation of being gingerly in their involvement—shy—to a strong sense of proprietary ownership. Until there is a structure in place that gives some regard to their strong sense of connection and ownership with that site and its land and its increasing significance for them as the permanent population, despite the fact that a lot of the other figures of non-Aboriginal people—those people have left town—the permanent Aboriginal people have quite a growing sense of ownership not only of the land but of the artistic work. They want a structure that underpins a strong voice with a megaphone rather than just simply going to meetings where they are equal participants with others. So quorums are utilised against that framework to object to inequality in the decision-making process. They want underpinned in an agreement something that gives prior recognition to their primary role in this, so that is something I sense. I do not know whether you want to comment on that aspect.

Ms Magadza: It is also a complicated issue in that the Wongatha-Wutha land title claim that covers that area, the elders who kind of are pushing that through the goldfields land and sea are based in Kalgoorlie and were not actually participants in the project, so the permission that we got from the Indigenous elders was from people not physically connected with Menzies. The Menzies population are not necessarily Wongatha-Wutha claimants themselves, so there is a bit of a complication in that. That community has really changed a lot and you see now the Indigenous representation on the council, for instance, that was not there five years ago. Therefore, there is a little kind of progressive movement going on in the town but it is not necessarily related to the native title claimants on that area, which complicates things.

The CHAIRMAN: Tom, I understand what you are saying, but we have to have some process that can allow this to be taken forward. I am concerned that you can use not turning up at a meeting as a

way of determining. I understand what you are saying—that is, flagging some broader disquiet—but the people who are not turning up, from my understanding, are actually local Menzies people, are they not?

Mr T.G. STEPHENS: Yes. I am not saying it is TOs; this is a combination of TOs and historicals in the community who evoke now an increasing connection with this art piece and are trying to assert a primary connection back through it. In my quick wandering around the lake with people trying to get a sense of what they are saying to you that was my observation and I just wanted to test it because I suspect these are always going to be in there —

The CHAIRMAN: Lance, do you have any comment on that?

Mr Hardy: Yes. Ian Tucker from the Menzies Aboriginal Corporation has stated in a number of meetings that they have lost that connection with Antony Gormley. I think they felt that they did not have a lot of say in the deed of agreement; hence, they are feeling a bit left out of the piece, and they want to be brought back into the piece. The consultation that Ecoscape undertook when they developed the management plan indicated that a consultation process needed to be re-instigated to bring about a sense of ownership with the Indigenous community and the elders. One of the issues that has come out of that has been visitors climbing what they call Conical Hill, which is the hill that you look at when you first arrive. That has been a process that I have been involved in over the last 12 months. We have some elders saying that people should not be climbing the hill and other elders saying that they should be. We have been going through a process of consultation to overcome that. We have achieved that now, and it has taken 12 months to get to a point where people are now allowed to climb the hill, although stay on the track. But we are still working through with the elders to have the right interpretation placed on a sign at the bottom of the hill so that people understand the importance of climbing that hill. That has caused a lot of issues in respect to the relationship with Antony Gormley because the advisory group advised Antony Gormley through Ecoscape straight out that they wanted him to agree to people not climbing the hill. He came back to the advisory group and said, “Well, no. One of the main reasons I picked that site was due to the importance of that hill and I wanted people to be able to climb the hill and feel that sense of place.” The advisory group then went back to Antony again and said, “Well, no, sorry, you need to be a bit more sensitive to the issues here; will you reconsider?” That communication was going through Richard Hammond who was the author of the master plan. He became frustrated, and so he sort of stepped aside and that has caused I guess a blockage in dialogue. Really, the only dialogue now that occurs is with the Art Gallery of WA, so Antony Gormley, from my understanding, is still under the impression that we have a stance that people cannot climb the hill. Therefore, that is an issue where we need to get that communication side of things happening because that is causing a lot of issues with the images of the interpretation that DEC are trying to place out at the site to finish the site works. Antony has basically sort of dug his feet in over this issue with the signage on the hill.

The CHAIRMAN: Okay. Have the local Aboriginal people accommodated that, then?

Mr Hardy: Yes, Kath Finlayson got involved. Kath Finlayson, the shire and I convened a meeting with Indigenous elders and they agreed that it was not an issue. The issue was then taken to the advisory group through to the management group. The management group then moved a motion that it was okay for people to climb the hill. The Goldfields Land and Sea Council then came in and said, “Well, that’s okay but we would like an elder to be able to go out to Lake Ballard and actually devise the correct interpretation that needed to be placed at the bottom of the hill.”

