

SENATE CANBERRA COMMITTEE

SENATE SELECT COMMITTEE ON THE PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT
OF CANBERRA

MINUTES OF EVIDENCE

Taken at Sydney

WEDNESDAY, 9th March, 1955.

PRESENT:

The Chairman (Senator McCallum)

Senator Benn

Senator Ryan

Senator Hannaford

Senator Vincent

~~ROY STON~~

~~ROBERT N.~~ JOHN KEITH HARRIS, ARCHITECT AND TOWN
PLANNING CONSULTANT, PREVIOUSLY LECTURER IN TOWN
PLANNING AT THE UNIVERSITY OF SYDNEY, sworn and
examined.

THE CHAIRMAN: You have prepared a statement for the information of the Committee?

MR. HARRIS: Yes, and if you desire it I shall read that statement to the Committee. My statement will give reasons for any criticisms that I may make at a later stage. One of the town planner's difficulties is that he is speaking of a subject in which the visual aspect is very important. In the lectures that I have given I have used about 700 slides for a series of 20 lectures. Consequently, I have brought some pictures along to help me in giving evidence to the Committee.

The development of Canberra presents problems which in many ways differ so materially from those of the ordinary commercial towns, which in Australia represent the common experience, that it seems desirable at the outset to attempt briefly to clarify the main issues.

First, Canberra, as Australia's Federal Capital, was founded to house the Federal Parliament and to accommodate the chief departments of the government. It should thus acquire a design expressive of its high purpose.

Secondly, as a natural corollary of the first, it is not

intended primarily to serve as a commercial city wherein trade and commerce, intimately associated with private ownership and investment in land, is of paramount importance.

Thirdly, unlike the normal towns referred to in the last category, and which, having been established with the objective of stimulating and relying upon private enterprise for development, were usually laid out to a more or less stereotyped pattern in order to dispose of land, Canberra was intended to be pre-planned so as to co-ordinate its activities in the most effective manner.

Fourthly, as the heritage of the Nation, it is largely financed from revenue which constitutes a tax upon the whole population of the Continent and therefore must not lend itself to exploitation by political, sectional or private interests for their respective advantages.

Of these issues, the one most difficult for the average person to grasp is the difference between laying-out and pre-planning, and as this distinction is of fundamental importance it merits explanation and analysis even if it entails what might appear, at first sight, as an irrelevant digression.

In order successfully to accomplish a task, whether it be to conduct a military campaign, to arrange a world tour, or to build a factory or a town, it is essential firstly to clearly recognise the main objectives, secondly, to take into account the means at our disposal, and, lastly, to consider the conditions under which the task is to be undertaken. Having made these preliminary investigations we can then set out to arrange, or plan, our programme. If we lose sight of our principal objective or hope to solve the problem by trusting to fortunate eventualities, we are apt to court disaster or at least to put up with an unsatisfactory result.

Applying these precepts to the subject under consideration, it may be said that the objective of town and country planning in a democratic country is to facilitate the use of land to its maximum advantage for the benefit of the greatest number of people. This,

SENATE CANBERRA COMMITTEE

of course includes their living and working conditions, their health, recreation and culture.

In order to use land it is essential to provide access to it, thus both urban and rural planning demands that the two inter-related factors of land-use and access be considered together. The numerous activities and facilities which constitute the basic and incidental needs of the inhabitants bear definite relationships to each other and should therefore be accommodated in such locations and under such conditions as will best suit their respective purposes and at the same time fit them into the overall pattern of the town as a whole. It thus follows that the street pattern should be governed by these considerations taking into account the natural features of the Site.

The street pattern, strictly speaking, does not constitute the plan - it is but one integral part of the whole town plan which in its complete form should indicate the various uses to which the land is put, whether for shops, dwellings, public buildings, schools, recreation etc., each and all of which are interrelated factors in the design. Thoroughfares may be likened to the passages in a home, providing access to the rooms, the positions of which are determined by several conditions including their inter-relationship so that both rooms and passages must be considered together in planning the house.

No sane person would think of 'laying-out' the passages and allowing them to dictate the sizes and positions of the rooms. Yet, incredible as this may appear, it is exactly that process which has been adopted in respect of the lay-out of the towns in which most of us live. The majority of the towns built in the 19th century both in the United States and Australia, grew up in an age in which private enterprise became inseparably linked with ownership, and investment in land played a major role in development. Under these circumstances, once a location was decided upon, it became customary to plot the area arbitrarily into blocks, based usually on a squared, or grid-iron street pattern - frequently regardless of hills and valleys, often

of watercourses and occasionally even of precipices. Blocks and street widths were respectively of uniform dimensions, irrespective of the uses which they were to serve. Such street pattern having been only registered, the blocks were sub-divided. A few were reserved for such purposes as a courthouse and gaol, post office, school and occasionally a park. The remainder were put up for sale. Hotels usually preferred corner sites; the town hall took its chance along with the butcher, and each owner built to suit his needs and taste.

Few, even of the government buildings, were placed or grouped to form any distinctive feature. Little thought was given to co-ordinating their various functions. From what we have previously said, it is obvious that such towns were not organically planned. They were merely 'laid-out' - a process more applicable to the last rites than to the nurture of a healthy body. Thus, confined from birth in a straightjacket, their growth depended largely upon individual effort and luck.

Notwithstanding such handicaps, the majority of settlements survived, and as long as they remained relatively small townships such shortcomings were seldom recognised. But, as they grew into cities the same characteristics remained. The rigid pattern which previously sufficed became more illogical when indefinitely extended, particularly when it encountered hilly ground. Shops were strung out along the main street even after it had become a through route. Individuality continued as a dominant factor and far from aiming at harmony in building, the objective of each owner was to outdo his neighbour. A characteristic still perpetuated in our cities.

With the exception of Victoria Square in Adelaide, and the closing of the Bourke Street vista by Parliament House in Melbourne, there are few instances of aesthetic sensibility, unless one accepts the sewer vent in the form of an obelisk at the head of Bathurst Street, in Sydney. We are prone to regard conditions to which we have become accustomed as natural and permanent, and our way of life as logical and pre-ordained, forgetting that this has constantly changed

SENATE CANTONERA COMMITTEE

and will continue to do so, and in doing so inevitably change our environment and outlook. In the process we both gain and lose. In early and mediaeval times typical villages and towns evolved organically round the market place, which formed not only the centre of trade but also of communal life, the deterioration of which constitutes one of the major social problems in our present-day towns.

The difference between 'laid-out' towns and those which are planned, might be expressed as the difference in viewpoints between those of the estate agent and the constructive designer. The former's interest ceases once the lots are disposed of. What happens as a result is not his concern. The planner, on the other hand, is vitally concerned in the welfare of the townsmen which depends almost entirely upon the town's overall efficiency. The need for this has become increasingly apparent in the unplanned towns wherein lack of amenities and, more especially, traffic congestion, arouse ever-growing demands for re-planning. Schemes which seldom result in more than tinkering and transferring trouble from one spot to another. The planner seeks to avoid, or reduce, these disabilities by planning in advance, that, however, is but a prelude to development which equally calls for guidance to achieve the final result. An architect's function does not end with the production of the drawing. Superintendence of the work is equally essential. Planning and efficiency both demand qualified and competent control and guidance.

In all walks of life, controls are inescapable, whether applied to health, safety, building or appearance. In the unplanned town they are imposed - often too late - and act as palliatives. In the pre-planned town they are constructive and become part of the development programme from the outset. To all control there is bound to be some resentment. Cries of 'regimentation', 'discouragement of private enterprise' and any other objection will be put forward in the early stages, until time and experience show the wisdom of their imposition. In the meantime, education and example must pave the way

SENATE CANBERRA COMMITTEE

so that we emerge from the stage of the shanty town with its rusty cans and rag signs to the orderly and, finally, efficient and pleasant town.

The change from the older individualistic layout to the comprehensive approach has already been demonstrated in factory design in Australia, wherein under efficient management, the former motley collection of sheds has given place to long-range pre-planning, ensuring not only logical sequence of operations and increased efficiency, but added welfare for the workers and, at the same time, bringing about a revolutionary improvement in appearance. It is this principle, on a larger canvas, which has to be applied to the town as a whole. Both demand a change of viewpoint.

Unfortunately, laid out but unplanned towns have constituted the local experiences of most Australians, and it is upon this mental screen that we have to project the picture of our future national capital, and to galvanise into life, or, at least, save from desecration, the conception of Walter Burley Griffin which, notwithstanding certain shortcomings and changes due to modern inventions, envisages a goal worth attaining.

It is safe to say that Canberra owes its inception to the example set by the United States in respect of Washington, and in view of our own experiences it is advisable to trace in brief outline, the vicissitudes of the American prototype. That capital, instigated by the thirteen states and initiated by Generals Washington and Jefferson, was originally planned by L'Enfant in 1791 and demonstrates the influence of the re-planning of Paris a few years previously. Its main lines reflect the dignified monumental character of the Renaissance. A neo-classic style which in the very simplified form of colonial architecture was at that time in vogue in towns such as Williamsburg, Salem and Boston. It was not long before the great commercial era of the 19th Century which revolutionised the American way of life, with unprecedented impetus tended to submerge these earlier influences. Changing policies, political interference,

departmental rivalries and pressure from outside interests together gravely threatened the whole future of Washington's conception and L'Enfant's design. This calamity was averted by a series of apparently unrelated events. Firstly by a secret vote cast to a small section who still treasured a respect for culture and aesthetics and secondly, from an entirely different angle, through unpremeditated action by 'Big Business'.

In 1893 the ultra-commercial city of Chicago staged its great Columbian Exposition, and under the guidance of Daniel Burnham assisted by the leading architects of America, produced a transient city of such order and impressive design and magnitude as to fire the imagination of the American public, and incidentally to so impress the hard-headed commercial magnates of Chicago that they thereupon embarked upon a momentous re-planning scheme for Chicago. Other cities followed suit. This event, grafted upon the earlier colonial tradition, rekindled the flame of enthusiasm for the nation's capital, so much so that Congress, in 1901, appointed a committee comprising the four great designers of the exhibition - Burnham and McKim architects, Olmsted the landscape architect and St. Gaudens the sculptor, to examine and report on the future development.

Having visited the great capitals in Europe, and in spite of the changed conditions during a century, they endorsed with slight modifications, the basic principles of L'Enfant's design. The capital was saved for the time being, and the wisdom of selecting such outstanding authorities on planning and design was confirmed. Furthermore, in order to prevent future dislocation and interference, Congress, in 1910, appointed a permanent Commission of Fine Arts of similarly qualified men as the responsible authority. In 1926 it was charged with preparing a comprehensive, consistent and co-ordinated plan of the national capital. Three years later the development of Washington was placed in charge of the Fine Arts Commission, the Officer of Supervising Architect to the Treasury and Board of

Architectural Consultants and the National Park and Planning Commission directly responsible to Congress.

The Development of Washington is thus controlled by a competent and efficiently trained town planning organisation secured against political and self-interested dictation. Implementation of the scheme is thus limited only by the amount of money which the Treasury from time to time is able to allot. This ensures planning ahead of development. Returning to the subject of Canberra, the plan submitted by Griffin in the 1911 competition for Canberra, and finally endorsed by Cabinet was based on the Washington pattern and, notwithstanding certain shortcomings, may be regarded as a fine conception, although certain modifications due to contours and changing conditions are inevitable. This plan, however, while outlining the general scheme and indicating areas or zones for some of the major functions, defined in detail little more than the thoroughfare pattern, the allocation of sites for the numerous needs necessary ultimately to fulfil the city's requirements remained unresolved for the time being.

But, since a city is a dynamic organism, integration of these into the general scheme is of such importance that their consideration cannot safely be postponed indefinitely, and every site illogically alienated constitutes a potential threat to eventual efficiency. This implementation of the plan presented a more involved problem than did its original design, inasmuch as the latter was the conception of one individual, whereas development, affecting not only major and ancillary functions but also working and living conditions, demanded concerted action by the legislature and by numerous departments.

From the outset difficulties arose. In addition to problems of finance in a thinly populated continent, changes of government with varying policies, control by ministers with differing opinions, and lack of co-ordination between departments, brought about a

condition akin to that previously experienced in Washington, and led to the appointment in 1938 of the National Capital Planning and Development Committee. This, however, was but a feeble reflection of its American prototype. Its functions were confined to those of an advisory committee, to which the Minister of the Interior could refer such matters as he deemed advisable. The Committee had power to procure information and make suggestions on any matter concerning the capital. It possessed neither the capacity nor the machinery requisite for direction of, or even participation in, formulating any comprehensive scheme of planning and development. While in this respect, American precedent in a diluted form was introduced to Canberra, the conditions were by no means identical.

In the first place, Washington, owing to its location, was a natural distributing centre and, as such, had developed into an important town in which commercial interests were well established so that it had a dual role to play. These conditions did not apply to Canberra which was founded essentially as an administrative centre with no natural potential commercial attractions.

MR. HARRIS (Continuing): In the second place, owing to close association with Europe, and to certain established traditions, there existed in America a cultural foundation which, for various reasons, was lacking in Australia, which was thus at a serious disadvantage as regards appreciation of aesthetic planning. And while competent planning authorities have long been in existence overseas, Canberra has been severely handicapped in that respect.

The need for a competent planning organisation was not so obvious in the early stages, and development in Kingston, Reid, Braddon and Forrest, even if extravagant as regards lot sizes and street widths, by following closely the formal lines of the Griffin law-out, did succeed in achieving a definite sense of cohesion and design far in advance of the usual suburban standards in Australia. And in the first section of its civic centre Canberra required its ^{own} ~~own~~ example to date of satisfactory co-ordinated architectural grouping.

The absence of competent and imaginative guidance however, became apparent when the question of flat-dwellings arose. Owing largely to an insular outlook which has tended to dominate the scene, there was a prejudiced antipathy to flats in any form, and a previous suggested policy involving a series of two-storey flat buildings lining both sides of Northbourne Avenue was, unfortunately, departed from. This seems the more regrettable since, in addition to the logical advantage of increasing density close to Civic Centre, it afforded a rare opportunity of securing an impressive approach to the city along an avenue flanked with rows of harmonically designed buildings instead of the varied assortment of suburban homes which ensued.

As a sequence to this episode, isolated groups of flats have been dotted about wherever sites could be found, so that the advantage of effective disposition and grouping continue to be jeopardised: a situation which could be aggravated by injudicious introduction of multi-storey structures. As has recently been demonstrated in the case of the Housing Commission's block of flats at North Sydney, which has blanketed one of the finest views of the Harbour.

Lack of comprehensive plan has been further emphasised in

SENATE CANBERRA COMMITTEE.

later years when, due to spasmodic and urgent demands for accommodation, a vast ring of residential areas, entailing extensive transport, has surrounded the town with a collection of dwellings reproducing suburban characteristics at variance with modern practice, wherein the value of co-ordinated design, embracing grouped dwellings, has generally been availed of, especially when, as in this instance, government ownership offered such opportunities.

The cry of 'urgency', both from ministers and departments, has too often been advanced as a reason for precipitate action. In some instances it is legitimate, and may occasionally be unavoidable, but as often as not, this is due to lack of long-range policy at top and intermediate levels. Apart from these causes the plea of urgency has been put forward sometimes as an excuse for banning outside competitions, and at other times in order to curtail due deliberation and studied criticism. One has only to recall so-called 'urgent' requests for sites for a courthouse, fire station, aged person's homes and a technical college, for which sites had to be selected facing existing thoroughfares in spite of the fact that few, if any, of them may be needed for years to come, when more suitable location might in the meantime be provided as part of a comprehensive scheme.

Such haphazard site allocations tend further to stultify logical organic planning.

Such a scheme is essential but a prerequisite to any efficient planning is a consistent long range policy of government which entails an appreciation of the ultimate objective and some understanding of the problems involved.

THE CHAIRMAN: Do you think that west lake should be retained in its planned form or should be modified?

MR. HARRIS: I have an open mind on that. Certain hydrographic considerations come into it but personally I should not object to that scheme being curtailed. Nevertheless I should not like it to be curtailed in the interests of a racecourse or a golf course. There would have to be more important reasons than that.

THE CHAIRMAN: With regard to your general idea of planning, is it not possible to have too much central planning so that you

destroy the initiative of individuals and groups?

MR. HARRIS: It should not do that. Planning should incorporate the activities of the smaller groups. In fact, a correct planning authority would seek all possible help from local interests. It would not be dogmatic. Its planning would be co-ordinated.

THE CHAIRMAN: Do you think that planning should be progressive in the sense that, although there may be a basic plan, there should also be a planning group to consider modifications?

MR. HARRIS: That is essential and not only for modifications, because planning does not cease with the laying down of a street pattern. From time to time, buildings have to be built, although their sites may already have been chosen. One of the great values of the Washington plan was that there were people qualified to criticise the buildings that went on the various sites.

THE CHAIRMAN: Do you think that the Australian prejudice against flats in favour of cottages springs from a healthy hatred of squalor and crowding, and a desire to live in the open spaces?

MR. HARRIS: It does to a great extent. In the Middle Ages of course, defence was a primary consideration for most continental towns and cities. Thus, although the farms were outside the cities proper, the people had to live inside the walls of the cities for protection. Therefore, such towns had quite intensive tenement dwellings and some of them were very fine buildings. In England however the risk of attack was not so great and land was the basis of development. Thus, the Englishman has been linked very closely to his land. His home and his occupation have been in the same position. He has not been forced to go to the towns. Nevertheless, for convenience, quite a number of people had to live in or close to the towns and for them the terrace houses had certain advantages. One of the antipathies to terrace dwellings springs from an association of ideas. When people think of terraces they think of the houses that were erected for instance in the Midlands of England. They were built originally for investment and renting and they became outmoded and inconvenient. People said "I do not want to live in a

house like that. They are slums." Nevertheless, there are many people who would give their eyes to live in terrace houses in The Terrace Square in Edinburgh, The Crescent at Bath, or Portland Place in London. They are terraced houses but the social stigmas do not apply to them. In modern planning, the tendency of a number of towns, particularly in England and on the Continent, is to advert to one type which is not actually a terrace in the old way. Such houses are known as row houses. They are scientifically designed. They are generally of two storeys with a low storey link between them. That means that there is not one continuous line but, at the same time they are complete, separate dwellings and they have space at the back, very often with a common playground for the whole block. The intermediate between the open dwelling, the little cottage standing on its own piece of land, and the row house is the group house scheme. That is where a number of houses are arranged around a little space to form a group. They can be separate houses or semi-detached. The prejudice against terrace houses stems mainly from the fact that many such houses in the past have been unsatisfactory. I should be the last to suggest that we should indulge in the building of terrace houses but we have to realise that, in town development, there is a limit beyond which we cannot go in open development. I think every country has realised that. We cannot expand indefinitely, giving every cottage a big piece of ground. That is impossible not only from the money point of view but also because there is not the labour available to construct the miles and miles of kerbing and guttering or to provide the services that are necessary. Also, development becomes so scattered that transport becomes a major problem. A city needs to have a more or less concentrated heart, with open development on the outskirts. Contrast is important in planning. Contrast between close development and open development, between formal development and informal development and so on. Contrast is desirable also in our thoroughfares. They do not all need to be the same width. There are various reasons for widths. The old idea of

having a standard width was too rigid and very often wasteful. There again, land was wasted. That is why terrace and group houses, in conjunction with open cottages standing in their own separate grounds are necessary. The desire for a separate piece of ground seems to be a particularly Australian outlook. I do not know of any country in which the idea has been taken as far as we have taken it. As I have said that kind of development brings transport problems and the financial problem of providing the necessary services over great distances. The time element also comes into it.

THE CHAIRMAN: Can you tell me why the outer suburbs of Canberra have been developed more than the inner suburbs.

MR. HARRIS: If my theory is right, that is the result of a lack of planning. There was indecision as to what would happen in the centre of the city. The development of Canberra has been largely influenced by the outlook of finding a site for something. My experience as a member of the National ^{Capital} Planning and Development Committee was that, from time to time an order would come through "We must have 500 cottages. Where can we put them?" It was not a matter of pre-planning an area as a definite organic neighbourhood but merely one of finding 500 building allotments. That is exactly what happens in the ordinary town when a new estate is thrown on the market for housing. Development is not co-ordinated with the main plan. The estate is sub-divided into blocks and the blocks are put on the market. That, I think, was often the outlook in Canberra because there was no plan.

THE CHAIRMAN: Some of the cutting up of estates in Sydney has not been as bad as the picture you have painted. For instance the Appian Way was planned rather well, I think.

MR. HARRIS: Quite well. I am not condemning all activity of that kind. However, it has not been appreciated that Canberra had a unique opportunity to plan groups of houses particularly amongst those built by the Government.

THE CHAIRMAN: You have mentioned a lack of long-range policy at different levels; can you elaborate on that?

MR. HARRIS: I am not acquainted with the history of

Canberra right through as Mr. Daley is but I know something of it. I understand that, at one time, in the early stages, there was opposition to Canberra from one of the state capitals. The original idea of Canberra, as I understand it, was that it should not be controlled by interests in the capital cities. Apparently there was quite a fight on that issue. Another factor that has entered the picture in more recent times is the idea that Canberra should be regarded, in some respects, as a commercial city. The question is asked "Why should people not be allowed to come here and do what they like?". But going there is one thing and doing what they like is another. That policy has fluctuated from time to time.

THE CHAIRMAN: Do you not think it is a good thing to encourage private building activity so that the burden on the government may be eased?

MR. HARRIS: I agree entirely, but it is argued that unless certain restrictions are removed private businesses will not go to Canberra. In the early days I was one of the three who made the report on Civic Centre and I personally am very proud of that development. I know of no other place in New South Wales at least that can show a little centre so harmoniously planned as that is. It is not hard to visualise what would happen if the present policy were departed from and say a chemist or a bank were to say "I will take one of those buildings and I am going to paint the frontage of it red." What would happen to the whole of that design in such circumstances?

THE CHAIRMAN: But it would be possible to get a design of a different type which would allow considerably more variety?

MR. HARRIS: Yes, provided there was a group competent to advise and to say "Beyond this point, it is not safe to go". I am entirely in favour of that. The excuse that big businesses will not come to Canberra because of restrictions is not entirely valid. Not long ago one or two big businesses did become interested in Canberra but that was not because there had been any relaxation of standards or restrictions. It was because the population had increased so much that it was good business to be interested in Canberra. I am

SENATE CANBERRA COMMITTEE.

sure that commercial enterprises would be quite co-operative if they were approached in that way.

THE CHAIRMAN: My next question is one that requires very careful consideration and I would not like you to think that I am expressing any particular point of view on it. Do you consider that the perpetual leasehold system has been satisfactory so far as compared with the freehold system?

MR. HARRIS: Yes. I would definitely say that that is one of the greatest safeguards. It is a curb on speculation and I think you will find it has been generally adopted in most of the principal planned towns. It is in force in the new towns in England. It has another advantage. As values increase, there is an opportunity to make rentals commensurate with those values whereas, once a block of land has been sold there is no such opportunity. If one owns a block of land in say George Street, Sydney, he can let nettles grow on it if he so desires. He would probably get more for it with nettles growing on it than he would with a building on it.

THE CHAIRMAN: Of course, the great advantage is that the unearned increment or the rent in the economic sense, does go to the community and not to the speculator.

MR. HARRIS: Yes. It gives more control.

SENATE CAMBERRA COMMITTEE

THE CHAIRMAN: Would you recommend that as an unalterable policy?

MR. HARRIS: I would unless I could be shown something that I am not aware of.

THE CHAIRMAN: The Committee has been told that the Department of the Interior, by making housing and building sites available in small groups, obtains for them an artificial price to which the Department is not entitled. Do you think that that is true?

MR. HARRIS: I have not thought of that but it seems logical. I do consider that the size of allotments for houses is over generous. I favour allotments of varying sizes with the larger ones furthest out from the centre.

THE CHAIRMAN: Would you consider a 50 foot frontage a fair size?

MR. HARRIS: There is no such thing as a "fair size". That might be accepted as an average size but the average should not be the limit. In other countries two-storeyed houses are more general than single-storeyed houses. A two-storeyed house requires only half the area required by a single-storeyed house. Better conditions can often be provided by a group of two-storeyed buildings on small allotments.

THE CHAIRMAN: You favour flats but you would set a limit to the number of storeys and place them only in certain positions?

MR. HARRIS: Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: You would limit the number of storeys?

MR. HARRIS: That depends on the circumstances. A tall building might be wanted at the end of a long vista so as to provide an imposing feature although I do not feel that flats are suitable as such a feature. I would not favour the erection of ^{multi-story} flats on the particular site that I think you are thinking of.

THE CHAIRMAN: Do you think that the Victorian Parliament and the spires of St. Patrick's Cathedral at the end of Bourke Street, Melbourne, is a good arrangement of buildings?

SENATE CANBERRA COMMITTEE

MR. HARRIS: Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: Do you like the vista up Macquarie Street, Sydney?

MR. HARRIS: Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: You would like to have two-storey flats along Northbourne Avenue in Canberra?

MR. HARRIS: I think that that would be good. Most of the people in Canberra will eventually be employed in the government triangle. The provision of flats in this area would provide accommodation for a large number of single people and married couples without children which would be close to their offices.

THE CHAIRMAN: Do you think that rigid control of private building is the best way to achieve harmony in building?

MR. HARRIS: Yes. I think that an understanding would grow up.

THE CHAIRMAN: Do you think that all the government head offices should be brought to Canberra as soon as the necessary buildings are available in order to make the place a real capital?

MR. HARRIS: I think so. I think that the provision of sufficient homes is the big problem.

THE CHAIRMAN: But it has been pursued in a dilatory way?

MR. HARRIS: I feel that the establishment of all government head offices in Canberra would help to establish a city as the national capital of people's imagination.

THE CHAIRMAN: You felt that there was some weakness in the powers that were given to the National Capital planning and Development Committee. Would you compare that Committee with the Fine Arts Committee or similar bodies in Washington?

MR. HARRIS: There would be a very big difference. The members of the Fine Arts Committee were outstanding, even on a world plane. They were also enthusiastic about their work.

THE CHAIRMAN: When was that Committee set up?

MR. HARRIS: In 1910. In 1901 the MacMillan Act appointed

SENATE CANBERRA COMMITTEE

a Senate Committee for the purposes of inspection. A Committee of four went abroad for 12 months and when it returned to the U.S.A. it felt that the basis of its plan was sound. The Australian National Capital Planning and Development Committee did not have the power that it needed and it had neither the personalities nor the machinery that were required.

THE CHAIRMAN: Many matters were dealt with without reference to the Committee?

MR. HARRIS: That only happened relatively recently. One official whose life centered around Canberra submitted all appropriate proposals to the Committee but he did not have to do so. There was a change of policy when he left his position. There was a slight feeling afterwards ^{to submit all matters to} ~~that the Committee was not necessary.~~

THE CHAIRMAN: Do you think that buildings are erected in Canberra merely to satisfy the demands of one department, without consideration of the general interest?

MR. HARRIS: I cannot say that but I am afraid that a certain Department does regard the matter in that light. Its prime objective has been to find a site on which it could put a building. At one time, that Department was dependant on another Department. After it had decided on a site, the other Department would decide the house that would go on the site. In proper planning, house and site are considered together.

THE CHAIRMAN: Would you consider it an ideal plan to limit the population of Canberra with the idea that when that limit had been reached another town would be developed?

MR. HARRIS: You are referring to the idea of the satellite town. Many authorities have considered that the ideal population for a city is between 30,000 and 50,000. But I doubt whether a city which performs functions such as those carried out by Sydney and London could function satisfactorily with only 30,000 people. The population of a city must be considered in connection with what the city does. If we had an idea of the number of departments that would be located in Canberra and the number of people

SENATE CANBERRA COMMITTEE

likely to be connected with them we would know how many people to plan for. Satellite towns have to be complete towns in themselves with amenities and schools. One could not provide a separate town for an additional population of, say, 5,000 people over and above the number that had been fixed for a city.

(Continued on page 761)

SENATE CANBERRA COMMITTEE

THE CHAIRMAN: Do you consider that about 100,000 people would be a fair number for the City of Canberra?

MR. HARRIS: A town of 100,000 people should be very comfortable, and it should be possible to plan now for an eventual town of that size.

THE CHAIRMAN: You spoke in eulogistic terms of the Chicago Exposition. I once read that the American architect, Frank Lloyd Wright condemned those buildings?

MR. HARRIS: Frank Lloyd Wright was an amazing man, and up to a point I will agree with him. We do not want permanent replicas of classic buildings, except for monuments. But this exhibition was so perfectly carried out throughout, both in buildings and arrangements, that the buildings were better than some of the famous old Roman fora. People suddenly saw these wonderful things and were very impressed by them.

THE CHAIRMAN: Do you think that we can safely allow the planning of a town to be entrusted to any one man, no matter how competent he may be?

MR. HARRIS: I do not think so, that is why a Committee is needed. Such a Committee could tell the architect where buildings were to be located in order that the overall plan could be carried out. For example, I would not like to see a building like that of the United Nations erected in Canberra. Such buildings have not been in existence long enough for their novelty to wear off.

THE CHAIRMAN: Within limits do you not think that each owner should build to suit his own needs?

MR. HARRIS: That would depend on his taste. There is such a thing as informed or uninformed opinion. A person is not entitled to say that a thing is good or bad, unless he can give his reasons for saying so. There must be a difference of opinion on the aesthetic side. We have the same feeling in music, where one man may like productions of one composer and another may dislike them.

THE CHAIRMAN: Fortunately one can choose his own music,

but one cannot escape a building after it has been erected. Do you think that one clear authority to govern the whole of Canberra is desirable?

MR. HARRIS: For the planning?

THE CHAIRMAN: To govern planning, the arrangement of buildings, the transfer of public servants to the capital and the full development of the town until it has become a real national capital?

MR. HARRIS: I think so. That is a policy problem and it seems that to get coordination in anything there should be an overriding committee, even if it has subsidiary groups.

THE CHAIRMAN: At present the Department of the Interior has a certain priority of control, but that is not even the major department concerned.

MR. HARRIS: I think it is very dangerous to have a conflict of, perhaps, three departments.

THE CHAIRMAN: Do you think that next to government and administration, the most important matter in Canberra is education and general culture?

MR. HARRIS: Yes, from time to time there have been suggestions that Canberra should develop some industries and should become a commercial city. I think that the only healthy towns have developed because there have been definite reasons for their foundation and the position in which they have been built. Town planners classify towns as military, trading, distributing and production centres. Trading and distributing centres are the most important and from the very earliest times people have built towns where two trading routes have crossed. Such towns have become natural trading centres. A trading centre must have a definite reason for its existence. If it is on crossroads or railway lines and is a centre for the collection of the produce of the surrounding district it is a town in a natural position. With artificial establishment of industries raw materials have to be brought from some distance to the town, processed and then taken away again. That is not natural. A mining town, for example, is located because it is

SENATE CANBERRA COMMITTEE

close to sources of minerals. Gold, of course, is sent away from the mining town to be processed, but if the substance is clay a whole town may grow up around the clay deposits so that the townspeople can manufacture the articles that can be manufactured from clay. The same thing applies to coal towns. If coal or clay should suddenly be found at Canberra, then Canberra could logically introduce industries associated with those materials. But, if the mineral supplies peter out then the mining town becomes a ghost town unless it changes its occupation. The town of Coventry has changed its occupation four times. The people there first started lace-making, then they changed to watch-making, then to cycles and finally to the manufacture of motor cars. Newcastle has changed its occupation three times. It started as a coal centre, and then as Maitland developed railways took the coal through Maitland to the wharves. When the railway was built between Sydney and Newcastle and between the coalfields to Newcastle Newcastle became an export port, and now it has become a steel-manufacturing city. There is only one example in classical times of a town that was built purely for administrative purposes. That was Megapolis which was built in the fourth century. That town lasted for 150 years and then it faded out because there was nothing to keep it alive. Now, if Canberra is to be a permanent city there must be something there to keep it alive. Something has been said about labour in Canberra. I believe that as most of the men there are public servants, ^{some of} their wives and daughters ~~will~~ ^{might} not have much to do. ~~unless~~ Perhaps an industry like weaving could be established. Even so, that would not be a major industry.

THE CHAIRMAN: Have you anything else to tell us?

MR. HARRIS: Yes, I wish now to refer to what is known as the government triangle. That looks very well on a plan but not so well in actuality. The new administration building is in course of erection, and I do not believe that the one on the opposite side is needed to balance it.

SENATOR HANNAFORD: You say that the necessity to balance

the new building does not matter at all?

MR. HARRIS: I do say that because you could not see both buildings at the same time except from an aeroplane. That illustrates the difference between the approach of an architect and that of a town planner. A town planner is interested in planning the buildings in a whole area whereas the architect is interested only in one building.

THE CHAIRMAN: The distant view is of some importance?

MR. HARRIS: Yes, and it is very important that some parts of the area should balance. I do not think that it is essential that the buildings facing Kings Avenue should balance with those facing Commonwealth Avenue. I now refer to London Circuit. There was a suggestion to put shops all round the outside of it but I think that that is impracticable, and I urged that there should be an inner road. I show the Committee a sketch of Sydney and Melbourne buildings indicating the new buildings that might be erected. It is generally agreed that the business section will now be developed on the side opposite to where the University used to be. It was suggested that London Circuit should be narrowed from 200ft. to 100ft. and a new road should be put through. That will mean that the traffic can go round outside the business district and will not interfere with the shops and hotels and the people using them. Those buildings will face a great park. The streets leading away from the area could be used for parking. The coloured sketch that I show you seems to be a logical solution of the traffic problem and would allow a dedicated park to be left right in the heart of the city.

SENATOR HANNAFORD: With regard to the large administrative block in course of erection, you said it did not matter much whether a similar block were built facing Commonwealth Avenue?

MR. HARRIS: That is so.

SENATOR HANNAFORD: But do you not think that the vista from Parliament House, or the outlook from the distant suburban areas

SENATE CALBERRA COMMITTEE

towards Parliament House would be completely spoiled if a similar building were not erected?

MR. HARRIS: I do not think you could say that. The buildings along the Mall were pretty-well inclusive, and I do not think that the other building would be seen at all.

SENATE CANBERRA COMMITTEE

SENATOR HANNAFORD: I take it from what you have said that you would have no objection to a similar building but that it would be really unimportant from the general aspect of The Mall itself?

MR. HARRIS: The important feature of The Mall is the row of buildings on either side. That will focus everything down The Mall as is done in Washington.

SENATOR VINCENT: What do you refer to as The Mall?

MR. HARRIS: It is known as Parkes Place.

SENATOR HANNAFORD: I must admit that I have been under some misconception. Would you agree that if the triangular aspect were maintained, it would have its advantages particularly in regard to the front of Parliament House for ceremonial occasions and so on?

MR. HARRIS: I think it would still be retained but I feel it is lost now unless you frame it with the other buildings. They are just buildings standing about in a great big park.

SENATOR HANNAFORD: Not necessarily. You would have your comparable buildings running up to Parliament House from the administrative building.

MR. HARRIS: I do not think that was envisaged by Griffin. His plans do not suggest it. He always thought of that as a long line of buildings framing his view right across to what is now the War Memorial although, of course, there was no War Memorial planned at that stage because the war had not started. I think this group of buildings has always been one of the main features of the plan.

SENATOR HANNAFORD: You will agree that, in the past there has always been a great deal of resistance by the States to the fuller development of Canberra?

MR. HARRIS: I am not aware of that. What I feel is that there has been apathy. They just do not care. Of course there is always pressure against any move if people feel that they will lose by it but, in the eyes of ordinary people, Canberra is just there, it has a lot of winding streets, and that is all. I believe that if we could arouse interest in the States our difficulties would be halved.

SENATOR HANNAFORD: Would you not agree that there is a feeling abroad that Canberra is something of a white elephant; that

SENATE CONFERENCE COMMITTEE

there is a lack of efficiency in administration because of the division of government departments between Canberra and Melbourne and Sydney; and that Canberra's location could have been better?

MR. HARRIS: I have not been conscious of any antipathy. As for the position of Canberra, it seems to me that the principle adopted was wise. Canberra is relatively free of the capitals and the site is obviously suited to development. I do not think there can be any logical argument against Canberra on that score but I do say that there is bound to be some criticism when people see the vast park layout that has to be kept up.

THE CHAIRMAN: I think we could justify it by the fact that it attracts tourists and tourist revenue will pay for it.

MR. HARRIS: That will help but I think it has a far more legitimate reason than that. I have heard people say that it is difficult to find one's way around Canberra. I believe that problem could be eased by planting lines of similar trees along the various avenues so that a traveller will instinctively follow a certain route.

SENATOR HANNAFORD: Do you think that Griffin took into account sufficiently the contours of the city in his plan?

MR. HARRIS: Not altogether. I think the centre is all right although it needs a bit of bulldozing but when we come to the outskirts we strike trouble. Probably Griffin himself would modify his plan, particularly for the hilly ground in Ainslie and Lyneham.

SENATOR HANNAFORD: Ainslie is hilly but it does not extend far.

MR. HARRIS: No, but Griffin's plan showed some very elaborate circles.

SENATOR HANNAFORD: Are you referring to the area going right around Mount Pleasant?

MR. HARRIS: Yes. Probably Griffin himself would have modified his plan there. It looks wonderful on a plan but it would not matter if it were a little out of shape.

SENATOR HANNAFORD: What about the area east of Mount Pleasant?

MR. HARRIS: Griffin did not consider Civic Centre as being a shopping centre. His mercantile centre was at the head of Kings Avenue but I think he was a little misled. A railway was shown on the contour plan for the competition and I think Griffin took it for granted that the railway was to be preserved. How he expected to develop his mercantile centre I do not know. He speaks of wholesale and retail trade, but one does not feel that the wholesale aspect need be emphasised very much. Griffin obviously regarded Civic Centre merely as an administrative centre.

SENATOR HANNAFORD: We have had evidence tendered to us that a lack of building sites made available by the Department has had a retarding effect on the development of Canberra. Have you any ideas on that point?

MR. HARRIS: That was the reason I brought sketches to show the need for planning ahead; getting down to the basic lines of Vernon Hill and Civic Centre, and not merely accepting the outer ring road and the vast paddock in the centre. Twelve years ago I suggested that they get down to that very thing. If sufficient foresight in planning is used there is no reason why an adequate number of business sites should not be available. But there is a real need to think in terms of the whole plan rather than of individual sites for this or that purpose. There should be no scarcity of building sites.

SENATOR HANNAFORD: We have had evidence that, with the passage of time, certain blocks of land have brought fantastic prices and that the speculative element has come very strongly into the picture. That does not altogether tie up with your view that leasehold land is not subject to speculation as freehold land is.

MR. HARRIS: It is not quite the same. Under the freehold system, speculation seems to rise to a higher level. There will always be competition for business sites if the prospective returns are high enough to warrant paying higher prices but, under the freehold system, in 50 years time a property owner will get far more for his land, apart from the improvements on it. Competition under the leasehold system could only be eliminated if prices were fixed

and that would not be practicable because, as conditions improve, all land prices rise.

THE CHAIRMAN: The case that was put to us by one witness was that a department had deliberately caused a scarcity of building blocks by releasing fewer blocks for business purposes than were required. In that way a speculative element was introduced.

MR. HARRIS: That would be most undesirable to put it as mildly as possible. I attributed the difficulty more to inability to plan. The authorities did not know what they were going to do. I should not like to think that the trouble was caused deliberately because little benefit could be gained from such a policy. I do not think there has been any effort to stop people from coming to Canberra.

SENATOR HANNAFORD: You have made it clear that you rather favour the two-storey type of building to give greater population density, and a better architectural effect?

MR. HARRIS: I do not suggest that all buildings should be of two storeys but I think that far more use could be made of two-storey buildings and group two-storey buildings. I am very keen on that. The saving of land is not the only reason. In Washington for instance there are groups of two-storey buildings but they have not been just strung along a main street. They are in little court-yards and other similar developments.

SENATOR HANNAFORD: You think buildings of that type could be introduced into Canberra?

MR. HARRIS: Yes. I feel that we are losing a chance for free planning by not doing it. I do not say that single cottages should be ruled out but they will be built by private owners in any case. The type of development to which I have referred has become an almost recognised pattern anywhere.

SENATOR RYAN: I presume that during your membership of the National Capital Planning & Development Committee consideration was given to the lakes scheme. Was any endeavour made to implement that scheme in accordance with the Griffin Plan?

MR. HARRIS: I think they rather felt it was beyond them.

SENATE CAMBERRA COMMITTEE

They wisely realised that hydrographic statistics were involved and that it would be necessary to have complete information about the probable effect of the proposed bodies of water on flood levels and so on. For that reason, the Committee felt that it was beyond them.