The CHAIRMAN: Has that happened?

Mr Hardy: That has not happened, no.

The CHAIRMAN: Is it going to happen?

Mr Hardy: I believe that at the last association meeting, which was held on 29 September, they had agreed for an elder to go out and the shire now needs to find the \$500 to get the elder out there so that that can take place. Obviously, I am not too sure who the right elder is. I do not know how long that process will take.

The CHAIRMAN: If we wanted to find a more competent management structure, is it the case that we really need to have a representative of the Art Gallery and a representative of Tourism WA on that management group? I find it odd that the Art Gallery which has ownership, albeit not in your collection, of these objects, is not part of that, and that seems to me to be a —

Mr Hardy: Correct.

[11.00 am]

Mr I.M. BRITZA: Mr Gormley is coming out in May, and this is just an absolute, in my opinion, a shemozzle. I would be embarrassed. And if I was him, I would be thinking, “What happened? What’s gone on?” It would be wonderful for it to be resolved before he came back so that his coming back would actually be enjoyed by everybody.

Mr T.G. STEPHENS: Is there in our state other items of artistic international excellence that are of interest to the tourism portfolio?

Mr Muirhead: Not to the level of this.

Mr T.G. STEPHENS: In regional Western Australia?

Mr Muirhead: Certainly, not to the level of this. In fact, some years ago there was going to be another place in the south west, which PIAF engaged us in early, which was great. When this happened we were not engaged early and I think from the serendipity point of view, it has been wonderful from a tourism perspective. But there was going to be another one that we were going to look at and we got engaged to talk about how it would work from a longer term tourism point of view. I am not aware; that one did not proceed.

Ms Magadza: No, we were not able to raise the funding for that. It was to be at the bottom of the Porongurups near Mt Barker, and it was an international artist from Indonesia, Didan Christanto, who wanted to do a very big singles culture at a very, very large one. That was tied into the tourism around the base of the Stirling Range.

Mr Muirhead: So there are no others that we are aware of that come remotely close.

Mr T.G. STEPHENS: For me, the presence of the art gallery for the tourist interest of a significant international collection at New Norcia is about the only other thing that I can think of that is of artistic international significance in the regional areas of Western Australia. I am probably looking at the wrong person, but maybe it is time to look to the art gallery. Is there anywhere else across regional Western Australia where you have got art objects that are of international interest?

The CHAIRMAN: Not in your collection, I think you are saying.

Dr Carboni: In general; but not that I am not aware of.

Mr Dufour: The other thing that you could compare and that would attract people to regional centres would be the Indigenous community art centres, of which there are about 11 or 12.

Ms Magadza: Do people go and see rock art?

Mr Dufour: Yes, rock art in Karratha perhaps, which is of significance and attracts, I would think, probably more visitations.

Mr T.G. STEPHENS: Yes; so the international visitor has the opportunity of looking at the Indigenous art centres, rock art, maybe even throw in New Norcia and Lake Ballard.

The CHAIRMAN: You could have a real art —

Mr Dufour: Art trail, yes.

Mr Muirhead: Yes, there has been an understanding. In fact, we have had a very good arrangement for a number of years with the Department of Culture and the Arts whereby we have had a seconded officer develop a tourism culture and arts strategy. I think that is a common arrangement that has finished now. Certainly, if you include things like New Norcia and things like the Aboriginal community centres, obviously the petroglyphs and the rock art in the Kimberley, there is a massive area. One of the ideas, if the Indigenous centre ever gets up on the Perth waterfront, which I dearly hope it does, is that that becomes a hub and spoke to take people out to the rest of the Aboriginal culture and artistic assets of the state and, indeed, the nation. I would not say at this stage we have a known tourism art trail as such, but Gormley's is one of the enormous assets to bring international focus in a contemporary sense.

Mr T.G. STEPHENS: While the committee was at Lake Ballard, we bumped into visitors who had come down Sandstone Road towards Menzies and had torn past the sign heading towards Menzies and had then spotted it in their rear vision mirror and had no idea, did a U-turn, and went back and were enraptured and captured. They had never heard of it and were stopping overnight. I understand that this, against the backdrop of the facility, is not ready to be promoted, but you can see that as people discover it, they just cannot believe what they are discovering.

Mr Muirhead: Correct.

The CHAIRMAN: You have to have some sort of development of facilities, but at the same time you do not want to remove that experience of being remote by having the site too developed. How are we going to resolve that? That seemed to be the essential concern of Gormley—that you did not have caravan parks and whatever there—that actually undermined the whole aesthetic experience.

Dr Carboni: I think that, in general, if you identify exactly what are the borders of the installation and you keep the area of the installation as pristine as and definitely what the artist wants, I think there is enough space to create facilities—I am sure that I read something in the papers—that are not impinging on the view of the lake, but they are constructed so that the view is not impeded in any way from all the main lookout points when you are actually inside the installation. I think there is enough room for that.

Mr Muirhead: If you go back to Antony Gormley's original views, he had a plan for a field house; in fact, he had some preliminary architectural drawings done that had dormitory-type accommodation in it, which was a significant piece of infrastructure and related to the fact that—I think he has felt and it is now folklore—the best time to see them is at dawn and dusk, so you need to really be there rather than doing the drive and dodging the kangaroos and other wildlife on the roads or the inherent dangers of driving at sunset and dawn. In Antony's early discussions with us and others, he did want to see that completed. I think he backed away from that.

The CHAIRMAN: My gauging of this was that it depended on that.

Mr Muirhead: He was keen that we did not make it a condition; he dropped it as a condition. Early on when we first started talking with him, it was a condition. We prepared some quite detailed documentation to seek corporate sponsorship, which included the cost of building the field house. So we were talking to various people with a lot of money who at one stage were very, very interested and were looking at it, but it fell over.

The CHAIRMAN: Just on that, Richard, if this structure was built using some government funds, have you looked at whether or not it could cover its own costs operationally?

Mr Crawford: We have talked about that in a very general sense, using “gut feel” rather than a more detailed analysis. It would need a level of analysis. But if you look at the current figures—let us say we are talking about 10 000 to 20 000 visitors a year—most of those would be in and out on the day. It would be a small proportion who would want to stay overnight, so a fairly small proportion. Let us multiply that by a factor of four or five and you might be in the ballpark. Other visitor attractions around the state would attract about 120 000 visitors a year. It is not quite at that

sort of critical mass level. The long and the short of that is that it would require a lot of support from the state to prove up viability and an ongoing commitment for not only the capital expense but also servicing that capital. My gut feel is that it is not something that the private sector would jump on to as an investment opportunity straight up.

The CHAIRMAN: No; we are taking that as given.

[11.10 am]

Mr Muirhead: It could be looked at. We have not done a business plan, but people's desire to stay close to these types of things would mean that it would be worth looking at, particularly the possibility of having a caretaker on site to prevent theft and damage, and who could also do the curatorial work. Maybe with the combination of a field house and additional camping area—I have over my years in government come to the belief that the user should pay—there would also be the opportunity to collect a small fee from day visitors. I see no reason why there should not be a fee for day visitors as well as overnight, which then offsets the cost to the state. That opens up all those opportunities that could be a combination of both free camping or more formal camping plus, if we ultimately could get to a field house it would be a wonderful asset. There is not necessarily consensus about whether additional accommodation should be on site or at the back of the site, so that it does not disturb the sanctity of the zone, or in Menzies. I believe the Menzies shire would like to see the accommodation in Menzies. I do not believe it would work as well. Menzies would still get the benefits from it, and indeed it could be managed by the Menzies visitor centre, whatever the accommodation or the commercial component of it is. It is certainly something that needs looking at, and I suppose the issue would always come down to revenue. As a small example, the old Durack homestead up at Lake Argyle, which is a small museum owned, for some reason by Tourism WA, has had a real struggle with capital and still has one, has managed to run at zero cost. It has been a break-even with a caretaker in situ, charging \$5 entry, and that gets about 20 000 visitors, and it has managed to have a caretaker there.

The CHAIRMAN: Does it have accommodation?

Mr Muirhead: No, it does not, but there is accommodation —

Mr T.G. STEPHENS: Just up the hill, about half a kilometre walk away.

Mr Muirhead: Correct.

Mr Crawford: It would depend how you do the accommodation. With minimal capital investment, you could get away with it.

Mr T.G. STEPHENS: Bibbulmun track-type accommodation.

The CHAIRMAN: I think the field house drawings I saw were a bit more —

Ms Magadza: We did costings on running the field house ourselves, when it was part of the original proposal, and the issue of staff made it uneconomical, but if you did look at Bibbulmun track style—help-yourself—it would be easier to sustain that.

The CHAIRMAN: If you were not providing food—if all you were doing was providing accommodation, but at a reasonable standard, and if you had a person —

Mr Crawford: On site, with a bit of site management.