SENATOR RYAN: Even the provision of the three central basins?

MR. HARRIS: So far as I know, they were generally accepted. I have never heard any suggestion that the three central basins should be abandoned, but whether they should be quite so big would depend upon the water conditions.

SENATOR RYAN: Nothing was done towards proceeding with the lakes according to the plan or abandoning the scheme altogether?

MR. HARRIS: No, except of course east lake.

SENATOR RYAN: And west lake was modified?

MR. HARRIS: Yes.

SENATOR RYAN: Do you consider it imperative that, as the city develops and its population increases consideration must be given to the establishment of public reservations, parks, domains, and so on apart from recreation grounds?

(Continued on page 773)

SENATE CANBERRA COMMITTEE

MR. HARRIS: I think so. I think that the provision of a green belt should be considered. I also think that suburban development should have the benefit of open spaces. Perhaps there could be fingers of developed areas pushing out into the green belt which would be all around the suburbs.

SENATOR VINCENT: If the permanent Parliament House is constructed where Griffin originally intended it to be, the vista from that building in a north-easterly direction will be very much obstructed by the present temporary Parliament House?

MR. HARRIS: There is no question about that.

SENATOR VINCENT: What would you suggest as a site for the permanent Parliament House?

MR. HARRIS: I suggest the site that was originally intended.

SENATOR VINCENT: Would you agree to placing the permanent Parliament House at the back door of the present building?

MR. HARRIS: I have assumed that the present building would be pulled down.

SENATOR VINCENT: But if it were not pulled down you would still favour putting the permanent building on the site originally intended?

MR. HARRIS: I do not think so.

SENATOR VINCENT: Where would you suggest that it should go?

MR. HARRIS: It seems to me that there would not be much alternative. Either the present Parliament House should be improved so that it would become a suitable permanent structure or it should be pulled down.

SENATOR VINCENT: What would you say to putting the permanent Parliament House on top of Capital Hill?

MR. HARRIS: It would then be some distance away from the other buildings in the government group.

SENATOR VINCENT: Would that not be a good thing?

SENATE CAMBERIA COMMITTEE

MR. HARRIS: There would be a loss of cohesion.

SENATOR VINCENT: Are you speaking from the aesthetic or the political point of view?

MR. HARRIS: The aesthetic. There would be a steep climb up the hill to the building.

SENATOR VINCENT: It is not as steep a hill as the one from the General Post Office in Sydney to Parliament House. Have you found it inconvenient to walk up the hill to Parliament House, Sydney or Parliament House, Melbourne? The hill leading up to Parliament House, Sydney is not very steep.

MR. HARRIS: I think it is steep.

SENATOR VINCENT: Would you say that Capital Hill would be a most magnificent site aesthetically for the permanent Parliament House?

MR. HARRIS: Yes.

SENATOR VINCENT: And is it not true to say that it is actually the focal point of the Griffin plan?

MR. HARRIS: As far as I know, that was not his intention. Apparently, he did not consider that it was a suitable site for Parliament House.

SENATOR VINCENT: How would you treat Capital Hill if Parliament House were not located there?

MR. HARRIS: I think that Griffin ~~would~~^{might} have put a War Memorial there.

SENATOR VINCENT: But as we have a War Memorial, what can we do with this important site?

MR. HARRIS: If it is not required for any other useful purpose it could be made a "hero's forest" in which there would be statues of famous people. I would be reluctant to put anything there hastily, merely to use the site.

SENATOR VINCENT: Where do you consider that the permanent Parliament House should be built?

MR. HARRIS: I think that it should be built where Griffin intended - behind the present Parliament House.

SENATE COMMISSIONS COMMITTEE

SENATOR VINCENT: But Griffin's intention has been overlooked. Assuming that the present structure is not demolished, where should the permanent Parliament House be erected?

MR. HARRIS: I would favour pulling it down.

SENATOR VINCENT: But could you kindly contemplate the possibility that it will not be pulled down?

MR. HARRIS: I would rather not.

SENATOR VINCENT: Let us assume that it will not be demolished. Could you tell us where the permanent Parliament House could be built?

(Continued on page 776)

SENATE CANBERRA COMMITTEE

MR. HARRIS: It is a contingency that I hoped would not occur, that a temporary building should affect the final disposition of the plan. But it is not doing any harm if it is there for another 50 years, although I should not like to feel that one had to put Parliament House in another position merely because of that.

SENATOR VINCENT: Is there any other desirable site except the top of Capital Hill for a permanent Parliament House?

MR. HARRIS: There is no other equally desirable site.

SENATOR VINCENT: When is it desirable to start building a permanent Parliament House?

MR. HARRIS: That is a matter of policy. I believe that the sooner they can get on with the administrative buildings the better it will be for Canberra. The new buildings will probably be structures more of the frame type, and not quite on the lines of the new administrative building with so much masonry. Frame buildings would be far more economical, and the sooner they build them the more useful it will be to Canberra. That is unless this Committee believes that the work of Parliament is being handicapped because of its present site.

SENATOR VINCENT: You think that it is desirable to do something about constructing a permanent Parliament House?

MR. HARRIS: No, there are other more important buildings to be erected first.

SENATOR VINCENT: When do you consider that we should do something about the construction of a permanent Parliament House?

MR. HARRIS: Such a construction would depend on the amount of work to be done first on the other buildings. Priority should be given to the other buildings but I should not like anything to be done to prevent Parliament House being built in its permanent position. However, I believe that there are other things to be done first.

SENATOR VINCENT: This Committee must consider questions of policy. Do you suggest that we should defer the construction of

SENATE CANBERRA COMMITTEE

a permanent Parliament House for 20, or 50 years?

MR. HARRIS: No great harm would occur if such a construction were deferred for 20 years, because the present building is working well and there is no interference with the functions of Parliament.

SENATOR VINCENT: Will you now consider the erection of a city hall?

MR. HARRIS: I made sketches about that matter.

SENATOR VINCENT: Do you consider it desirable to preserve the civic centre of Canberra in accordance with the Griffin plan?

MR. HARRIS: Yes.

SENATOR VINCENT: How should Civic Centre be treated?

MR. HARRIS: I have an open mind about that.

SENATOR VINCENT: What permanent buildings do you suggest should be constructed around the conception of the city hall?

MR. HARRIS: I would narrow London Circuit to 100 ft. The buildings then erected would be largely commercial buildings and hotels situated on the northern perimeter.

SENATOR VINCENT: Do you suggest that Civic Centre should be a place for hotels and shops?

MR. HARRIS: Those buildings should surround it, yes.

SENATOR VINCENT: Do you not consider that that conception would be opposed to the Griffin scheme to use the city hall as a place for gatherings of the people?

MR. HARRIS: No, I intend to keep the city hall, but Burley Griffin did not anticipate a paddock as big as the present one in the London Circuit remaining empty.

SENATOR VINCENT: I suggest that Burley Griffin envisaged that whole area being utilised for public buildings associated with the civic administration of Canberra?

MR. HARRIS: Yes, I have suggested that. The blue line on the plan that I have shown you is the present alignment. The area so defined is too big

SENATE CALBERRA COMMITTEE

SENATOR VINCENT: I suggest that your idea is rather contrary to Griffin's plan to preserve the whole area for civic administration buildings?

MR. HARRIS: The civic administration building would be towards the south.

SENATOR VINCENT: Is there not enough room elsewhere for shops?

MR. HARRIS: This great paddock is too big.

SENATOR VINCENT: But that great paddock could be used for the construction of a city hall, a gallery of fine arts, a municipal building and so on?

MR. HARRIS: The municipal building could be the city hall.

SENATOR VINCENT: I envisage the construction of an up-to-date auditorium in which first-class musical recitals, and so on, could be held. It would not be necessary for the municipal building to be associated with the buildings on the northerly side of the town?

MR. HARRIS: That is so.

SENATOR VINCENT: Do you not consider that putting hotels near the civic administration centre would be contrary to Griffin's aesthetic conception?

MR. HARRIS: I think that hotels, or whatever those buildings might be, should be symmetrically designed. Indeed, my treatment focuses on the city hall. My suggestion is that the area could be made a little smaller and could include the buildings that I have spoken of.

SENATOR RYAN: Why should the roads be narrowed?

MR. HARRIS: The main road would lie outside the road that I consider should be narrowed. My plan will allow people to move about from shop to shop without crossing the main traffic arteries. It would also allow the southern half of civic centre to be used for government buildings and other buildings of a similar type. Not much would be taken away from the city hall.

SENATE CANBERRA COMMITTEE

SENATOR HANNAFORD: With regard to your interest in the National Planning and Development Committee, you said that that body was acting as an advisory committee, and that it only attends to matters referred to it from time to time by the Minister. You suggest that it does not act on its own initiative and puts schemes before the Minister?

MR. HARRIS: It has large powers of enquiry and may obtain evidence and that sort of thing. Its activity in that direction depends on the initiative of the committee itself. If it is very much alive it can work on all sorts of schemes.

SENATOR HANNAFORD: Do you consider that it is functioning as fully as it might at the present time?

MR. HARRIS: No, I believe that it could work more efficiently if it spent more time on the problems of Canberra. It would need active leadership to do so, but there is room for more vital work.

SENATOR HANNAFORD: You do not think that it is giving sufficient application to its work at present?

MR. HARRIS: I do not think it is, by its very nature.

SENATOR HANNAFORD: Would those remarks apply to the Advisory Council?

MR. HARRIS: I cannot speak about that body.

SENATOR HANNAFORD: How long were you yourself associated with the Committee?

MR. HARRIS: Sixteen years - I was one of the original members.

SENATOR HANNAFORD: You have never lived in Canberra?

MR. HARRIS: No, I went backwards and forwards to Canberra about ten times a year. I doubt whether this Committee is doing the work that it was hoped it would be able to do. It was a sort of compromise, having been put under a single minister, whereas the complementary body at Washington was able to report directly to the

SENATE CALIFORNIA COMMITTEE

American Parliament.

THE CHAIRMAN: I thank you for your evidence and for your attendance before this Committee.

THE WITNESS RETIRED.

SENATE CANBERRA COMMITTEE.

SIR JOHN HENRY BUTTERS, Chartered Engineer, Company Director,
sworn and examined:

THE CHAIRMAN: You may if you so desire, Sir John, make a statement on any matter you like and later we shall ask you questions.

SIR JOHN BUTTERS: I received your invitation to give evidence before this Committee and, of course, anything connected with Canberra is something in which I have always had and will continue to have a very great interest. I was not very clear as to exactly the kind of evidence that you wanted and also, I might point out, it is a quarter of a century since I left Canberra at the end of my appointment. Since then I have made only about half a dozen visits to the Federal Capital. It seemed to me that it would not be very helpful to discuss my personal views on the subject. However, when I left Canberra I put in a report - a special covering report - to the then Minister forwarding the Federal Capital Commission's Fifth Annual Report. In that covering report, I made a number of observations which seemed to me to be pertinent and might possibly be useful to succeeding authorities charged with the construction and administration of Canberra. It seemed to me that probably that would form the most useful basis for the Committee to ask any questions on. However, I shall be only too glad to answer any questions that the Committee cares to put to me.

THE CHAIRMAN I have read the report to which you refer. One of our concerns is the best form of government for Canberra. On p.6 of your report you made some reference to the system operating before the Commission was established. That was a form of control by several departments. On p.17 you state:

It would be nothing less than a tragedy to sub-divide the activities of the Commission and distribute them among two or more departments.

Do you still adhere to that view?

SIR JOHN BUTTERS: Nothing that I have heard of or observed in Canberra has made me change at all the opinion I formed at that time. The establishment of a National Capital is a very important venture. It is not merely a matter of bricks and mortar. You must try to create what is commonly known as a soul. You cannot do that if you are

going to distribute the responsibility amongst half a dozen departments, from the point of view of tradition, morale, and general pulling together. . .

You cannot have control in the form of an ordinary municipal government because the tempo of the development and the bulk of the investment in the place must inevitably be the problem of the Federal Government. You cannot possibly hand over the whole responsibility to an elected municipal government. So, you have to produce that civic development and that national capital spirit in a different way. The way that appealed to me after five years' experience is the way that I have set down in my report and, as I have explained, I have not observed anything that would lead me to change that opinion.

THE CHAIRMAN: I think it is clear to everybody that Canberra is in a different position to any other Australian city in that, first and foremost, it is a national responsibility. Therefore, you cannot treat it as you would treat a city in a State, even a city of comparable size. What do you think could be done to give the people who live in Canberra an adequate voice in their own administration? You have made some recommendations in your report and I have read them. I think you recommended some kind of municipal government.

SIR JOHN BUTTERS I looked upon that as something that could well be developed progressively, but you could have an elected council to look after the matters I suggested at that time. It could be charged with the responsibility of managing recreation facilities, public halls, public health under the supervision of a higher authority, the hospital, milk supply, the cemetery, abattoirs, and social services activity which I, in my time, looked upon as very important. It could also look after local transport, the fire brigade and things of that kind. That I think would be satisfying to the local population and would give Canberra people something to get their teeth into. It would also provide the experience which is necessary and desirable before any further step could be taken.

SENATE CANBERRA COMMITTEE

SIR JOHN BUTTERS: (Speaking): That could be added to by Parliament at any time on the recommendation of the main controlling authorities.

THE CHAIRMAN: In other words, those matters which concern the local citizens would be administered by the local Council and those which concerned the Commonwealth would be controlled directly by the Commonwealth Government by means of a central authority?

SIR JOHN BUTTERS: Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: I understand that your Commission was abolished with the onset of the depression?

SIR JOHN BUTTERS: Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: In the course of his second reading speech on that occasion, the Minister said that it was a costly experiment and that it had failed as an administrative device. What is your comment on that?

SIR JOHN BUTTERS: I should prefer not to comment on that. But I have often wondered in what way the Commission failed.

THE CHAIRMAN: I think that history will regard the abolition of the Commission as a depression measure. At that time all unavoidable expenditure on the capital ceased.

SIR JOHN BUTTERS: That was the gravamen of the discussion that I had with the Prime Minister at that time.

THE CHAIRMAN: Do you think that it was wise to discontinue expenditure on the capital because there was a depression?

SIR JOHN BUTTERS: I cannot encroach on the ground of national finance but, from the point of view of carrying out urgent constructional operations, it is hopeless to have changes in planning, especially in a city such as Canberra. Such a city can be developed on a sound economic basis only by operating in accordance with a long term plan.

THE CHAIRMAN: Were your powers restricted by finance or ministerial advice?

SIR JOHN BUTTERS: In my five years of office I had no restrictions except in regard to finance. Under the Seat of Government

SENATE CANBERRA COMMITTEE

Act we were required to obtain the Treasurer's approval for the raising of loans. We raised them through the Treasury.

THE CHAIRMAN: That was before the amendment of the Constitution under which the Loan Council was set up? It would be towards the end of your term?

SIR JOHN BUTTERS: I think that the Loan Council was set up towards the end of my term of office but this provision was in our original act. Once the money was raised the only restriction on our use of it lay in the fact that Parliament was in a position to determine our programme in advance.

THE CHAIRMAN: With what Minister did you deal principally?

SIR JOHN BUTTERS: The Minister for Home Affairs and Territories.

THE CHAIRMAN: You did not have to worry about whether other departments supported you or not? I understand that several departments are now concerned in the construction of a single building.

SIR JOHN BUTTERS: That does happen sometimes. But in those days the Commission had the final say unless the matter was taken up on the ministerial level.

THE CHAIRMAN: Your powers were granted by Parliament?

SIR JOHN BUTTERS: Yes. We always got on well with the departments.

THE CHAIRMAN: You were financed by loans obtained through the Treasury?

SIR JOHN BUTTERS: Our operations were financed almost entirely from loans. They amounted to about £10,000,000.

THE CHAIRMAN: Your report states, on page 6, that you commenced to proceed, with all speed, to transfer the rest of the Public Service to Canberra. They are not there yet.

SIR JOHN BUTTERS: That was the result of a depression, then lack of interest and finally, the War.

THE CHAIRMAN: I believe that you experienced a period of full employment similar to the present time. You would have had great difficulty in getting manpower and materials.

SENATE CAMBERRA COMMITTEE

SIR JOHN BUTTERS: We had great difficulty. We had to have our work completed by the 9th May 1927 when the Duke was due to arrive. We had to train promising labourers as tradesmen.

THE CHAIRMAN: You had no opposition to that?

SIR JOHN BUTTERS: The local trade unions co-operated very well.

THE CHAIRMAN: I suppose that the wages paid were higher than those paid in the capital cities?

SIR JOHN BUTTERS: They had to be higher in order to attract men away from Sydney and Melbourne.

THE CHAIRMAN: Do you remember how many houses were constructed during that 5 years?

SIR JOHN BUTTERS: About 1,000 I think. A number were constructed at Braddon, some at Acton, and others around Kingston, Manuka, Red Hill and in that general area. Also at Westlake and near Government House.

THE CHAIRMAN: Did the establishment of hotels, hostels and boarding houses give you much trouble?

SIR JOHN BUTTERS: They did.

THE CHAIRMAN: They were not a business proposition? There was no hope of making them pay?

SIR JOHN BUTTERS: Not in those days.

THE CHAIRMAN: You had problems in relation to water supply and sewerage?

SIR JOHN BUTTERS: Only from the point of view of getting those services completed in time.

THE CHAIRMAN: Would you recommend the establishment of a single authority to govern Canberra until the Public Service is transferred there? Would you recommend a single authority to be set up under statute for a limited number of years?

SIR JOHN BUTTERS: That would be the simplest and most effective way of administering the city - the establishment of a body such as the original Federal Capital Commission. But whoever was concerned in it would have to be prepared for the same sort of

SENATE CANBERRA COMMITTEE

irritation that I experienced in my day when people were making complaints about everything. They looked on the Commission as an authority whose object was to tread on the faces of the poor and extract the highest possible rent although we went to the greatest trouble to ensure that everything was done as fairly as possible. Then there is a tendency on the part of citizens to like to run their own local affairs to a certain extent. For that reason I suggest that some of those affairs could devolve upon a local authority and, over the years, the functions of that authority could be extended.

THE CHAIRMAN: And if such an elective body co-operated with the Commission, it would take away the disadvantages?

SIR JOHN BUTTERS: I think so.

THE CHAIRMAN: But you would not advocate a Commission partly elected and partly nominated by the Government?

SIR JOHN BUTTERS: No. We had a year's experience of that type of body. The elected representatives considered that they were there for the purpose of opposing. They would bring up the most trivial matters.

THE CHAIRMAN: Would it be best to have one Commissioner with overriding authority or three or five commissioners?

SIR JOHN BUTTERS: We had four people on our commission but it all depends on the individuals concerned.

THE CHAIRMAN: Did the Chairman have the right to veto the decision of the others?

SIR JOHN BUTTERS: As Chief Commissioner, I was the Chairman and I was a whole-time officer of the Government. The other members of Commission were visiting members who came to Canberra for Commission meetings but, as a Commission, they had power. They very soundly delegated the powers of the Commission to me as Chief Commissioner between Commission meetings so that the work could proceed. I would keep them informed of my intentions and, in due course, would tell them what I had done. They were free to come to Canberra whenever they wished. The system worked very well. But as soon as the elected men came in the operations proceeded on a different basis

SENATE CANBERRA COMMITTEE

THE CHAIRMAN: You do not think that it would be sufficient for the local citizens to have an advisory body such as they have at present?

SIR JOHN BUTTERS: I do not believe in advisory bodies. It is difficult to give satisfaction to anybody concerned when a body is merely advisory.

THE CHAIRMAN: You think that certain powers should be given to a Commission by statute?

SIR JOHN BUTTERS: I have thought that the authority which is ultimately set up to control the Australian Capital Territory could take the form of a State administration. That authority would then advise the Government on the deliberations of the municipal authorities.

THE CHAIRMAN: One of the problems that we have to face is that part of the expenditure on services in Canberra comes out of the pockets of taxpayers elsewhere in the Commonwealth. Would you care to comment on that?

SIR JOHN BUTTERS: I think that I referred to that matter in my report. One of the great difficulties from the beginning in Canberra was that the local authority was employed by the Australian democracy and was expected to ensure that that democracy received proper consideration. But it was also expected to keep the local people happy. In my day, the Commission attempted to make the charges to the local citizens as close as possible to the average of similar charges throughout the Commonwealth.