The CHAIRMAN: The other idea, Tom, that we spoke about—the idea of a —

Mr T.G. STEPHENS: DEC had these resident hosts, and they seem to come in during the season and take proprietary responsibility and in return get fuel for the year or the six months that they are there, and then responsibility for collecting the fee. It is very minimalist, and no cost to DEC other than providing the grey nomads with fuel money, and it delivers wonderful management of their various installations in comparable locations to Lake Ballard.

The CHAIRMAN: We were wondering whether that model could be used—if you had a field house and you had a sort of resident volunteer couple that ran it.

Mr Muirhead: I think there are all types of options that can be explored.

Mr T.G. STEPHENS: I have one other question that is just about the value of this project. Because it was my suggestion that we do the inquiry and every now and then you wonder whether we are taking up the time of busy people who have other things they are trying to do, is this something that, in the view of participants here, is worth the government focusing in on to resolve this issue for the long-term future of Western Australia, or is it something that is on the periphery of the interests of the state, and it does not really require any immediate attention? Is it something that will just roll along unresolved?

Dr Carboni: We are having a lot of discussions here now because this was supposed to be a temporary project, that then turned into a permanent one, or a semi-permanent one, and so there are all the difficulties inherent in this. But if the Gormley project was conceived from the very beginning to be a permanent project, I think that all of these ideas about a field house or making it a tourist site, would have been dealt with at the very beginning. We need more of these projects in Western Australia, so it is very important in order to be able to do other things in the future to try to keep this, because it is an asset for the state, and it is an asset for tourism in Western Australia. I hope that other international artists in the future could come in, so we could actually build a proper trend. There are several examples of site installations around the world that are working very well as tourist sites.

Mr A.P. O’GORMAN: Is that not the crux of the problem? It was supposed to be temporary, and there for six months.

Dr Carboni: Exactly.

Mr A.P. O’GORMAN: And now the Indigenous people who are participating? Is that their issue—it should have been here and gone, and now they have this problem and Menzies has this problem, or advantage, as a tourism area?

Mr Muirhead: In answer to Mr Stephens’ question, from a tourism point of view, I think the effort is definitely warranted. Here we are in sleepy old Western Australia, and we have got one of the great placement artists in the world, who chose this place to make his canvas, or his studio, or whatever, and a comment was made—I cannot remember by which of the panel—that the amazing thing was it took people out and made them relate to —

The CHAIRMAN: Led you into the environment —

Mr Muirhead: Into the environment, and let people see it, and people who would never go to that type of place, then go “Look at this extraordinary place”, which is actually what our tourism product is primarily about in Western Australia. It has this double activity of being an asset in its own right and drawing people to what our bigger asset is, and I am sure pushing people on to do other experiences. I think we, through PIAF, are extraordinarily lucky and fortunate to have had this put here. We worked very hard with others to retain it when we heard the glimpse that it would be available because we could see what would happen. I would love to know the numbers of people overseas who are aware of this compared to the people locally. I suspect they would far outweigh local people who have an awareness of it. From a tourism point of view, it is an asset that probably has value far beyond what people perceive in terms of its remoteness. It is because of its remoteness that it is an asset and well worth the effort to try and look at how that can be enhanced from a tourism point of view, as well as obviously from an artistic point of view.

Mr Dufour: And also, as a pilot, if it was deemed to be unsuccessful it would set us back a couple of decades before you would be able to engage with an artist to attract them here to perhaps work in Western Australia again. In a sense, whilst it was temporary, and we are making it function, the real goal is to make it the greatest success that it could be because launching it here with Gormley would

be fantastic. Incorporating it into tourism even when they launch overseas, because his reputation is phenomenal, not least because of the Trafalgar Square project currently, people follow him.

The CHAIRMAN: I was amazed —

Mr Dufour: It was a very manageable project from the conservation side. It is just taking time and energy.

Dr Carboni: Having the funds —

Mr Dufour: But making a success of it would be the goal and to not achieve that would be a problem for all of us.

The CHAIRMAN: You would not want to suggest that there is not an enormous amount of enthusiasm in Menzies, because I think one of the extraordinary things is that because this is actually based on the bodies of local people, and they were involved in the artistic event, there is a level engagement that is just quite different that you would see.

Mr Muirhead: To answer Mr O’Gorman’s question about whether the shire and the local Indigenous people like it, I might ask Lance just to comment on that, because I think it is important.

Mr A.P. O’GORMAN: It seems to be an issue to me that the Indigenous people are not engaging any more for some reason, and is the reason that they thought it would be a six-month or 12-month thing and then it is gone, and now they have not come to terms with that?

Mr Hardy: I do not believe it is an issue that it is now a permanent fixture. I believe that, as I stated previously, the Indigenous people feel they have lost the connection with the project, and they want to be engaged more within the project. I know that they are very keen, when Antony Gormley comes back to Menzies, to spend a couple of days with Antony in some way or another, so they can redevelop that connection with him. They stated that they really want to have more involvement in the project, as I have stated, and that if they are left out of the process, they will be making a noise. It is very clear. I think they are very proud of what they have out there.

Mr Muirhead: We also have a priority in tourism to build more of the Aboriginal experiences. It is one of our six strategic objectives. Going back in time, we saw the option of this actually provided some of that. It is an interesting blend between adding in the Aboriginal story about the lake and what that meant and its significance to a contemporary artist and then the blending of the two elements.

[11.20 am]

Mr T.G. STEPHENS: We are lucky enough, in Australia, to have a traditional culture that is still alive, an example of which is in the Warmun community, where, in 1975, an event like cyclone Tracy produced the art of Rover Thomas and the like. Recent events and recent incidents around the landscape suddenly get converted into a newer oral story, and that is what is happening with the Gormleys at the moment with the Aboriginal people. Possession is taking over those objects and they are being interpreted back into a vibrant new ownership and stories are being created from the contemporary Aboriginal view of that, integrating old story and new story, and ownership is underpinning this. There is a new dynamic going on there, which is what traditional societies do when confronted with new situations. It is accidental, I think, but it has happened, and this is not a disinterest, this is strong proprietary interest.

The CHAIRMAN: That is right; they want to be more involved, not less involved. I understand one of the Aboriginal councillors—it is not Mr Tucker, it is the other guy who actually runs tours out to the —

Mr Hardy: That is Greg Stubbs.

The CHAIRMAN: Greg Stubbs, sorry, yes.

Mr Hardy: Would you like me to comment on that?

The CHAIRMAN: Does he still do that?

Mr Hardy: Nugget Tours, yes. We are working very closely with Nugget Tours in capacity building, to get his tours sustainable and running up there on a more regular basis.

Mr T.G. STEPHENS: They operate sporadically—is that the way to describe that?

Mr Hardy: Yes. He has a number of interests; he works with school groups, he has his on-site accommodation, and he has Nugget Tours. He also was, until recently, running a school out at Morapoi station, so he has a lot of arms and legs. All his intellectual knowledge is up here, and we are working with Greg Stubbs to get that intellectual knowledge on paper so that we can actually get a business plan working for Greg Stubbs so that he can actually get Nugget Tours running. He has some very good people out there who are very keen to be involved and to start running regular tours out there. He has only just joined the visitor centre, so he has only just started to pay a commission; until then, the visitor centre was not booking him. He is going through a long learning curve, as most Indigenous people have to when they enter the tourism industry. There are some great opportunities for Indigenous people in the area to leverage off Lake Ballard. From an economic perspective, one of the issues we have is that the shire is floundering on how it is going to receive a return from Lake Ballard. It has a \$50 000 budget earmarked for the upkeep of Lake Ballard, and some councillors are battling to see where their return is going to come from, because people are not necessarily spending money in the town and there is not necessarily the accommodation to stay in town, and the shire is changing all the time. It is always a conundrum on what support and what commitment the shire will give.

The CHAIRMAN: That is why it seems to me that it is just absolutely necessary for change; this thing cannot continue to run as it is. You need someone out there who can be a caretaker and who can generate enough money from fees to provide that role. At this point, it is not realistic to get the council to do that.

Mr Hardy: The council needs assistance.

Ms Jones: I also think, too, there are some possibilities that have not been explored perhaps in the interpretation of the biosphere environment out there, both from the Indigenous perspective and from the perspective that we would look at it. I am thinking of ecotourism; a lot of people come to Australia to see these unique places. The salt lake environments are very unique environments, and that is another layer that could be perhaps put in, and obviously DEC and the Museum, and partners such as that, would be very happy to be involved in that.

The CHAIRMAN: Mr Gormley seemed to have some difficulty with that being too close; it would appear that he wanted this to be an aesthetic experience. I do not know whether that is a realistic objection.

Ms Jones: I was thinking more of the value adding outside of that area. We were talking about the lack of things to do, perhaps, in that area; there could be another interpretation of that whole area.