(Continued on page 789)

SENATE CANBERRA COMMITTEE

THE CHAIRMAN: Parks and gardens and so on can be said, in many cases, to be national in character. For example, the people of Kingston might say that they are no more concerned with a big park in the central part of Canberra than are the people of Perth. Therefore, whatever is paid for big national parks and gardens in Canberra is paid for the benefit of the people as a whole?

SIR JOHN BUTTERS: That principle should be adopted which has been adopted in other cities of the Commonwealth.

THE CHAIRMAN: Do you think that the areas which it is contemplated will be parks and gardens in Canberra will prove to be too costly?

SIR JOHN BUTTERS: I do not know what has happened since I left Canberra. I do know that whatever was there in my day was not costly, and I would say confidently that whatever it may cost it should be done. We cannot compete with the rest of the world in the splendour of our architecture, perhaps, but we can compete in producing a garden city.

THE CHAIRMAN: Canberra is situated in an arid area. There is a proposal for three basins, a big lake and the continuous watering of gardens and even trees. Do you think that the water which will be available to Canberra will be sufficient for all those activities when Canberra becomes a big city?

SIR JOHN BUTTERS: I am confident that the Lakes Scheme as provided in the Griffin plan cannot be carried out in full. Because of that fact I set up a committee to explore the matter thoroughly and to determine what, if any, modification was necessary to provide a waterway and recreation area. We proceeded a considerable distance before I left Canberra, and I am sure that the committee will find all the reports on that matter very interesting. We were getting close towards completion when I left the city, but at any rate the information was quite sufficient to satisfy me that a Lakes Scheme could be economically carried out.

SENATE CANBERRA COMMITTEE

THE CHAIRMAN: East Lake has been abandoned, and there is some controversy about West Lake. The Public Works Department is reporting on the latter at present. Do you consider that the city could carry West Lake as well as the central basins?

SIR JOHN BUTTERS: I could not say. I know enough about the subject not to hazard any information without a full study of the matter.

THE CHAIRMAN: The water available for the scheme is to come from the Cotter and the Molonglo Rivers?

SIR JOHN BUTTERS: The water for the lakes is to come from the Molonglo, but there is not enough water there for the full Lakes Scheme.

THE CHAIRMAN: I refer now to parks, gardens and recreation grounds. We discovered that no land has been definitely set aside for parks and recreation areas, and that it is within the power of the Crown to turn over land from being used as parks to be used for building. Do you not think that the time has now arrived when certain lands should be dedicated as parks?

SIR JOHN BUTTERS: Yes, it is part of city planning to do that. To the time when I left, that point had not arisen because we were constructing playing fields and other recreation areas.

THE CHAIRMAN: You consider that the parks then available were adequate for the people, but you would not like to express an opinion about the present position?

SIR JOHN BUTTERS: That is so.

THE CHAIRMAN: Much opinion has been expressed about leasehold tenure. Do you think it is generally a satisfactory system for Canberra?

SIR JOHN BUTTERS: I do not know whether I could say that. The matter was a headache in my day, because the system was being introduced. I do not know how it has worked out.

THE CHAIRMAN: It has been said that the system is hampering development in the business areas. If a storekeeper or manufacturer has freehold land he can improve it at will, and all his improvements

remain his own property. In Canberra he has to take a lease whose value deteriorates. Do you think that would hamper the development of the city?

SIR JOHN BUTTERS: It could hamper development in certain areas, but not necessarily the whole area. Certain political difficulties might be introduced if certain areas were freehold and others leasehold, but I could not say about that.

THE CHAIRMAN: Is leasehold satisfactory for residential areas?

SIR JOHN BUTTERS: No, one could visualise possible future widening of the roads and so on, which might affect the situation.

THE CHAIRMAN: If I should take a lease for 99 years and put a house on my land, as the lease expires the value of my house declines?

SIR JOHN BUTTERS: Yes, but I do not think that leases are normally for such a long period.

THE CHAIRMAN: Is there now an understanding that after the lease has expired the improvements on the land remain the property of the lessee?

SIR JOHN BUTTERS: During my time the leases ordinance was amended to give the lessee surrendering a lease rights in his improvements.

THE CHAIRMAN: It has also been said that a person will refuse to make any improvements to his property towards the end of the term of his lease?

SIR JOHN BUTTERS: That is so. On further thought I believe that the lease you mentioned is a long-term lease with a fairly short reappraisal period.

THE CHAIRMAN: Therefore, if a man puts improvements on his leased land he has them virtually in perpetuity?

SIR JOHN BUTTERS: Subject to paying the reappraised rental.

SENATOR HANNAFORD: But that is subject to the land being wanted for some government purpose?

SIR JOHN BUTTERS: Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: We are concerned about the large number of unsatisfactory buildings in Canberra. Would you recommend that we should suggest that there should be no more temporary buildings in that city of any sort?

SIR JOHN BUTTERS: I would very much like to be able to bring about a situation such as that. About the time of the opening of the Parliament I put that proposition up to the Government. The difficulty is to achieve it. Some national need is sure to arise and some additional accommodation is wanted, and immediately someone decides that that accommodation must be available in three or four months' time. Consequently, an improvised arrangement is made immediately.

THE CHAIRMAN: Most arrangements of that kind are more costly than permanent buildings in the long run. Do you recollect Burley Griffin's recommendation in regard to Parliament House?

SIR JOHN BUTTERS: Only by reading historical documents.

THE CHAIRMAN: I understand that he recommended the construction of a Parliament House in sections. One section could have been erected to house the Parliament and other parts added to that. The estimated cost was £250,000, whereas the present temporary Parliament House has cost £750,000.

SIR JOHN BUTTERS: I heard many stories about that matter which one could take with a grain of salt. No building could house two Houses of Parliament with all their ancillary activities and still be built in sections. You must have a Senate Chamber, a House of Representatives Chamber, you must have a ventilation system and all the ancillary activities. In a design of such a building all those matters must be considered. A design was arrived at, it was referred to the Public Works Committee by the Parliament, and you will find

SENATE CANBERRA COMMITTEE

the complete story in the records. The estimate for the building was £250,000, but that did not nearly approach the size and requirements of the Parliament House as I knew it, and I have never heard anybody suggest that the accommodation provided in Parliament House when it was opened was more than was necessary. In fact, as soon as we finished the building, we were asked to start building extensions.

THE CHAIRMAN: Do you think that building in sections is practicable?

SIR JOHN BUTTERS: I am dead against putting up temporary buildings.

THE CHAIRMAN: You are opposed even to sectional building such as the Church of St. Andrew in Canberra?

SIR JOHN BUTTERS: I would far rather see half a monumental building erected as a permanent structure and designed to be left in its unfinished state, than I would see a completed temporary building.

THE CHAIRMAN: The new administrative building is being completed in sections.

SIR JOHN BUTTERS: The fundamental matter is to determine the course that you shall follow, and then give the authority time to study your requirements and produce its plans. I believe that the plans of Parliament House reached me after the House was partly constructed, and the only way that we could get many of the buildings up was to draw up our own plans.

THE CHAIRMAN: During the time you were at Canberra was the National Capital Planning Committee in existence?

SIR JOHN BUTTERS: No.

THE CHAIRMAN: Was there any special body in existence to make sure that you had good architects available?

SIR JOHN BUTTERS: The Commission thought that it knew enough to select an architect, but most of the buildings that had to be built

SENATE CANBERRA COMMITTEE

such as Parliament House and East and West Blocks, the Hotel Kurrajong, the Hotel Acton and so on, were designed by the Public Works Department in Melbourne.

THE CHAIRMAN: Were the designs in existence when you took over?

SIR JOHN BUTTERS: No, the Hotel Canberra was there - under construction. That was about half-ready to occupy when I got there. The Hotel Acton was built on the plans of the Hotel Kurrajong because there was no time to do anything else. When we had more time we designed the Forestry School and the Institute of Anatomy. They were designed in the Commission's office. The Forestry School was not a monumental structure but it was a classic design. Civic Centre was designed by the Commission's staff, but just about that time the Commission set up an advisory committee and we got several architects of high calibre to help us. They performed a very useful function and we obtained their opinions in regard to any architectural and planning development from that time on.

THE CHAIRMAN: Was the bulk of the work done under contract?

SIR JOHN BUTTERS: No, under a system of day labour.

SENATE CANBERRA COMMITTEE.

THE CHAIRMAN: Was that from choice or necessity?

SIR JOHN BUTTERS: Necessity, mainly. The difficulty was to attract contractors to Canberra. There was so much work for them in the capital cities that they were not interested in Canberra. We tried to set about developing a number of small contractors and, I think, quite successfully. Some of them have done very well indeed.

THE CHAIRMAN: Was the Canberra brickworks in existence in your time?

SIR JOHN BUTTERS: The original part of it was. We expanded it.

THE CHAIRMAN: I think we have been told that the original bricks were good but that with the introduction of new processes bricks of an inferior quality were produced.

SIR JOHN BUTTERS: I have not heard any complaints about bricks in Canberra except that they were too good.

SENATOR BENN: On p.41 of your 1929 report, under the heading of "Housing" the last sentence of the first paragraph states:

The Commission's investment in housing alone is now approaching one million pounds.

I suppose you are aware that the Commonwealth Government now spends approximately £1,000,000 a year on housing in Canberra.

SIR JOHN BUTTERS: I was not aware of that.

SENATOR BENN: But you are not surprised?

SIR JOHN BUTTERS: Not a bit.

SENATOR BENN: The programme provides for the erection of approximately 400 houses a year.

SIR JOHN BUTTERS: Of course, that £1,000,000 in those days, at today's relative values, would be about £2,500,000.

SENATOR BENN: There has been great development in Canberra since 1929?

SIR JOHN BUTTERS: Yes.

SENATOR BENN: They are building up all the time at Civic Centre and the other centres as well. You are aware of that?

SIR JOHN BUTTERS: Yes. The population has roughly doubled.

SENATE CANBERRA COMMITTEE.

SENATOR BENN: You know that a new office block is in course of construction?

SIR JOHN BUTTERS: Yes.

SENATOR BENN: We have been told by one or two expert witnesses that the development of Canberra is now approaching its second phase. In other words, we are approaching the conclusion of the developmental phase. We have got over the initial stages about which you know so much. Witnesses have said that the time perhaps has arrived when we could give some consideration to a review of the plan. You have a fair knowledge of the plan of course?

SIR JOHN BUTTERS: Yes.

SENATOR BENN: You know what the vista is from Parliament House towards the Molongolo River and the War Memorial and you are also aware of the large tract of land between Civic Centre and the Molongolo?

SIR JOHN BUTTERS: Yes.

SENATOR BENN: I suppose you have some idea of the purpose of that land?

SIR JOHN BUTTERS: Yes.

SENATOR BENN: And you have some idea of the purpose for which Capital Hill has been set aside?

SIR JOHN BUTTERS: Yes.

SENATOR BENN: Can you visualise a time in the history of Canberra when development will have almost ceased and there will still exist in the heart of Canberra a miniature sheep station?

SIR JOHN BUTTERS: I do not think it will ever come to that.

SENATOR BENN: There is a huge vacant area at present between Parliament House and Manuka, in front of the Hotel Kurrajong.

SIR JOHN BUTTERS: I personally would hate to see those particular areas that you have referred to too rapidly wiped out of the plan. One or two fundamental decisions have to be made. You have to decide the treatment that is to be given to Capital Hill. That is a very important feature of the whole city plan.

SENATOR BENN: Have you any suggestions on that matter?

SIR JOHN BUTTERS: I think it needs to be something on what I term the spiritual basis, almost like a national mausoleum among

SENATE CANBERRA COMMITTEE.

other things. I put the proposition up to the Government that we should approach the U.S.A. and get the relics of Captain Cook brought here. The scheme was put up to the Historic Memorials Committee and the historian member of that committee answered the Prime Minister's reference by saying "I do not believe in moving dead bones". Nor do I, but when you are building a capital city it is necessary to do something that will add to the tradition of the place. That may overcome the reluctance to remove dead bones. But the matter was dropped and, to my knowledge, has never been raised again. The transfer, holus-bolus, of a bombed church from London to Canberra would have been a fine idea. These things would link us with other parts and create a national spirit in the centre of the nation at Canberra. Not in my time, but in the time of younger people, Australia may be a nation of 20,000,000 or 30,000,000 and nobody can say in what direction the development will go or what the demands will be. Therefore, I would hesitate to advise the filling up of the spaces in the vicinity of the governmental triangle.

SENATOR BENN: Except with the buildings that are meant to be there.

SIR JOHN BUTTERS: That is so. Adequate space must be left for future expansion.

SENATOR BENN: You say "leave things as they are, and let the development take its course"?

SIR JOHN BUTTERS I must not say that I entirely agree with that. I think there should be planning as far ahead as possible but you should keep revising the plan year by year.

SENATOR BENN: That is the plan of development?

SIR JOHN BUTTERS: Yes.

SENATOR BENN: Civic Centre appeals to me and it probably appeals to you. On the Molongolo River side of it there is still a large tract of land not in use. Would you say that the Griffin Plan for that area should be altered in any respect?

SIR JOHN BUTTERS: I think the Federal Capital Commission, in its day, recommended a modification there, or rather decided upon

and submitted it for the approval of Parliament. The Commission had power to make modifications subject to Parliamentary approval.

SENATOR BENN: I suppose you are familiar with the sites set aside for the High Court, the Commonwealth Bank, the Commonwealth Arbitration Court, the Australian Broadcasting Commission and so on?

SIR JOHN BUTTERS: I have not heard of those.

SENATOR BENN: Apparently that is a development since you left.

SIR JOHN BUTTERS: Apparently.

SENATOR BENN: Another interesting part of your report is as follows:

The Commission has reviewed the main housing schemes throughout Australia, and has exhaustively investigated types and designs of houses and materials of construction, with the object of reducing the cost of building. It is now experimenting with two-storey semi-detached types, which it is thought will provide attractive dwellings at rentals approximating 30/- a week.

So, it was in your period of office that the two-storey residences were first introduced?

SIR JOHN BUTTERS: A certain number of them, yes.

SENATOR BENN: I do not suppose you ever gave consideration to constructing houses on blocks 7 feet and 11 feet high as is being done in Queensland?

SIR JOHN BUTTERS: No. Of course we have not that delightful climate of yours in the summer or the necessity in the winter.

SENATOR BENN: Do you think such houses in Canberra would relieve the monotony?

SIR JOHN BUTTERS: I think it should be possible to find ways of relieving the monotony a bit more to local public taste than that.

SENATOR VINCENT: I take it from your evidence that you are in agreement with the often propounded view that there should be some form of local governing authority in Canberra for local administration?

SIR JOHN BUTTERS: That side should steadily and persistently be developed.

SENATOR VINCENT: Would you care to hazard an opinion as to

SENATE CONFERENCE COMMITTEE.

as to when or at what stage some form of local governing authority should be established?

SIR JOHN BUTTERS: I would have done it within a year of making my report had approval been given.

SENATOR VINCENT: You consider that the time is overdue for some form of local government?

SIR JOHN BUTTERS: Yes, but not local government in the ordinary sense of the word. Of course, I am still talking of a quarter a century ago. Whether there has been any change in the atmosphere, I do not know. I do not know whether I gave any reasons for the views that I expressed in my report but one of the things that must be borne in mind on the subject of local government is this: A city council or municipal council has to maintain its own organisation for looking after roads, sewerage, and the 100 and one other things associated with the maintenance of properties. In Canberra for years to come during the constructional period you will have an engineering organisation, an architectural organisation etc., and the municipal authority would not need to duplicate those functions by setting up its own establishments. All that was needed in that direction would be done by arrangement with the authorities. So, there is no need for duplication. But the things I had in mind were simpler things which are of great public interest in any city.

SENATOR VINCENT: How would you apportion responsibility between the local authority and the departmental administration in respect of such matters as road construction and maintenance? Clearly it would be unfair to impose on the citizens of Canberra the total cost of road construction and maintenance for all the roads in Canberra. Can you suggest any compromise whereby the local authority would accept responsibility in certain quarters and the governmental authority would accept responsibility in other directions?

SIR JOHN BUTTERS: It would be rather difficult. For some years to come, the system we worked on ourselves would probably be the only way. The central Canberra authority would carry out dual purpose

services and charge to the municipal body a figure that would be in line with that charged to any other municipal authority for that purpose.

SENATOR VINCENT: You would charge the local authority with a proportion of the total cost commensurate with its civic responsibility.

SIR JOHN BUTTERS: Yes.

SENATOR VINCENT: Do you think I am right in saying that throughout Australia there is a lack of consciousness amongst the general public of the real significance of the fullest development of Canberra as a national capital?

SIR JOHN BUTTERS: I would say that is so.

SENATOR VINCENT: I agree entirely. Having gone that far, can you tell us how we should deal with the apathy that exists?

SIR JOHN BUTTERS: The most effective way of course would be to complete the city. By that I mean complete the transfers.

SENATOR VINCENT: You are aware of course that Canberra is the only city in Australia that can be accurately costed. We do not know the cost to the general public of Melbourne or Fremantle but we do know the cost of Canberra.

SIR JOHN BUTTERS: Yes, but the accounts in Canberra are not yet in order.

SENATOR VINCENT: I am concerned with an important aspect of this question. How can we promote amongst the general public a favourable attitude towards the significance of our National Capital?

SIR JOHN BUTTERS: I think we have to do something to create what I have referred to as a soul in Canberra and a national spirit in association with it.

SENATOR VINCENT: How can we do that?

(Continued on page 802)

SENATE CANBERRA COMMITTEE

SIR JOHN BUTTERS: I do not know. The bones of Captain Cook and some distinguished Australians would merit a place in such a building; also, a number of relics associated with the history of Australia. Then there is an opportunity to develop in Canberra a form of local government which would be in advance of the general mass thinking. The average level of intelligence should be much higher than the average in other cities.

SENATOR VINCENT: I agree. But I am more concerned with the attitude of the person living in other parts of Australia.

SIR JOHN BUTTERS: Why not give him something in Canberra that he can talk about.

SENATOR VINCENT: Do you think that some better form of public relations should be established so as to condition public opinion on the important matters that we have been discussing?

SIR JOHN BUTTERS: I should say that that would be valuable.

SENATOR VINCENT: A previous witness observed that there is a lack of aim in relation to the development of Canberra and that until Canberra's purpose in life has been ascertained it will be difficult to plan its ultimate development. Would you agree that there has been a lack of thought in relation to the ultimate aim in establishing Canberra as a city?

SIR JOHN BUTTERS: I should not have thought so. I thought it was clear that the ultimate aim was that Canberra should be an administrative centre which would develop into a city with the ancilliary industry that are associated with a city. I had not envisaged any deliberate attempt to attract large industries but I have thought that there would be some small industrial development which would be associated with the development of a city.

SENATOR VINCENT: Would you say that only those industries associated with the growth of the administrative centre should be encouraged at Canberra?

SIR JOHN BUTTERS: I should say so.

SENATOR VINCENT: Do you know whether that policy has ever been given consideration and approval?

SENATE CANBERRA COMMITTEE

SIR JOHN BUTTERS: I took it as a sine qua non. Industrial sites were provided for in the plan but I do not see how Canberra could become anything approaching an industrial centre. That would be contrary to the fundamental conception of the city. The atmosphere of Canberra should not be associated with high-pressure commercialism or industry.

SENATOR VINCENT: Would you agree that it would be contrary to the spirit of federalism to endeavour to establish a manufacturing city in the Federal capital in competition with industry in the State capitals?

SIR JOHN BUTTERS: Yes.

SENATOR VINCENT: But no policy has been laid down in respect of this important matter of what our aim should be in the development of Canberra?

SIR JOHN BUTTERS: I suppose that I must have taken it as an axiom.

SENATOR VINCENT: I suggest that, in this atomic age, there would be nothing to stop the Broken Hill Pty. Limited from starting one of its heavy industries in Canberra?

SIR JOHN BUTTERS: They would have to get a lease.

SENATOR VINCENT: I presume that they would be denied a lease but there is no policy from which that denial would flow?

SIR JOHN BUTTERS: I cannot recollect any legislative authority for such a denial.

SENATOR VINCENT: I understand that the present Parliament House is a temporary building?

SIR JOHN BUTTERS: I think that it was described on the drawings submitted to the Works Committee as a "provisional" building.

SENATOR VINCENT: It is not built on the site which Griffin intended to be used for the permanent structure?

SIR JOHN BUTTERS: I think that is so.

SENATOR VINCENT: It is almost immediately in front of the permanent site. Would I be right in saying that when the permanent Parliament House is built it will look down on the back door of the

SENATE CANBERRA COMMITTEE

present building and completely obstruct the vista which Griffin planned to have from the front of the permanent Parliament House to Mount Ainslie?