Mr T.G. STEPHENS: Have any of the submissions made any comment on the option of completing the project to its original extent?

Dr Carboni: The 100 statues? We expressly say in the deed that it is up to the seller—Anthony Gormley and Gormley's representative here in Australia—to come up with the funds for that. Even though there have been some efforts to that extent, nothing has really happened.

Mr Muirhead: From a tourism point of view, to be honest, we do not think that would add any additional tourism outcomes. I think if we were going to look at any further investment, I would rather see it in attached infrastructure, attached interpretation, diversification of what is there. It is already a relatively long walk to circle the statues; adding another 49 in will make it twice as long.

Mr T.G. STEPHENS: I gather it was to populate the area; it is there, but I am not sure of that.

Mr Dufour: That was to increase the density. People do not get to see many of the far ones.

The CHAIRMAN: But it may well be that we need to fix the other stuff up before it becomes feasible.

Mr Muirhead: Yes.

The CHAIRMAN: Given RiskCover's insurance obligation and given that you say that has been discharged, can you not get RiskCover to fund the replacement of the missing statues?

Mr Dufour: They have not gone missing recently; they have been missing since before the deed was signed. We took possession of an object that was claimed to be 51, and there were not 51 statues. We are replacing objects that disappeared some years ago.

The CHAIRMAN: All right. Any further questions?

Mr I.M. BRITZA: I have two comments. I really enjoyed visiting it, but I was one of those who had no idea that Lake Ballard existed until it came up for inquiry by the committee. I do not enjoy admitting that, but I have to tell you that there are lot more people in the same position as me than there are people like yourselves. Having gone out there, it was far more than I anticipated. I also have to admit that I would be one who would really like so stay in Menzies. There are a lot of people who like to camp out there and do the stuff, but there are also a lot in the same position as me who would be very happy to stay in Menzies and go and visit from out there as well. I think although Menzies is struggling, I think that would be great. But, for me, if I had a desired outcome for this committee that I feel would be worthwhile and would make me feel as though we had done our job, it would be simply to get the management to work together. I will not say you that I have the solution, but if I could be a part of that I would feel as though we had done our job. Would anybody like to comment on that last point?

Mr T.G. STEPHENS: Would any of the witnesses like to comment on that?

The CHAIRMAN: Yes, any final comments, or do you feel that there anything you would love us to do, apart from telling the government to give you hundreds of thousands of extra dollars?

Mr Muirhead: From Tourism WA's point of view, yesterday we were talking about what we would like the outcome to be of coming here, and I think that Lance's view is that we need to address the governance issues to make it make faster decisions. Ultimately that may lead to better outcomes, but it seems to us, I think, that that is probably the number one issue. From tourism's point of view, it is just about the governance of the project at the current time. I think we all have a very similar understanding of what outcomes we can get from our different portfolio responsibilities, but that is the thing that appears to be frustrating at the moment.

Mr Dufour: For us, from a practical perspective, the recurrent funding is not included in the forward estimates.

Dr Carboni: It is only for the first four years.

Mr Dufour: There are two more years to run on our ability to actually fund the care of this object.

Dr Carboni: Certainly we will be very happy to continue to do it from the curatorial and conservation point of view, obviously.

The CHAIRMAN: Really, there needs to be a clear decision by government that this will be in perpetuity, and then we have to set in place a structure that will enable that to be sustained and developed and really exploited.

Mr Dufour: And I would also think a very intensive look at where you would locate the interpretive centre, because some of Gormley's aspirations for it would be well served by the centre being in Menzies because his idea of a clear landscape. That might answer some of the questions that the town raised about the income flow.

The CHAIRMAN: I think that is good. Any final comment, Shelagh?

Ms Magadza: No, not at all; I am just delighted to hear that there is still such a level of support.

The CHAIRMAN: It has been very enjoyable, and a great pleasure, I think, for us to have you in today to discuss this topic about which you obviously know a great deal. We really appreciate the expertise and skill that many of you have been bringing to your tasks on behalf of the state; thank you for that.

You will receive a transcript of this hearing in the next couple of days. You can correct any minor errors but you cannot change the substance of it, though many people do try. Any such corrections must be made and the transcript returned within 10 days from the date of the letter attached to the transcript. If it is not returned, it will be deemed to be correct; I am sure you have all been involved in these things before. Thank you very much; it was very enjoyable and we really appreciate your time.

The Witnesses: Thank you.

Hearing concluded at 11.30 am