SIR JOHN BUTTERS: If it is built high enough it would not do that. I have not seen the actual site for the building. We imagined that that subject would not worry anybody for another 25 years.

SENATOR VINCENT: When do you suggest that we should take any action towards the construction of the permanent Parliament House?

SIR JOHN BUTTERS: I should think that there would be lots of things to proceed with before that necessity became important.

SENATOR VINCENT: When do you consider that we should take action towards the construction of a permanent city hall?

SIR JOHN BUTTERS: I think that it would be very necessary to do that in the near future.

SENATOR VINCENT: It should take precedence over Parliament House.

SIR JOHN BUTTERS: I am hardly able to say that. It is for Parliament to decide whether or not it is adequately housed. I cannot contemplate Parliament deciding to build another Parliament House at this stage of the capital development merely for the sake of transferring of an effective building to a monumental one.

SENATOR VINCENT: Would you say that the top of Capital Hill would be a desirable site for the permanent Parliament House?

SIR JOHN BUTTERS: I should not think so. The practical difficulties involved would be considerable. Speaking from my own recollection of the place, Capital Hill is a conical hill with fairly well defined slopes. For a permanent Parliament House one would need an area of land very much bigger than the present Parliament House has in order to provide for future development and access. It would be necessary to cut off a lot of Capital Hill if a Parliament House were to be constructed there. It would be a pity to do that. In addition, pedestrians would find the place difficult of access.

(continued on page 806)

SENATE CALLEJERA COMMITTEE

SIR JOHN BUTTERS: We need to encourage the visiting public to go to Parliament House, and they all have not got motor cars. If we attempt to provide parking space on Capital Hill for buses and cars after the new Parliament House is erected, we shall find that there will not be any hill left.

THE CHAIRMAN: The apex of Capital Hill is small, but the hill itself is rather large?

SIR JOHN BUTTERS: Yes, that is my recollection. I visualized a much smaller building than a new Parliament House on top of that hill, something striking and monumental.

SENATOR VINCENT: Whatever is finally erected there will not alter the access to the hill?

SIR JOHN BUTTERS: No, but the visitors to any such building will be spread over the whole year and not concentrated into short periods as at present with Parliament House.

SENATOR VINCENT: If there were a national mausoleum on Capital Hill that would still be difficult from the point of view of access?

SIR JOHN BUTTERS: Yes, but you would not have the same number of people visiting it at the same time as you have visiting Parliament House. Touring buses are continually taking loads of people to Parliament House at present, and with a smaller building on Capital Hill the visiting would be spread over the year, and a smaller structure would allow greater parking areas and areas of access to the hill. You can imagine what the hill would be like by thinking of a building half as large again as the present Parliament House on the top of it.

SENATOR VINCENT: Capital Hill is only about 100 ft. high.

SIR JOHN BUTTERS: But we would need to take a good many feet of earth off the top before we could get a comfortable area, 50% bigger than the area covered by the present Parliament House, on which to erect a new Parliament House. Then, of course, we should have to add the space required for roads and parking areas.

SENATE CANBERRA COMMITTEE

SENATOR VINCENT: Do you consider that the proposed site for the new Parliament House is higher than the present Parliament House as the Melbourne Parliament House is higher than Princes Street?

SIR JOHN BUTTERS: I think so.

SENATOR VINCENT: Can you give us any views on how the area known as City Hill should be treated. We have been told that some of that area should be used as shop sites and hotel sites. Do you agree with that?

SIR JOHN BUTTERS: I had visualised that area as the site of an ultimate City Hall for Canberra.

SENATOR VINCENT: Do you visualise any public buildings other than a City Hall?

SIR JOHN BUTTERS: No.

SENATOR VINCENT: Do you think that the area is too large for just one building?

SIR JOHN BUTTERS: I think so. I consider that that area would pay for some re-planning as time goes on.

SENATOR VINCENT: Do you agree with the suggestion that we should aim at constructing a main shopping centre in Canberra instead of having a number of shopping centres of smaller proportions?

SIR JOHN BUTTERS: No, I think that the original layout as decided upon by the Commission, which was developed from pre-Commission days, was to provide for a principal shopping centre in the city area and for suburban shopping centres in other areas, similar to the development of most cities.

SENATOR VINCENT: Why do you require a principal shopping centre in a city such as Canberra, or in a city such as Canberra will ultimately be. That is a widespread city with an area of about four miles square?

SIR JOHN BUTTERS: Let us forget the word "shopping" and say that we require a main business centre. We must have a centre for the representatives of banks and insurance companies, for example.

SENATE CANBERRA COMMITTEE

I imagine that all the big banks and most of the big insurance companies will ultimately be represented in Canberra. The area in which they are collected will naturally develop into a business or shopping centre. A shopping centre will be needed for that area and we shall find that there will be a principal shop, or the head office of a business, in the main centre, and subsidiary shops or businesses in the suburbs. As the suburban shopping centres develop that tendency will increase.

SENATOR VINCENT: You do not think that our desire to have a principal shopping centre in a principal street is merely part of the good old Australian tradition of main street towns?

SIR JOHN BUTTERS: I do not think so.

SENATOR VINCENT: Canberra at present is a garden city with a pastoral atmosphere. Do you say that we should endeavour, at all costs, to maintain the pastoral atmosphere while the city is developing?

SIR JOHN BUTTERS: A lot depends on what is meant by the word "pastoral". I believe that it is fundamental that Canberra should be looked upon, as a No. 1 priority, as a garden city.

SENATOR VINCENT: We should endeavour to preserve that tradition?

SIR JOHN BUTTERS: Yes.

SENATOR VINCENT: Even though it may cost more in capital expenditure?

SIR JOHN BUTTERS: I say that, with the full knowledge that it will cost more. Even so, I consider that it is essential.

SENATOR VINCENT: Do you think that the population density could be increased, and yet that pastoral atmosphere preserved?

SIR JOHN BUTTERS: Within small limits. I have been disappointed to see the tendency that has arisen of putting some houses much closer together than we contemplated.

SENATOR VINCENT: Do you agree that an 8-storey block of flats

SENATE CANBERRA COMMITTEE

should be built close to Civic Centre?

SIR JOHN BUTTERS: No.

SENATOR VINCENT: Would you agree that because of the height and size of such a building, it would tend to affect the impression that one gains from observing all the other public buildings in Canberra?

SIR JOHN BUTTERS: Yes, I think it would be a pity at this stage for any high building other than Government structures to be erected in Canberra.

SENATOR VINCENT: We have had evidence that because of the annual budgeting provisions works are delayed, and it has been advocated that project budgeting would encourage more expeditious building?

SIR JOHN BUTTERS: Yes.

SENATOR VINCENT: What are your views about that matter?

SIR JOHN BUTTERS: I am completely in favour of project budgeting. It is the only method of budgeting that I have ever been able satisfactorily to proceed upon - and I was a public servant for 15 years. I found that unless that system were adopted jobs could not be done.

SENATOR VINCENT: Would you say that in Canberra we have achieved an ideal style of dwelling house?

SIR JOHN BUTTERS: No, I should not go as far as to say that. At the time the Commission had to deal with this problem we were about as far ahead as we could go with economically-possible Australian houses. However, I do not think that we have yet arrived at a real Australian domestic architectural type. I think the type of houses in the principal areas to the time when I left Canberra, was a very good example of modern cottage design by Australians for Australian conditions.

SENATOR VINCENT: A well-known architect said yesterday that while we do not yet have the ideal type of Australian house for Canberra conditions, nothing could be done towards encouraging a better type of house. Do you consider that the position is as hopeless

as I have stated it?

SIR JOHN BUTTERS: I would not say that it is hopeless, it will take a long time to develop an ideal architecture. In my day we did not fill up all the land available to us in a sub-division, in the hope that private citizens would build houses for themselves in those sub-divisions, and introduce types of architecture from all over Australia. I did not have sufficient time to see the result of that policy.

THE CHAIRMAN: The Embassies are helping us with their different styles of architecture?

SIR JOHN BUTTERS: Yes, but they are in a rather restricted area. Of course they have spread, to a certain extent, from that area.

SENATOR VINCENT: The Government has built most of the dwelling houses in Canberra. In view of that fact, what steps should be taken by the Government to improve architectural standards, having regard to the ideal Australian dwelling?

SIR JOHN BUTTERS: The only way that can be done is by means of competitions. I would like to see competitions encouraged. We had one competition which was adjudicated upon before the Commission was appointed. That was in connection with the Oakley Park Estate between Adelaide Avenue and Capital Circuit on the slopes of Red Hill. A variety of types of houses were introduced as a result of the competition, and we hoped, by building such places, to introduce variety into Canberra. I am in favour of extending that idea.

SENATOR VINCENT: The competitive element in building has disappeared, but you advocate that it be re-introduced to improve standards?

SIR JOHN BUTTERS: Yes, and to get ideas.

SENATOR VINCENT: Do you agree that it would be undesirable to build larger public buildings according to styles commonly referred to as experimental, or would you prefer to retain the architectural patterns and standards that have proved their value

SENATE CANBERRA COMMITTEE

SIR JOHN BUTTERS: I should probably be accused of being back in 1066 if I say this, but I believe that until they develop a better type of architecture than the classical style, I shall be all in favour of classical buildings. I have not seen any virtue that could be called an architectural virtue, in the modern buildings. If you are to think in terms of economical building then, of course, you must make the building as plain and simple and as flat as possible. But I prefer the classical design, and would be much happier to see Canberra develop on classical lines of architecture than I would to see it develop along the lines of the architecture of plain walls and apertures in those walls.

SENATOR RYAN: Was Adelaide Avenue constructed during your time in Canberra?

SIR JOHN BUTTERS: The excavation was done before the Commission was appointed.

SENATOR RYAN: That road was constructed entirely in conformity with the Burley Griffin plan?

SIR JOHN BUTTERS: My recollection is that it was built partly according to the plan, but not to the full width.

SENATOR RYAN: Would you say that it is a principal and highly developed arterial highway?

SIR JOHN BUTTERS: Yes. It was not a matter of urgency for us to finish it off quickly.

SENATOR HANNAFORD: Was Burley Griffin responsible for the cutting?

SIR JOHN BUTTERS: That was done before the Commission was appointed.

SENATOR RYAN: Why was that particular highway restricted when other avenues such as Northbourne Avenue, conformed completely to the Griffin plan?

SIR JOHN BUTTERS: We did not start building the eastern half of Northbourne Avenue until the western half was done. We built only one side of practically every avenue first, and afterwards we completed the more important and urgent ones.

SENATE CANBERRA COMMITTEE.

SENATOR RYAN: Adelaide Avenue is an important highway serving not only a rapidly expanding suburban area of Canberra but also the tourist traffic to the Cottor River. You say that it awaits full development.

SIR JOHN BUTTERS: Yes.

SENATOR HANNAFORD: When you first assumed your duties in Canberra were you enthusiastic about the Griffin Plan?

SIR JOHN BUTTERS: I was enthusiastic about it from the point of view of having a plan to start with as a charter. I was enthusiastic about it from the point of view of the general layout in relation to the terrain. But I never looked upon it as unalterable in any circumstances like the laws of the Medes and Persians. For instance, I cannot see any virtue in having a city constructed in a perfectly circular form if there is some sound reason why it should be a little bit oblate. For instance to follow the Griffin Plan in the construction of a certain road which was not related to anything else, would have involved the cutting down of two very fine trees. I had issued a standing instruction that no tree could be cut down in the city area without a recommendation from the Superintendent of Parks & Gardens, not to the Commission or to the Secretary of the Commission, but to me personally. No tree could be cut down without my specific approval. I went along and saw the location of the proposed road and I found that by changing it from a purely circular form and making it a little bit flatter, the trees could be saved. That could occur all over the place and such an alteration would not affect the city plan at all. In some places it is very desirable to have straight roads and in others it is impracticable to have anything but circular roads.

SENATOR HANNAFORD: In other words, you met circumstances as they arose particularly in relation to the smaller streets?

SIR JOHN BUTTERS: Yes. Up to the time I left, we always went through the procedure laid down by law for having a modification approved. That is to say, a determination was made by the Commission and tabled in each House of the Parliament. If it were not objected to

SENATE CANBERRA COMMITTEE.

the scheme was proceeded with.

SENATOR HANNAFORD: Would you say that during the period of the Commission, there was greater expansion than there has since been in any comparable period?

SIR JOHN BUTTERS: I should think that would be so but of course I have not the statistics.

SENATOR HANNAFORD: Were you ever starved for finance?

SIR JOHN BUTTERS: Never.

SENATOR HANNAFORD: You had all the money that the labour and materials available to you could absorb?

SIR JOHN BUTTERS: Yes. We had difficulty in getting materials at times but the money was there.

SENATOR HANNAFORD: You attended to such matters as roads, water supply, public health, sewerage, power and transport?

SIR JOHN BUTTERS: As I think I said somewhere in my report "everything from the maternity hospital to the cemetery".

SENATOR HANNAFORD: Do you consider that, if the plan had provided for a greater population density the provision of the necessary services would have been facilitated?

SIR JOHN BUTTERS: I think that, in the initial stages, a more desirable result could have been obtained by compressing it a little but not a tremendous amount. It was desirable to have plenty of space in the developmental stage, but I think it was overdone just a little bit.

SENATOR HANNAFORD: You favour a not too rapid filling in of the central administrative area?

SIR JOHN BUTTERS: Yes, the governmental triangle.

SENATOR HANNAFORD: We have been told that the cost of building houses in Canberra is not much greater than it is elsewhere. Have you any knowledge of that matter?

SIR JOHN BUTTERS: I have no knowledge of the present situation but in my time we were able to build houses in Canberra at about the same price as in Sydney but our prices were about 7% or 8% higher than Melbourne because of different wage scales.

SENATOR HANNAFORD: Do you consider that from the point of view of assistance to home builders and in other respects, the people of Canberra are very well treated under the present system of administration?

SIR JOHN BUTTERS: Very well treated indeed.

SENATOR HANNAFORD: Do you consider it to be essential that that principle should be carried on to facilitate the transfer of civil servants to Canberra and to encourage the building of enough houses?

SIR JOHN BUTTERS: Yes.

SENATOR HANNAFORD: You agree with the policy that has been pursued by successive governments?

SIR JOHN BUTTERS: Yes.

SENATOR HANNAFORD: I gather from an answer that you gave to Senator Vincent that you are in favour of the people of Canberra paying a reasonable fee for the services they receive such as water supply and so on? You feel that Canberra residents are rather spoon-fed in this direction?

SIR JOHN BUTTERS: I think they are well treated.

SENATOR HANNAFORD: We have been told by several witnesses that the work of building the national capital, at least during the transfer stage, would be facilitated if the development of Canberra were placed in the hands of a body such as the Federal Capital Commission of which you were the Chief Commissioner. That is your view also?

SIR JOHN BUTTERS: Quite definitely.

SENATOR HANNAFORD: Although Canberra is no longer in the more or less primitive state in which you knew it, you still maintain that a Commission, specially appointed for the job, could carry out the work better than the present form of administration?

SIR JOHN BUTTERS: Yes. It could do all the necessary planning and thinking for the future. It could give its time to a study of Canberra's future problems. It would have plenty of time to do its designing on the drawing board before it put a peg into the ground.

SENATE CANBERRA COMMITTEE.

SENATOR HANNAFORD: At Whyalla in South Australia, a municipal authority has been given more or less a free hand to develop the city in conjunction with the major industrial undertaking that is established there, and it has done a fair job. You believe that something along municipal lines could adequately carry out the development of Canberra provided it had adequate finance from the Commonwealth Government?

SIR JOHN BUTTERS: I do not think you could possibly hand over the whole job to an elected municipal authority. After all there are 100,000 square miles of Territory to be administered.

SENATOR HANNAFORD. I am thinking merely of municipal responsibilities.

SIR JOHN BUTTERS: Those responsibilities could be defined in the way that I indicated 25 years ago and it would be a very interesting job for the elected representatives.

SENATOR HANNAFORD: You think that such an authority could work within the scope of the Commission?

SIR JOHN BUTTERS: Yes. With a little bit of thought on that subject I think you could work out a very satisfactory arrangement.

THE CHAIRMAN: Do you think that such a commission should be free from Public Service restrictions - free to get employees without going to the Public Service Board for instance?

SIR JOHN BUTTERS: I cannot think of any better arrangement, assuming of course that you appoint an intelligent commission that could be relied upon, than that provided for in the legislation which established the Federal Capital Commission. We were entirely free although we were told that it was desired that we should use the existing Department of Works as much as possible, subject to that Department's convenience.

THE CHAIRMAN: But you were not compelled to use the Department of Works. You were at liberty to engage private contractors if you so desired?

SIR JOHN BUTTERS: That is so.

THE CHAIRMAN: You think the best thing would be a statutory commission, with its powers defined by Act of Parliament, and beyond ministerial interference?

SIR JOHN BUTTERS: That is so.

THE CHAIRMAN: Do you think it would be a good thing to have, alongside that commission, a Parliamentary Committee - a joint committee or one of either House - with power only to report to the Parliament, perhaps once a year on the progress that the commission was making.

SIR JOHN BUTTERS: I think it could be a very helpful idea. There is only one thing to be guarded against. The commission should not be made to feel that it had somebody riding on its neck all the time.

THE CHAIRMAN: I do not have in mind an inquisitorial committee but one which would meet perhaps once a year to consider a report from the commission and to forward that report, together perhaps with its own comments, to the Parliament.

SIR JOHN BUTTERS: I think it is a very good idea. It would also encourage interest in Canberra.

THE CHAIRMAN: They had in Washington a Fine Arts Commission composed of celebrated and able architects, engineers, and others. Do you think it would be good to have a similar body for Canberra to deal with such matters as architecture.

SIR JOHN BUTTERS: It is one of the things which I recommended, under a different name, in 1929. I think the title was a Committee on City Design and Development.

THE CHAIRMAN: Naturally there would be town planners, architects and engineers on it. Do you think it would be good also to have a . . . of arts to express opinions on such matters as statutory?

SIR JOHN BUTTERS: I think my proposal was for the inclusion of a sculptor, and also a landscape artist. But I am rather afraid of sculptors. If a statue of a typical Australian woman was to be erected I should hate to see it done by Epstein.

THE CHAIRMAN: Would you care to express an opinion on the statue of King George V in front of Parliament House?

SIR JOHN BUTTERS: I object to its position. Apart from spoiling the view from Parliament House there was an opportunity to have a fine big square which could be used for ceremonial purposes. I would not have allowed anything to be put in that square except grass. All the statues that are required could be put up along the avenues.

(The witness withdrew)

THE COMMITTEE ADJOURNED.

SENATE CANBERRA COMMITTEE

SENATE SELECT COMMITTEE ON THE PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT
OF CANBERRA

MINUTES OF EVIDENCE

Taken at Sydney

THURSDAY, 10th March, 1955

PRESENT:

The Chairman (Senator McCallum)

Senator Benn

Senator Ryan

Senator Hannaford
Senator Wood

Senator Vincent

HAROLD HARRY SMITH, Architect and Town Planner,
sworn and examined:

THE CHAIRMAN: Will you commence your evidence by making a statement to the Committee?

MR. SMITH: I should like to do that and I should like to commence by giving the Committee my background. I qualified as an architect in 1936. From 1937 to 1940 I did post graduate studies in Europe, England and the United States. In 1941, having returned to Australia I was engaged with the Department of Works and Housing as an architect. From 1943 to 1944 I did some lecturing and wrote a number of articles and had a small booklet published on town planning. In 1946 I became certified as a town planner under the New South Wales Act. Since then, I have been a Counsellor of the Sydney Division of the Australian Planning Institute. From 1944 to 1946 I was in charge of a section of the Department of Works and Housing which was asked to prepare some plans and investigate the possible redevelopment of Canberra and Darwin. Besides carrying on my architectural practice at present, I am a consultant planner to two municipal councils - Baulkham Hills and Rockdale. I hope that the Committee will permit me to give evidence on broad planning principles and policies although the terms of reference of the Committee refer only to the original plan for Canberra.

One might say that there are two alternatives in deciding what type of city Canberra should be; one is the sponsored city

SENATE CANBERRA COMMITTEE

which becomes a seat of government and nothing else and for which the Federal Government is responsible; then there is what I call the real city which is similar to most cities which function as far as possible within themselves economically. I feel that Canberra should eventually become, as far as possible, self-supporting. If the population of Canberra reaches 100,000 I think that it would be too much of a strain for any government to bear the cost of its finance. I think that the affairs of the Commonwealth should be ^{directed toward making} ~~part of an~~ economically self-supporting city. That will be the whole basis of my comments.

In considering a city I think that we can concern ourselves with too much detail. Many authorities are of the opinion that too much concern about detail results in no broad policy being formed. An American planner by the name of Hilberseimer has written as follows:-

There are two schools of thought in city planning. One takes into consideration only parts of a city without connecting them to the whole. "Little" things are thought about and little parts are changed. Everything is done on a "sound" basis. This is the school of the practical man. Paradoxically, this practical work....eventually reveals itself as impractical and unsound....The city so tinkered with remains essentially the same. The second school thinks about the city as a whole, its zone of influence, its function, in the region and in the nation. It takes everything into consideration and tries to conceive of the needs and function of the city as an entity.

I feel that a city can only be as good as its government. Perhaps due to lack of information, past governments have not, in my opinion, done the work necessary to provide the basis for a sound City of Canberra. In a report which my section of the Department of Works and Housing prepared in 1946, the following statements were made concerning the origin of the plan of Canberra:-

The competition was largely limited in that the conditions were unacceptable to the Royal Institute of British Architects which decided that it could not endorse them. In this attitude it was supported by the Institution of Civil Engineers, and these bodies advised their affiliated Associations throughout the Empire to take no part in the submission of designs. This had the effect not only of greatly reducing the numbers of architects and town planners who competed, but also of limiting the field for the selection of a technical board to report on the designs.

(Continued on page 822)

I do not suggest that only architectural planners or engineers could have prepared a good plan but, because the field of competition was limited, we have a plan which, in the light of present knowledge, is bad. Lewis Mumford, an eminent sociologist in the U.S.A. has said:-

The function of geometry in planning is to clarify and guide. Like every other type of useful abstraction, it must be conditioned by facts and give way to facts when the latter point to some aspect of life that has escaped the formula..... They (the monumental planners) were too confident about the type of order they imposed: they had no place even in their three dimensional planning for the factor of time..... All those changes and adaptations that are inevitable with future growth they left out of their purview: hence their plans were too symmetrical, their order too exclusive and rigid, to allow for the needs of future generations.

I think that time has shown that to be correct in relation to the Burley Griffin plan. Professor Hancock has stated:-

Neither growth nor planning is a virtue in itself; there can be untidy, ugly growth or an empty pretentious plan. The plan of Canberra is that of a garden city in which the garden is more emphasised than the City. It is ten times more spacious than the new Delhi.

(Continued on page 833)

Mr. Gideon, in "Space, Time and Architecture", has made the following statement:-

The modern town planner studies the different categories of people who have to be accommodated each according to their manner of life.

He must consider where these people work, the routes traffic must take, the distance there would be between residential and other sections. He must establish a control of the relation between the communications of a city and its living quarters. He thinks no longer in terms of streets and "axes" but in terms of population groupings.

Most of us know that Griffen was, in effect, a landscape architect. In 1911 his effort may have been rather good. But, judged by contemporary standards, it would only be by accident if the plan were a good one. I am not speaking in terms of beauty or grandeur but in economic terms. I have the same criticism to make of Washington.

SENATE CANBERRA COMMITTEE

Some minor amendments have been made to Griffin's plan which was accepted by the government in 1925, a lapse of 14 years which went by with practically no broad investigation of the plan. Practically no administrative detail was set down by Griffin. That is a very faulty thing. There was no real positive sponsorship of the plan. The attitude was that as money became available something would be done. Governments have been content to let their domestic architects develop the city. That cannot be satisfactory for the development of an economic city. There are examples overseas of two types of planning procedures. One is to make, by law, a statutory plan for a city. The other is the so-called "Advisory Plan". Every planner academically likes an advisory plan. But when we come up against society and administrative angles we find that a statutory plan is the only one acceptable. The statutory plan can be dangerous as it has been in the case of Canberra. If a bad plan is made statutory the city is saddled with it. So some provision must be made whereby the statutory plan can be amended from time to time without advantage being taken of that provision to vary it too often and in too great detail. I feel that the varying departmental control that has been exercised over the Griffin plan has been too cumbersome. Too many different departments and commissions have had something to do with the plan. I think that departmental control is cumbersome and wrong. I spent two years in the Department of Works and Housing and I found, after I had reported at length on some aspect of the plan after consultation with a group of technical men, that somebody higher up the ladder would disagree and wipe my recommendation. That is not the way to build a good city. Those who look after the planning of Canberra must be practical men constituting a committee or commission and they should not be over ruled by any department.

(Continued on page 825)

SENATE CANBERRA COMMITTEE

MR. SMITH: It must be under the Minister, or it must be an independent statutory body. At least it should be of no lower status than a body under the direct control of the Minister. I shall quote again from the report that I previously mentioned which was prepared in 1946 -

"During the past few years it has become apparent that a complete review of the whole question of the development of Canberra is necessary before any fundamental works are permitted. Modern application of town-planning principles is very different now from what it was when the Griffin plan was evolved, and it is certain that had its designer continued to implement his plan he would have amended many of the original features to meet the convenient needs of the people of today."

I am a great believer in the fact that the technical man should be in charge of the planning. Technical men should be unhampered in putting forward opinions and reports, and the government should only come in -

SENATOR BENN: When the money is to be found?

MR. SMITH: ~~Thank you~~. That is not as serious a matter as a lot of people think, because ultimately the necessary money will be found. If it is not found immediately it will be found over the years and the whole development will proceed according to the money available. I often fight aldermen and other persons who tell me that the plans they require are not to cost more than a certain amount. I say that the plan has to cost so much, and that it is only a matter of time. I say that if we do not do the job in three years we shall do it in 50 years, and the money will be found as the job is completed. To try to work out costs with the present state of our money is quite impossible.

The Committee that I was in charge of did a lot of work. We tried to ascertain the economic optimum population for Canberra over the years. On our last finding, submitted in 1946, we stated that the population of Canberra at the end of 1954 would be 31,400. I believe

SENATE CANBERRA COMMITTEE

that it was about 29,000. We worked out figures up to 1971, and at that stage we estimate that there will be 55,000 to 60,000 people there.

SENATOR VINCENT: That is assuming that all the Government departments will be transferred to Canberra by 1971?

MR. SMITH: That is so. Of course the estimates will have to be changed from time to time, but it is interesting to notice that we are not very far out in our 9 years' estimate. With regard to the future of Canberra, I do not think it is too late to make sure that the city will become the pride and joy of the Government, the people of Canberra and, indeed, all Australia. The city is still going through its growing pains, but a city of the size of Canberra can be planned much more easily than a town like Rockdale which has about 80,000 people, and which I am at present engaged in planning. I have studied history mainly from the point of view of discovering past mistakes that have been made. I do not believe that I should study history and the development of towns in order to see what can be done in the future. The vital question is what type of town is required. If the Government has its say it might say that it has to be a Government city. That is why I say a technical group should be brought in and it should tell the Government what sort of town Canberra should be. Then the Government should just take its own part in its own function, its administration and so on. The type of technical man required is very important and I believe the top man in any such group should be a sociologist. That is a nice academic term, but there are such men, and as an example I mention Lewis Mumford who is not an architect, but is a world authority on this aspect of ^{town planning} ~~architecture~~. He looks at the whole city and considers how to plan it so it can function economically for the good of society. I believe that the technical man available who know much about town planning are architects, engineers and surveyors. But naturally the architect is the most suitable man to do the job, mainly because of the type of work that he does. He is designing different buildings

all the time to suit different people, and to understand their social needs. After all, the framework of planning a city is not much dissimilar to the framework of planning a building. If I were asked to nominate somebody to be in charge of a group such as that which I have mentioned, I would nominate an architect-trained man who is also a planner, but who is mainly interested in sociology. The planner's task is most complex, and I prefer, in this initial chat, to mention broad aspects of his work. I shall mention the way in which we may try to evolve a physical plan of a city which is workable. That is the secret of all economic planning. In other words, the city must be organic. While I was listening to the evidence given yesterday by Mr. Harris, I brought out my map of the development of Canberra and noticed that in 1933 there were houses at one end of a particular suburb and no more houses until you reached the other end. The groups of houses were about four miles apart and the population then was about 3,000. That was one way in which the Griffin plan was perhaps wrong, but in its administration and control it was radically wrong. ^{But} Temporary planners today will try to evolve a physical plan which they will attempt to bring about over the years, by organic planning and the grouping of neighbourhood units. They are doing an organic grouping job within a certain radius, and as that group develops and gets close to saturation point they will allow the next organic unit to develop slowly. Therefore, at one stage, they may have three organic groups developing at the same time. I think that such a method should be carried out with the new plan, and it could be done in Canberra. However, it needs fairly efficient regulation and control, and I do not think that the administration to the present time has ever taken that into consideration. The administration believes that if a person wants to live at point X., the person should be allowed to go there. I do not know the exact population of Canberra, but in the County of Cumberland people often buy cheap land on the fringe of the city, they force councils to build a road to the land, and sooner or later there are people building all over that area. That brings about ribbon

development in areas that have no services or ~~autonomy~~ ^{economy}. I believe that another physical master-plan is needed for Canberra. I do not say that the old plan should be radically altered, because that is a matter for the expert. But it is not too late to go into the whole matter and study a new master plan based on an optimum figure of population arrived at after investigation. We could base the plan on perhaps the next 25 years. There must be an administrative ordinance to control that plan and to ensure that it is not upset in any of its broad principles. I do not think that the master planner should have to worry about a lot of minor detail, because that will not really affect the issue as to whether you have an economic city or not. It may affect the appearance of the city, but I shall speak of that matter later. The plan must be statutory, but it must be organic in its conception, otherwise it is doomed to failure. The statutory plan must be one subject to review over so many years - three or five years - and it must be prepared by technical men. I say again, because of my experience with the Government for two years doing nothing but town planning, and because of work on my own account, that the technical body must be based essentially on consultants. The main members of the body must be consultants. I had in mind a planning body, but if we cannot get that with ad hoc authority and independent of the Government, it should have a status no lower than that of a body under the direct control of a Federal Minister. I believe that there should be one planning committee for each Federal territory, and the bodies will have to consist of paid servants employed part-time to do each specific task. The Chairman of the body should be a sociologist architect, and then there should be a civil engineer and a surveyor who are certified planners. There could be a nominee from the Treasury, a nominee from the Department of the Interior, a town planner of the Department of the Interior, an expert in local government, and two members drawn from the Canberra citizens. There might be one from a citizens' committee and one from the Chamber of

SENATE CANBERRA COMMITTEE.

commerce. There would be nine voting members and a member from the Defence Department without a right to vote. A group like that should be asked by the Commonwealth Government to prepare a planning scheme for Canberra, to prepare an ordinance to control the development of Canberra, and to indicate that the ordinance, together with the plan, is to be reviewed every so many years - possibly five years. That body could do an independent job.

I do not hold the view of many other planners that the functions of planning and administration and building should be a joint concern, mainly because planning has to be unfettered by Government influence. I have seen excellent town planners get into a government position and become mediocre. That is not good enough for a city, especially Canberra. Men who are unfettered do have no axes to grind can put their hearts and souls into this job. If you choose the right men I think that you will get the right plan. As the plan gets under way the money will become available, probably under pressure on the Government.

Regarding the actual administration of the ordinance prepared by this authority, I believe that it can be administered by a department such as the Department of the Interior, and at a later stage it might be administered by organizations similar to local government groups. I see much value in local government groups, but I think that they should interest themselves only in services and not in broad planning principles. The implementation could be done through the Department of Works and Housing as the money is made available. One matter makes this problem a little different from others, and that is that most of the land in Canberra is held on 99 year lease, and in many cases private enterprise develops the property. In the Cumberland area and in most other areas the land tenure is freehold, which would lead one to think that a different set of conditions would apply to Canberra. However, I believe that in the long run the tenure will make no difference because there are certain values inherent in property and only a small part of the 99 year lease has at present expired. Therefore I do not

SENATE CANBERRA COMMITTEE

think that land tenure will make much difference in regard to planning development, although it might have if the leases had but a small time to run. In the case of Rockdale, whenever we try to zone an area for a use different from the present use we come up against the problem of compensation for injurious affection. That is also a terrific problem in the Cumberland County Council scheme where about £300,000,000 has been claimed from the council for injurious affection.

If somebody prepares a plan for Canberra and we decide to zone a certain area as part farmland and part residential, we must decide what rights those people will have. In Canberra it will be simple, because people will not be able to develop vacant land for any other than the zoned purpose. The claims for injurious affection are almost upsetting our planning schemes in Cumberland, because if the council has to pay about £300,000,000 out to land owners, good night to the planners. I do not think that that problem will occur to such a degree in Canberra because there is much vacant land to develop, and there will therefore be a minimum of injury to owners or tenants. Nevertheless, people will have the democratic right to claim compensation for injury.

SENATE CANBERRA COMMITTEE

MR. SMITH (Continuing): I have certain opinions on the road pattern of Canberra, density, and design of buildings. Whilst I may not be able to answer specific questions because I do not remember Canberra in detail, I am quite prepared to answer questions of broad policy relating to those matters.

There is one other point that I should like to mention. In reading through evidence already given to this Committee I find that there has been discussion on the design of buildings, both private and governmental. I believe that the ^{appearance of} important buildings of the city could, to a degree, be divorced from the plan ^{ning} that I hope will be perpetrated by this authority. I feel that one is architecture and the other is planning. The planning committee could for instance limit the height of certain buildings or suggest that certain things be done, but the actual design of the buildings themselves has nothing to do with the town planning. I feel that the only way to control ^{the appearance of} good buildings is through what I call a fine arts commission or its equivalent. I do not necessarily think that ^a competition is a good thing. There are many problems associated with it. I do not think that departmental architecture is necessarily good. The departmental architect tends to become mediocre after a while. He has conflicting interests and often cannot allow his architectural ability to come to the fore. A fine arts commission should be the body that determines the value or even the designs of some of the buildings.

With regard to buildings of a lesser light, the town planning ordinance might tend to control the type of development but not necessarily ^{the appearance of the} actual buildings themselves. That would be left to the administration of say, the Department of the Interior. Another point is that I do not believe in controlling the design of small buildings to be built by private money. I think that is wrong in principle. One witness before this Committee said that unless there was control there would be outrages and buildings blatantly different to those next door would be erected. If I were to agree to that, I would only be perpetrating a mediocre city. In 50 years time our approach to ^{design} planning may be quite different to what it is today.

SENATE CANBERRA COMMITTEE

If we, in the 1920s or the 1930s^{not} design standards and impose conditions on future buildings, we will always have a city of the 1920s or the 1930s. We shall just have to suffer the development that will come about by design and architecture. I hope the face of the city will change over the long years. I think it is wrong to impose strict design conditions on private enterprise in the erection of small buildings.

THE CHAIRMAN: Do you find a big difference in the problems confronting you in Rockdale on the one hand and at Baulkham Hills on the other?

MR. SMITH: Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: Why?

MR. SMITH: They are quite different. One is a shire which is about 20 miles long and a few miles wide. It ~~is an~~^{has} urban settlement in rural green belt country, and the other is a built-up, semi-industrial area.

THE CHAIRMAN: The Baulkham Hills experience would be closer to what is likely to happen in Canberra?

MR. SMITH: Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: Did I understand you to say that we could be prepared virtually to scrap the whole Griffin Plan and get a new master plan?

MR. SMITH: I may have hinted at that. What I mean is that if an expert committee such as I have suggested were to report that the plan should be scrapped, then it should be scrapped.

THE CHAIRMAN: Do you recommend an expert committee for that specific purpose?

MR. SMITH: No. I recommend that an expert committee be set up to investigate and prepare a plan for Canberra - for the real Canberra. Whether that committee bases its plan on the Griffin Plan or finds another scheme, is a matter for itself.

THE CHAIRMAN: Would you care to indicate some specific modifications of the Griffin Plan that you regard as essential?

SENATE CANBERRA COMMITTEE

MR. SMITH: I cannot do so in detail because it is nine years since I had anything to do with the matter.

THE CHAIRMAN: You spoke earlier of "minor" details. Can you give us an illustration? The terms "major" and "minor" are rather vague.

MR. SMITH: Take for instance the development of the Duntroon area. There are certain main roads circumnavigating that area. The planning committee of which I have spoken would possibly zone land in an area like that for special purposes. But it would not necessarily determine the width of every road. The details could be left possibly to the Department of the Interior. The present town planning section of that Department could perhaps be retained, with Mr. Gibson in charge, or the work might even be done by the Department of Works.

THE CHAIRMAN: Have you any definite opinions on the widths of main thoroughfares?

MR. SMITH: I hate to be nebulous, but I think it is a matter of determining what the traffic volume will be on a particular thoroughfare at a particular time. A planning authority would prepare a master plan for an optimum population of say 100,000. It would know from the road layout and the distribution of traffic flow to and from offices where the traffic would move say between 8.30 a.m. and 9 a.m. That could be done without much trouble. It would then be possible to determine the width of the roads.

THE CHAIRMAN: The National Capital is somewhat different from other towns in that, at certain times, it has to cope with a very large influx of visitors. That would necessitate some very wide streets?

MR. SMITH: It may.

THE CHAIRMAN: With several lanes of traffic?

MR. SMITH: I agree with that. That can be determined on the basis of the normal traffic flow plus the additional demands that will be made by such an event as a carnival, the sitting of the Parliament, or perhaps a visit by the Queen. These things would be taken into consideration and a scientific analysis made.

SENATE CANBERRA COMMITTEE.

THE CHAIRMAN: Would you say that leasehold tenure makes it easier to carry out planning changes than would be the case if the land were freehold?

MR. SMITH: From the legal and administrative point of view, yes. It may make it a little easier, but not very much. From the financial point of view there would be very little difference.

THE CHAIRMAN: You think that the leasehold system could be adhered to?

MR. SMITH: So far as democratic planning goes, I think it could be.

THE CHAIRMAN: Do you think that changes in the existing plan should be determined by an individual or by a planning group?

MR. SMITH: I think it must be a planning group. Much as I might admire one individual's ability, he might, in all sincerity, prepare a plan that had faults, and those faults would be perpetuated.

THE CHAIRMAN: You have said that, with regard to private building, you would have no controls?

MR. SMITH: That is in respect of design.

THE CHAIRMAN: But you would have certain standards relating to building materials and so on.

MR. SMITH: Yes. I would have a very strict building code.

THE CHAIRMAN: You would have unlimited scope for experimentation and design?

MR. SMITH: Yes. I think it is quite wrong to have control over design because it is something abstract.

THE CHAIRMAN: You are referring to dwellings?

MR. SMITH: Essentially, yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: What is your attitude with regard to shopping centres?

MR. SMITH: I feel that it depends on the type of shopping centre and here I have strong personal views. I believe that most shopping centres should be of the precinct type.

SENATE CANBERRA COMMITTEE

MR. SMITH (speaking): At Civic Centre all the shops are on the outside of a square which is bad planning. The position should be reversed. Civic Centre should be planned as two LL's with an open mouth on one side.

THE CHAIRMAN: Would you allow a limited scope for the decoration of buildings?

MR. SMITH: I would control the erection of such things as ^{buildings} ~~things~~ which could affect the proper functioning of the area. If the land is leasehold the local authority would have a democratic right to control it. I would restrict the height of buildings. I do not see how the particular design of each building could be restricted if private enterprise erected its own structures. But I think that applications for building permits should be referred to a committee which would endeavour to achieve a unity of design.

SENATOR BENN: You said that the Durley Griffin plan was bad. Was it always bad?

MR. SMITH: I think so.

SENATOR BENN: What was its chief defect?

MR. SMITH: Its chief defect is purely innate in the author of the design. In my opinion, he did not design a town on contemporary good town planning principles. The man had grandiose ideas which will result in many parts of the city being very nice when it is complete. I favour grandeur in certain parts of the city rather than throughout the city as a whole. One should then proceed with the economic planning of the rest of the area.

SENATOR BENN: How would your plan for Canberra differ from Griffin's?

MR. SMITH: First, one has to determine how big the population of the city will be.

SENATOR BENN: Suppose that you were given that information.

MR. SMITH: I would approach the problem on the basis of what planners call "neighborhood units". These would be precinct living areas containing about 4,000 people each. No main artery

would pass through them. Each neighborhood unit would have its own local facilities and services including schools which would be within half a mile walking distance of any school children. A city of 16,000 people, for example, would have four of these neighborhood units. Those four units might require a main shopping centre and a high school which should be close to the physical centre of the four units.

SENATOR BENN: Can you tell me a city in Australia that has been developed according to this theory?

MR. SMITH: No.

SENATOR BENN: Can you tell me of any in England?

MR. SMITH: Yes. Litchworth and other new towns have been developed on this principle; also all the Green Belt towns in the U.S.A.

SENATOR BENN: I think that you recommended that a city should be self-supporting?

MR. SMITH: I do not recollect using those exact words. I think I said that it should be as economically self-supporting as a city could be.

SENATOR BENN: Do you think that it was ever possible to make Canberra an economic unit?

MR. SMITH: My approach would be to make it as economically self-supporting as possible. I do not see why the government which needs only a main administrative triangle should carry the burden of the cost of services for the whole city.

SENATOR BENN: I should like you to give the Committee a picture of your ideas. How would Civic Centre appear today if your ideas had been given expression?

MR. SMITH: At the moment, Civic Centre is nothing more than one of three or four shopping centres. Presumably, it is intended to serve about 14,000 people. I consider that the logical position for Civic Centre would be about the physical centre of the area in which those 14,000 people live. But it is necessary to ask whether Civic Centre is intended always to be a shopping centre

only for that population.

SENATOR BENN: Certain people who have given evidence to the Committee believe that one main centre is necessary in every city for the concentration of commercial activity.

MR. SMITH: If that contention is accepted, Civic Centre might be a good position for such a centre. But apparently it has not been decided whether there will be one main centre or not.

SENATOR BENN: What is your view concerning the situation of Parliament House? Would you say that it was on a good site?

MR. SMITH: That is a difficult question to answer. I know of no objection to it but there may be a better location.

SENATOR BENN: It has been proposed that government buildings should be erected in what has been called an "administrative triangle". Would you have any objection to the government offices being located in that administrative triangle?

MR. SMITH: I do not think so. However, in order to make a firm decision, I would need to know the number of people who would be there, the distance that they would have to travel to work, and the traffic congestion that might be created. From the aesthetic or administrative points of view I cannot say that it would be undesirable to locate government buildings there.

SENATOR BENN: It would be natural to have residential areas around the industries?

MR. SMITH: Care would have to be exercised in that respect. I agree that people should not have to travel too far from their homes to the industry but care should be taken to avoid interference by industry with the amenities of a residential area.

SENATOR BENN: Can you tell me what is wrong with Canberra?

MR. SMITH: It is essential that the lines of travel from one part of a city to another should not be extended unnecessarily. I think that Canberra could retain certain open areas and still be more compact than it is now. From my general knowledge of Canberra I would say that it should have more of the amenities

and services which normal towns have. I think that industry could be developed there. Industry could be zoned into certain areas, possibly set apart from the living areas by a small green strip. That could be done quite easily.

(Continued on page 840)

SENATOR BENN: Do you think that the present plan will prevent Canberra from functioning as an ideal city?

MR. SMITH: Yes, but if an expert committee were allowed to go into the matter, and possibly use the best points of the existing plan, or arrive at their own conclusions regarding a new plan essentially for zoning, it would be much better both economically and for the Commonwealth. I do not think that the present plan is basically a good one.

SENATOR BENN: I think you said that Griffin did not prepare any administrative details of the plan. Do you know that of your own knowledge?

MR. SMITH: No, I believe that there were some reports available about what Griffin would have liked to have done in certain areas.

SENATOR BENN: Burley Griffin was an administrative officer in Canberra?

MR. SMITH: There was a statutory plan but no statutory administrative ordinance.

SENATOR VINCENT: I wish to ask whether it is your opinion that the Griffin plan is basically wrong?

MR. SMITH: Yes, I am prepared to say that.

SENATOR VINCENT: Can you tell me what is basically wrong with it?

MR. SMITH: I thought that I had made that clear, but I shall repeat myself. I did not want to produce the little booklet I have here because it contains only theories and is written for lay people. When I wrote this book I took a practical application of my theories and used Canberra as an example. Of course, it is easy to use theories, and such activity is not of great value. However, I show you a plan in that book, and I shall leave that book with the Committee. ~~I hope that it will be returned.~~ The book was written in 1944 when planning was coming into its own, and when we were trying to get people interested.

SENATE CANBERRA COMMITTEE

SENATOR VINCENT: Can you put your theories into words that I can understand?

MR. SMITH: Yes, assume that it is desirable to have a waterway, for aesthetic purposes, along where the present lakes are proposed. My approach might have been to have the population divided more equally on either side of the waterway, with activities based more in the centre of each population area. Consider the Duntroon area. We might get 4,000 people in such an area, which would give a reasonable density of population. Each group of 4,000 people would require a shopping centre and a public school. These facilities should be built to suit the 4,000 people.

SENATOR VINCENT: Your objection to the Griffin plan is that its zoning is ineffective?

MR. SMITH: I know of no zoning in the Griffin plan, other than the treatment of certain isolated shopping centres, and maybe something in the Government triangle. There are no zoning and planning principles such as those which we accept today as being paramount. I know of no principle that there shall be a school for every 4,000 people. When you get 16,000 people there might be enough children to support a high school. When the demand is there, we should be able to build a high school because it will be economical.

SENATOR VINCENT: I do not understand why your principles cannot be implemented on the Griffin plan and, indeed, I suggest that they are being implemented. For example there are three main shopping centres to serve about 30,000 people. Is that not in accordance with your principles?

MR. SMITH: Yes, but I said that this was a bad plan when it was conceived, and it must be bad if it was not conceived on correct town-planning principles.

SENATOR VINCENT: Would it be a good plan if the shopping centres, schools and other civil requirements are geographically placed in convenient localities?

MR. SMITH: If that could be done in this plan, I think there could be no serious objection.

SENATOR VINCENT: Why can it not be done with the Griffin plan?

MR. SMITH: You are asking me to answer a question that would need a better answer than Yes or No. I see evidence in many areas where it can be.

SENATOR VINCENT: If it can be done under that plan, your objection to the plan would not be very substantial?

MR. SMITH: On the contrary. I said the plan was a bad plan, and because it may work now with some efficiency does not alter the fact that it is bad. It may work with more efficiency as we bring the experts in to modify it.

SENATOR VINCENT: If it was a bad plan but now is a good one, we need not worry about the past. If your requirements for the public can be met on the old plan, surely your objection to the plan ceases to exist?

MR. SMITH: I cannot agree with that. My objection is that the plan is uneconomical at the moment, whether it is Griffin's fault or the fault of the administration.

SENATOR VINCENT: You stated that there was a disadvantage because of people living so far apart. You mentioned one house at the southern end of the city which would be about four miles from a house at the northern end. While that may be a disadvantage at the moment, surely it can be rectified in relation to closer settlement without altering the plan?

MR. SMITH: May I ask you a question, sir? What do you mean by altering the plan?

SENATOR VINCENT: I mean what you mean.

MR. SMITH: That is hardly fair. I mean in altering the plan do we alter the main zoning and the main service requirements.

SENATOR VINCENT: May I ask a question in your own terms. If the economic disadvantages of the plan, which you have postulated

and with which I agree, can be rectified on the present plan, would you suggest that the plan is bad on economic grounds?

MR. SMITH: At the moment, yes, but all that we are doing is accepting something that was not the best and making it as economical as possible.

SENATOR VINCENT: You agree that the density of population, which was the gist of this particular economic argument, can be altered to suit the taste of the planner from time to time?

MR. SMITH: No, I disagree with the last part of your statement, because there are two parts to a plan - the physical layout and the administrative control.

SENATOR VINCENT: I am referring to planning under your own terms?

MR. SMITH: This is administrative control, and immediately I want the city to be economically designed, I do not endeavour to pull every building down, but I try to institute administrative controls, through ordinances, to control certain developments and to control certain areas.

SENATOR VINCENT: Surely the planning, in your context, need not be modified or altered so as to alter the relative density of the population in a given area?

MR. SMITH: That presumes that there is an existing density arrangement. That will be modified, whether we like it or not.

SENATOR VINCENT: I suggest that it may be modified without altering the plan?

MR. SMITH: Yes.

SENATOR VINCENT: I am particularly interested in the function or the aim of Canberra. We all agree that its first function is to be a place to house the Government and its administrators. Have you any views on any other aim that we should endeavour to achieve in relation to the optimum development of Canberra?

MR. SMITH: Yes, it has to be a seat of government. We want

it to be that, but there is no reason why the city should not be allowed to develop in a more normal way.

SENATOR VINCENT: How should Canberra be encouraged to develop?

MR. SMITH: One essential is to prepare an ordinance so that people will know where they are going, and what they can get in those various areas. Consider industry, for example. Nine years ago there was the usual talk about industry, and we believe that a lot of light industry of a suitable type should be sponsored by low freight rates, and that sort of thing.

SENATOR VINCENT: What type of industry should be encouraged?

MR. SMITH: Secondary industry essentially, without mentioning particular types, because I might have to know the sort of industries that it would be wise to put there.

SENATOR VINCENT: Can you give us illustrations of suitable secondary industries?

MR. SMITH: It would depend on the type of produce and so on that would come from the back country.

SENATOR VINCENT: What should be the policy in regard to the encouragement of industry in Canberra?

MR. SMITH: I think that a special area should be zoned so that it will be known that that is where industry is to go.

SENATOR VINCENT: What type of industry should be fostered. Would you foster a steelworks?

MR. SMITH: That is not a secondary industry. I would not necessarily foster a steelworks. As I understand the term secondary industry, it is the same as the phrase used in the Cumberland County Council ordinances. Secondary industry is the processing of basic materials, which processing does not create any nuisances. A cannery might be a suitable industry or any other processing plant for household goods, clothing and the like.

SENATOR VINCENT: There is a most important significance attached to Canberra as a Federal capital, in relation to industry.

Would you suggest that the Australian Federation of States would be very happy about the Federal Government sponsoring canneries in Canberra?

MR. SMITH: They may not be happy.

SENATOR VINCENT: Would it be within the spirit of our Federation for the Federal Government to compete with State instrumentalities?

MR. SMITH: You mentioned the word "sponsor". Do you mean financial inducements?

SENATOR VINCENT: Yes.

MR. SMITH: I do not think it is wrong.

SENATOR VINCENT: Do you not consider it to be against the spirit of federation for the Federal Government to compete with the States, whose function it is to foster industry?

MR. SMITH: It may be, but I do not think that I am here to discuss that question, with respect to the Committee. I am interested only in the economic function of a city, and a city with the population of Canberra requires certain things.

SENATOR VINCENT: Would there be any objection to fostering industry in Queanbeyan?

MR. SMITH: If that is done Queanbeyan will possibly compete with Canberra, and I believe that Canberra will naturally tend to develop more than Queanbeyan, and that Canberra is the logical choice.

SENATOR VINCENT: You would not interfere with the design of buildings by private entrepreneurs? Have you recently seen Lonsdale Street in Canberra?

MR. SMITH: I have not been to Canberra for eight or nine years.

SENATOR VINCENT: Lonsdale Street is an example of unfettered architectural designs by private persons. What objection have you to low density population in a city, apart from economic reasons?

MR. SMITH: I would like you to name a figure.

SENATOR VINCENT: Consider the density of Canberra at

present, which I believe is low in relation to, say, Paddington in Sydney?

MR. SMITH: Using the word "low" in the sense of not normal, the question answers itself. You get so many more road services and other services to maintain in a low density population for the number of people catered for.

SENATOR VINCENT: Your objection is purely economic?

MR. SMITH: Not only that. Unless the town is carefully planned there are long distances to travel. A horizontal city is more costly, and there is a happy normal.

SENATOR VINCENT: Where do you draw the line in Canberra?

MR. SMITH: In Australia about 75% of the people like to live in their own homes, and it is not for me to say that is right or wrong. At the moment, therefore, we should allow for a density based on dwelling units of ~~85%~~^{75%}, with reasonably-sized allotments, reasonably-sized roads and reasonable services, which conception automatically covers the conception of density.

SENATE CANBERRA COMMITTEE.

SENATOR VINCENT: Would you say that the present policy with respect to density is wrong?

MR. SMITH: I do not know what the policy is. Has it been decided that in such and such an area there will be a certain density?

SENATOR VINCENT: It can be worked out. There is a uniform policy on the size of private building allotments and that would govern density to a great extent.

MR. SMITH: I would say that I do not object to the net density, that is the density of housing subdivisions, but when it comes to gross density one finds there is so much more land that is used for purposes other than living, it becomes uneconomic. Excluding the government triangle where you want this effect, let us have honest to goodness scale living quarters. The overall density is a little low because of the uneconomic planning possibly around the net areas.

SENATOR VINCENT: Take for example Manuka which is fairly well established. Would you say that the density in that area is too low?

MR. SMITH: I would say that it was possibly a little low by contemporary standards but that would not necessarily worry me so long as the house allotments were not unduly large and I do not think they are.

THE CHAIRMAN: Do you think that if the Government builds the office accommodation that is necessary and provides homes for public servants it will be doing enough to encourage industry in Canberra? That alone would build the population up to about 60,000 and thus provide a solid market. In addition, of course, Canberra will be a tourist centre and that will enlarge the market considerably. Do you not think that will be sufficient to attract enough retail trade to Canberra?

MR. SMITH: Of the figure of 60,000 that you mention, how many would be public servants?

THE CHAIRMAN: We cannot say exactly but I think we can assume that there would be about 15,000 families.

SENATE CANBERRA COMMITTEE

MR. SMITH: That means that the whole of the population of 60,000 would be dependent on the Public Service?

THE CHAIRMAN: My feeling is that such a population, in itself, would provide an inducement to industry.

MR. SMITH: I agree with that but I was looking for something further. I was looking for the possibility of ^{other} employment as well which would be a further inducement.

THE CHAIRMAN: In addition of course there is the National University and the Canberra University College which will eventually be a full Undergraduate University. They will attract a lot more people. Then there are boarding schools which attract children from outside Canberra and I am sure that more such schools will be established. So, as a Public Service town, an educational town, and a tourist centre, I think Canberra will provide a market sufficiently big to attract all the industry that is needed there. Business people are aware of what is happening. Already certain big firms have become interested and of course, the small businesses are expanding.

MR. SMITH: On that basis Canberra may be expected to be a city of about 90,000 people when all public servants have been transferred there.

THE CHAIRMAN: That is my view.

(The witness withdrew)

SENATE CANBERRA COMMITTEE

CYRIL JOHN FARRINGTON, Architect, and

MERTON EARL HERMAN, Architect, both of Sydney, sworn and examined:

THE CHAIRMAN: Do you propose to make a statement, Mr. Herman?

MR. HERMAN: I should like to put a few personal views before the Committee. I think that the original plan for Canberra as a whole is now outmoded and that it should be reconsidered from two points of view. One is the circulation of traffic within the city; the other is the civic treatment of future buildings. The principles on which Canberra was conceived resulted from a reaction against the growth of cities during the 19th century ^{and as Canberra} which became far too "exploded"; that is to say that the limits of the city were too far divorced one from the other. In the development of Canberra I think that an enormous recovery could be made in order to make it one of the greatest cities in the world. That would require careful consideration of what I shall call "civic requirements" instead of what is commonly called "town planning".

I think that the whole attitude of the designers towards the future buildings of Canberra should be governed by modern developments. As a nation we have a tradition, but we are in the general flow of world events and I think that our architecture should reflect those events. I shall elaborate that opinion further, as questions are asked.

THE CHAIRMAN: Would you like to make any special points concerning the flow of traffic?

MR. HERMAN: Not in detail. But it would have been a great advantage if Canberra had developed from the centre outwards instead of parts of the city being in isolated positions. Future development should aim to build in units which are related to each other. It is a great waste to have buses hauling people across the Canberra countryside in order to connect between parts of the city which should have been in greater proximity to each other.

THE CHAIRMAN: I take it that Griffin foresaw the inconvenience that would be caused at the beginning but assumed that the whole area would eventually be built on.

SENATE SUBCOMMITTEE

MR. HERMAN: I have heard that. But I have explored the writings of Griffin and have never been able to understand his mind.

THE CHAIRMAN: At one time it was proposed that temporary buildings should be built closer together than the plan provided but Griffin opposed that proposal and insisted on keeping to his plan.

MR. HERMAN: With his opposition to buildings of a temporary nature I would be entirely in accord. But I consider that it was wrong to build a perimeter type of city with isolated units.

THE CHAIRMAN: It would have been more sensible to have developed a couple of suburbs close to the governmental area and to have allowed the other suburbs to grow up later?

MR. HERMAN: Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: Would you elaborate on what you mean by "civic treatment" as opposed to "town planning"?

MR. HERMAN: Yes. Canberra is a very open city. It is very hard, in Canberra, to determine whether one is in the country or the city. "Civic treatment" would provide a nucleus of buildings in very close juxtaposition so as to give convenience and architectural dignity and grace. Civic Centre is so open that it could be taken for a village. I think that the buildings should have been grouped so as to form squares and give a sense of dignity. They would then have appeared as a city and not as buildings in a country side.

THE CHAIRMAN: I understand that the general idea is to have vistas along wide avenues running between public buildings. Would you be in favour of that treatment?

MR. HERMAN: I would favour it if the buildings were in sufficient proximity to give a sense of city development. At the moment, one does not get the feeling of a city in Canberra. That is mainly due to the wide dispersal of its buildings.

THE CHAIRMAN: You would not agree with the statement of the previous witness that the main use of trees is to hide buildings.

SENATE CANBERRA COMMITTEE

MR. HERMAN: I should like to think that they would not be required to hide the buildings of the future Canberra.

THE CHAIRMAN: Would you suggest that one man should be engaged to revise the whole master plan of Canberra?

MR. HERMAN: I think that that would be beyond the capacity of one man. I think that that job should be done by a small committee. I would appoint individual architects, designers, or planners to deal with parts of the city and their recommendations would be co-ordinated by the central committee.

THE CHAIRMAN: Would you favour the appointment of a committee to do a single job of general revision or would you favour a committee whose work would continue over a term of years?

MR. HERMAN: Prima facie, I should say that a continuing committee would be best.

THE CHAIRMAN: Who would you have on that committee besides architects?

MR. HERMAN: I would have engineers, surveyors and people who were versed in social problems.

THE CHAIRMAN: Would you want an artist such as a sculptor?

MR. HERMAN: I agree that that would be desirable.

THE CHAIRMAN: You are fairly familiar with Canberra?

MR. HERMAN: Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: Would you agree with a previous witness that there was not a single piece of sculpture or statuary of any artistic value in Canberra?

MR. HERMAN: No. There is some good work at the entrance to the new University House and there is also the King George V Memorial.

THE CHAIRMAN: You think that the King George V Memorial is quite good?

MR. HERMAN: It is, in my opinion.

THE CHAIRMAN: Do you like its position?

MR. HERMAN: No. It is too isolated.

SENATE CANBERRA COMMITTEE

THE CHAIRMAN: And don't you think that it blocks the view from Parliament House to the War Memorial?

MR. HERMAN: It seemed to me to be a little too insignificant to block the view but it is unfortunately placed.

THE CHAIRMAN: Could you give any general indication as to the sort of building that we should have for public buildings in Canberra?

MR. HERMAN: I think that my previous statement might cover that matter. If a committee of competent men is appointed to deal with the plan the result will be a city of architectural merit.

THE CHAIRMAN: Do you agree that what has been termed a "monumental" type of building should be either built in stone or have stone facing?

(Continued on page 855)

SENATE CANBERRA COMMITTEE

MR. HERMAN: I really cannot answer that, it would depend on the site and the circumstances of the building. Normally, I should answer Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: Some witnesses have said that one should get the best type of architect and let him do what he likes. We have been told that if anybody watches the architect the result will be mediocre?

MR. HERMAN: You are taking me into very deep waters. The answer is halfway between the two extremes. A competent architect will generally lead the people to accept the building that should be there, but, frankly, I would not give an architect his head on Canberra. There should be a competent body to judge his work.

THE CHAIRMAN: There should be a body along the lines of the Fine Arts Commission in Washington?

MR. HERMAN: I do not think that we can build the city that we want without a controlling authority, the personnel of which, of course, should be hand-picked.

THE CHAIRMAN: As well as a controlling body you must have a good architect. What is the best method of obtaining a good architect?

MR. HERMAN: Take a ticket in the lottery.

MR. CHAIRMAN: You have to depend ultimately on someone's judgment?

MR. HERMAN: Yes, but you may also refer to the architect's work and his reputation, which will carry you a long way towards judging whether he is suitable for the job.

THE CHAIRMAN: You are familiar with most of the buildings that people will stop and look at in Sydney?

MR. HERMAN: Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: There used to be an old Scots Church in the position now occupied by the Presbyterian Assembly Hall?

MR. HERMAN: Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: That was a solid stone building. Would you say that that was a better building than the present assembly hall?

MR. HERMAN: On the ground of pure architectural design, yes.

But, on the ground of utility for the present purpose, you could not compare the two buildings. The old Scots Church was built within the tradition of its own time and the present church is an imitation of a past style which has not picked up the spirit of the style it was intended to copy.

THE CHAIRMAN: Would you say that that building is a failure?

MR. HERMAN: As ^{pure} a design ~~it~~ ^{is} a failure, ^{in my opinion} but as a functional building it is adequate.

THE CHAIRMAN: The artist has tried to convey the spirit of Reformation architecture, and I believe that he has failed?

MR. HERMAN: Yes, I think so.

THE CHAIRMAN: Is it possible for a good architect to succeed in reproducing, in modern times, a building which conveys the spirit of the former age?

MR. HERMAN: If he has the spark of genius in him, yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: Would you say that St. Andrews' Anglican Cathedral in George Street is a good building?

MR. HERMAN: Yes, I am so greatly an admirer of Blackett that I believe that anything he did is good.

THE CHAIRMAN: He also designed the Great Hall at the University of Sydney?

MR. HERMAN: Yes, he worked all over Australia.

THE CHAIRMAN: Some people have told us that modern architecture should not be hampered by tradition, but if we let some modern architects loose at Canberra the result might be a city of glass houses?

MR. HERMAN: I think that the fear you mention is rather past now. We went ^{so} very far into copyism in the Victorian era that there had to be a revival of truth and honesty in architecture. That revival started like all revivals by being very radical in its nature and by going to extremes. Australia is normally about 30 years behind the rest of the world in such matters and we are now getting

to the peak of the modern revival. Consequently there is great accent on functionalism. However, there is a trend throughout the world to bring the humanities back into architecture, and when you get on with the plan of Canberra you will find that the architects will gradually bring that modern feeling to bear on the building of the city.

THE CHAIRMAN: Modern factories are better than any factories that were built in the olden days?

MR. HERMAN: Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: But the building of factories has so permeated architectural style that almost any building is likely to turn out to be like a factory?

MR. HERMAN: Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: You have seen the interior of University House. Do you like the Refectory?

MR. HERMAN: Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: It is a modern building but it conveys the spirit of the old University Hall?

MR. HERMAN: Yes, you ^{can} interpret the spirit without having to copy the detail of outmoded forms.

THE CHAIRMAN: You have made a close study of the architecture of the Macquarie period, and the period following. Do you say that that type of architecture as applied to Australia is beautiful and gracious?

MR. HERMAN: Yes in general, but for the present time, no. All those factors are founded on things that are now past. The house is more complicated than it used to be. The beautiful Georgian style came from the needs of the Georgian era and I think that at present it would look false. Of course there is no reason why the spirit should not be retained.

THE CHAIRMAN: Is there more scope for experiment and individuality in residences than there is in buildings like Parliament House?

SENATE CONSTRUCTION COMMITTEE

MR. HERMAN: Every architectural problem is the same to me.

THE CHAIRMAN: There is a great difference in the modern house but there is no reason why the debating chambers in Parliament House should be changed. Their function has been the same for years?

MR. HERMAN: Yes, except that the chambers in the British Houses of Parliament used to be very bad, accoustically. The accoustics will control the design of a modern chamber, and not the architect's ideas.

THE CHAIRMAN: The introduction of microphones has made the accoustics of less importance?

MR. HERMAN: Perhaps so.

THE CHAIRMAN: Great public buildings should be impressive, not only to highly-cultured people, but also to everybody. The ordinary man should get the feeling of pride in the buildings where his laws are made?

MR. HERMAN: That is true.

THE CHAIRMAN: Is it possible to get buildings which satisfy the aesthetic tastes of the highly-cultivated and also other people?

MR. HERMAN: Yes, with a little compromise from both sides.

THE CHAIRMAN: I have read various architectural works and it seems to me that some architects believe that they know what buildings should look like and that nobody else has anything to do with it. But the consumer is to a large degree the judge?

MR. HERMAN: That is a natural attitude in all professions including those of the law and politics.

SENATOR HANNAFORD: You said you thought that the Griffin plan was outmoded?

MR. HERMAN: Yes.

SENATOR HANNAFORD: Would you not say that it is no more outmoded now than it was at its conception?

MR. HERMAN: I would not say so because the plan was part of the revival against the old conception of architecture and town planning.

SENATE CANBERRA COMMITTEE

SENATOR HANNAFORD: To some extent it repeats the experimentation carried out in other parts of the world such as Washington and New Delhi?

MR. HERMAN: In general it carries out those ^{ideas} designs, but the general concept is of an exploded town. Previously the buildings of cities used to be built close together but now the town planners believe that they should be far apart. I have seen suburban areas so planned that the people have to walk 300 yards to places that they usually go to.

SENATOR HANNAFORD: You would be horrified if I suggested that the grid-iron system was more effective and economical?

MR. HERMAN: Yes, as a general concept it has no relation to the means of traffic flow, vistas and amenities and so on. Canberra appears to be deliberately confused in regard to its streets to discourage the traffic flow except in main arteries.

SENATOR HANNAFORD: You said that the circulation of traffic was one of the chief drawbacks of Canberra. How could that be altered.

MR. HERMAN: You cannot cure what has been done to date. In the future you can see that the new parts of Canberra are considered in the light of the traffic flowing through them. Instead of having to cross the city to perform two functions people should be able to perform them in the one place.

SENATOR HANNAFORD: There seems to be a clash between the functional and the impressive?

MR. HERMAN. I agree. Function is about 80% of the building or town, and the remaining 20% relates to beauty or dignity, or whatever you want. If you go too far in one direction you get a succession of factories.

SENATOR HANNAFORD: The central triangle possesses some merit for the erection of impressive and imposing buildings?

MR. HERMAN: There are great potentialities there.

SENATOR RYAN: You said the Canberra plan was outmoded. Another witness said that the second phase of this development had been reached. What would be your reaction if some authority changed the City of Canberra and dropped the Griffin plan?

MR. HERMAN: I would use what is in the Griffin plan to satisfy the modern requirements of the city.

SENATOR RYAN: To develop Canberra outside the central triangle, should we eliminate the lake system?

MR. HERMAN: No, I would not be in favour of the elimination of the lakes. I would link the present groups of buildings and suburbs into a coherent whole. But that is too big a subject to speak lightly about.

SENATOR RYAN: Are you familiar with the development of Canberra's suburbs?

MR. HERMAN: I know Canberra fairly well but I have not been there for six months.

SENATOR RYAN: Are we not already providing assential facilities within the residential groups?

MR. HERMAN: I would say No. As it is at the moment it does not satisfy me.

SENATOR RYAN: What is your opinion of the Griffith area?

MR. HERMAN: Like most areas in Canberra, it is too widely dispersed. There are not enough shopping and other facilities available, and not sufficient transport to other parts of the city.

SENATE CANBERRA COMMITTEE.

SENATOR RYAN: That is a density problem?

MR. HERMAN: Yes.

SENATOR RYAN: Are you aware that there is a row of shops catering for the requirements of people in that area and also a modern school and kindergarteh and modern playgrounds?

MR. HERMAN: I can only say that having walked from certain parts of that suburb to the shopping centre, in my opinion, the somewhat feeble experiment is too concentrated. I am in favour of local business areas and not concentrations.

SENATOR RYAN: But all the facilities to which you referred are provided in that area?

MR.HERMAN: In one group.

SENATOR RYAN: There are even recreation grounds.

MR. HERMAN: Sports grounds I class as different to actual shopping areas.

SENATOR RYAN: But there is a row of shops and the transport service is good.

MR. HERMAN: I do not think you should have to take transport to do local shopping. That of course is my personal opinion.

SENATOR RYAN: But in other towns and cities people do not always have shops at their back doors.

MR. HERMAN: I think that, with the exception of Brisbane, which is rather like Canberra, most cities have shops within a quarter of a mile of residential areas. I agree that is not so in some new areas such as are to be found on the North Shore in Sydney. I think those localities could be greatly improved by an increase of local shopping facilities.

SENATOR HANNAFORD: You do not like the trend towards divorcing houses from shopping centres?

MR. HERMAN: By long distances, no.

SENATOR RYAN: You prefer a multiplicity of shops?

MR. HERMAN: Small well designed centres of shops, well dispersed.

SENATOR RYAN: That, I think is the way Canberra is

developing.

MR. HERMAN: It certainly has improved lately.

SENATOR RYAN: Do you feel disposed to comment on the types of homes that are being erected in Canberra?

MR. HERMAN: They are mostly fair to middling in design but I would not go beyond that.

SENATOR RYAN: Would you say that they are too spread out?

MR. HERMAN: That is hard to answer. On principle, I would say yes, but in Canberra where the landscape is so much part of the residential area, I would not criticise that too strongly.

SENATOR RYAN: Have you any opinion to offer on the desirability of tenement houses, terrace houses, or multi-storey dwellings? Such developments would of course increase the population density.

MR. HERMAN: I would say that in Canberra terrace houses are not very desirable although they may be a logical development in other cities. In regard to two-storey houses however I would say yes.

SENATOR RYAN: Perhaps with the growth of Canberra and the increase of its population, it may be necessary to turn to tenement and terrace houses in say 20 or 25 years time?

MR. HERMAN: It may even come to have sky-scraper flats.

SENATOR RYAN: The matter of public reservations is somewhat outside your ambit?

MR. HERMAN: I would sooner dodge that. Mr. Farrington will be able to answer those questions much better than I could.

SENATOR VINCENT: I take it that one of your objections to the Griffin Plan relates to the manner of the circulation of traffic?

MR. HERMAN: Yes.

SENATOR VINCENT: Am I right in saying that this undesirable state of affairs will automatically right itself when Canberra reaches its optimum population?

MR. HERMAN: Not if it is developed exactly on the present plan. Arterial roads will require greater development than

is provided for in the plan.

SENATOR VINCENT: That could be done without any material alteration of the present plan?

MR. HERMAN: Yes, I quite agree.

SENATOR VINCENT: You do not agree with the wide dispersal of buildings provided for in the Griffin Plan. Let us consider first public buildings. Do you consider that the existing locations of public buildings in the administrative triangle as we call it are too far apart?

MR. HERMAN: I could not be more emphatic in saying yes to that. They are so widely dispersed that they give no sense of civic unity.

SENATOR VINCENT: What do you mean by "civic unity"? Do you mean something like Martin Place in Sydney?

MR. HERMAN: Something a little more grand than that. I feel no different in spirit when I am in Barton than when I am in the civic triangle.

SENATOR VINCENT: Why not?

MR. HERMAN: Because one is a centre and the other is a living area.

SENATOR VINCENT: But surely the artistic, sentimental or ethical reaction should be the same if there is an attempt by the planner to preserve a pastoral atmosphere which should apply to the whole of the city, including the centre as well as the perimeter?

MR. HERMAN: I think the pastoral atmosphere is destroyed by a complete lack of contrast. It is all right to preserve a pastoral atmosphere if at certain important points you come to something which gives you the sense of city - a sense of buildings beautifully grouped, with scale and proportion, and conveying to the onlooker the feeling "Here are certain functions being carried on" and in such a way that one is fairly within the precinct of those activities.

SENATOR VINCENT: What would you say if one were to suggest that the public buildings are already too close together?

SENATE CANBERRA COMMITTEE

MR. HERMAN: I should have to fall back on saying that the person who said that and I are at opposite poles.

SENATOR VINCENT: With the greatest respect, do you not think that yours is a somewhat emotional reaction conditioned by a long tradition of closely knit cities such as Sydney, Melbourne and London?

MR. HERMAN: Not Sydney and Melbourne. London, possibly, and other great cities, yes.

SENATOR VINCENT: Do you not think that the Americans would give their very eyes for an opportunity to replan Washington with two or three times the space that they now have between buildings?

MR. HERMAN: Heaven forbid!

SENATOR VINCENT: I suggest that the Americans are really concerned with the lack of space in Washington.

MR. HERMAN: They may be concerned about a lack of space for buildings but I do not think they are concerned with the open spaces.

SENATOR VINCENT: I think it is a combination of both. You think that our public buildings should be closer together?

MR. HERMAN: That is an over-simplification of the view that they should be designed as an entity and a whole. If I had four or five days before the committee perhaps I could elaborate on that as fully as I should like to. My view is that the buildings are too dispersed.

SENATOR VINCENT: Would you say the same thing about our housing?

MR. HERMAN: No. I think that, for the present, you can leave that as it is. Then, by contrast, with my conception of the civic centre, there would be a juxtaposition of beautiful buildings with open spaces around them.

SENATOR VINCENT: Am I right in saying that, in your view, in order to appreciate the beauty of one building, you must have another so close to it that a comparison can be made?

MR. HERMAN: If you are creating a city, yes. If you are creating a building with a separate function, no. You must build a

SENATE CANBERRA COMMITTEE

city in which functions are closely and visually related.

SENATOR VINCENT: You will agree that the development of a federal capital should be different from that of a port?

MR. HERMAN: Yes. With skilful designing, the very nature of building will reveal itself in the design.

SENATOR VINCENT: Would you require, for example, a building close to our permanent Parliament House in Canberra so that you could see both buildings at a glance?

MR. HERMAN: That is difficult to answer without going deeply into the question of siting. Normally however I would say that Parliament House should be on a separate location. It is the centre of all those activities.

SENATOR VINCENT: Would you agree that it would be preferable to have Parliament House completely remote from any other building?

MR. HERMAN: That again is hard to answer. Instinctively I think it should be separated from the others.

SENATOR VINCENT: Then why do you want to join the other public buildings?

MR. HERMAN: When I say "separated" I mean not attached but grouped in such a way that its siting gives it the maximum importance in the city.

SENATOR VINCENT: When we build a city hall at Canberra - a building that must be of a dignity worthy of the Federal Capital - do you think it should be isolated from other buildings?

MR. HERMAN: Without considering the plan as a whole, I cannot answer that. It is a question of the relationship of all the buildings to each other and the nature of topography and so on.

SENATOR VINCENT: It is very difficult to generalise on these matters?

MR. HERMAN: Except with Parliament House, it is very difficult.

SENATOR VINCENT: As a generalisation however, you think that the public buildings are too widely dispersed at present?

SENATE CANBERRA COMMITTEE

MR. HERMAN: We should have more of the sense of a precinct.

SENATOR VINCENT: You do not agree that each building should be a complete artistic entity in itself?

MR. HERMAN: No. You would be building a lot of tiny cities instead of one big city if you did that.

SENATOR VINCENT: Do you think that, in the domestic architecture of Canberra, we have achieved what one might call the ideal Australian home for this part of the world?

MR. HERMAN: No.

SENATOR VINCENT: Have you any idea of what we lack in our domestic architecture in Canberra?

MR. HERMAN: Not in words, but there is a general mediocrity of design about Canberra houses.

SENATOR VINCENT. Do you include workmanship in that?

MR. HERMAN: Some of it is below average.

SENATOR VINCENT: What do you think is wrong with the designing? Can you suggest how the problem of improving designs could be overcome?

MR. HERMAN: If I may be facetious for a moment, wait 10 years until the students we are training in the principles of design, ^{and} building topography in Australia are at work and then we might get improvements.

SENATOR VINCENT: Is it a matter of not having sufficient good architects in the department to do the designing or is it a question of money?

MR. HERMAN: Australia has been in the architectural doldrums for many years. At present, in all matters of taste, culture and allied interests, Australia is entering a period of complete renaissance. In these very important aspects of social life, we have been depending on things that have gone before, but we are reaching the point when, in my opinion, in many fields of art and, if you like, in more spiritual fields, Australia is becoming more mature. That is why I am glad that the Canberra plan is being considered now. I think it will have the benefit of this maturity

SENATE CANBERRA COMMITTEE

of thought that is coming not only to architecture but also to the other arts.

SENATOR VINCENT: You think that circumstances will improve domestic standards and that no other action is necessary?

MR. HERMAN: As has been said, a certain number of architects are designing for Canberra. That is half the answer. But I think a little wider application of the architectural profession to the problem might help.

SENATOR VINCENT: Some witnesses have told us that nothing can be done and that we shall have to leave things to chance and hope for the best.

MR. HERMAN: I cannot agree with that. If you leave everything alone nothing will happen and the mere fact that this Committee is sitting around this table means that something is being done.

SENATOR VINCENT: I do not agree with that proposition myself. In fact I think we can do something perhaps by introducing a competition for domestic architecture in Canberra. Do you think that might assist?

MR. HERMAN: In a small way perhaps. A well conducted competition might help to raise standards.

SENATOR VINCENT: Are there any other ways we can assist?

MR. HERMAN: As I have said, by getting a wider field of the architectural profession to turn its mind to the problem. Then we can see what happens just as you would see what happened if a competition were held.

(Continued on page 867)

SENATE CANBERRA COMMITTEE

SENATOR VINCENT: Have you any views as to what should be the ultimate aims of Canberra as a city.

MR. HERMAN: I should like to see it kept as an administrative city.

THE CHAIRMAN: I take it that though you favour the buildings being grouped you would be quite willing to allow parks and trees in abundance?

MR. HERMAN: Yes - if they are used as part of the whole design.

THE CHAIRMAN: Would you allow complete freedom of design for private homes?

MR. HERMAN: There is some sort of censorship of design throughout Australia and I think that it would be desirable to have it in Canberra, too.

THE CHAIRMAN: Do you think that it would be a good idea to allow complete freedom of design for privately built homes in some part of Canberra?

MR. HERMAN: I would favour some experimentation along those lines.

THE CHAIRMAN: Do you think that little corner shops should be allowed?

MR. HERMAN: I have advocated small shopping centres as satellites to the main shopping centre.

THE CHAIRMAN: Do you think that there should be a grocer shop or a mixed business within reasonable walking distance of every residence? I do not like to have to walk more than a quarter of a mile when I want to make a small purchase.

MR. HERMAN: I agree that a quarter of a mile should be the greatest distance from any residence to a shopping centre.

THE CHAIRMAN: You do not think it is necessary to have one big shopping centre?

MR. HERMAN: I think that, besides the smaller shopping centres, it is desirable to have a place where shops such as furniture stores are located.

SENATE COUNCIL COMMITTEE

THE CHAIRMAN: I have heard criticism that one of the main faults of Canberra is that there is no main street.

MR. HERMAN: A main street does encourage the civic spirit. Unless people have the feeling that they are living with other people in a city, it is not a city.

THE CHAIRMAN: In a country town of reasonable size, people like to go to the main street, not only to do shopping, but to meet other people.

MR. HERMAN: It is a social necessity.

THE CHAIRMAN: Do you think that it is desirable to build an eight storey block of flats in a fairly prominent position as an isolated building in one suburb?

MR. HERMAN: It could be. If flats are designed with a sense of land usage they can be very good. If, instead of having dozens of houses spread over the landscape, one uses the same area of land for a block of flats to house an equivalent number of people, the result is a sense of openness which people can enjoy. So I should not rule out large blocks of flats.

THE CHAIRMAN: At present there are no very large buildings in Canberra. Until we have a mass of buildings in the governmental centre do you think it is desirable that attention should be focussed on a group of flats in the suburbs.

MR. HERMAN: I could only answer that question if I knew the site and background of the building.

THE CHAIRMAN: This one is at Civic Centre.

MR. HERMAN: Then perhaps we would get the grouping of buildings around it that I favour. But I do not think that it should dominate the city for ten years to come. I think that the Parliament House should dominate everything else in Canberra.

THE CHAIRMAN: Do you think that all private homes should be designed by an architect and that the speculative builder should not be allowed to build from a pattern?

MR. HERMAN: I do. Architecture is an art. Certain men have been trained in it and I think that it is foolish to waste their ability when it is available.

MR. FARRINGTON: I came here with the intention of not getting involved in matters of detail, if I could resist the temptation to do so, and I am sure that you have had plenty of detail. I came here to try rather to offer suggestions as to how to set up an organization to handle the planning of Canberra for the future.

It should be borne in mind that Canberra never has been planned, mainly because nobody knew what the requirements were. Griffin's plan could almost be called a scheme for landscaping Canberra, and, in a sense, you cannot blame him for that because the essential requirements of the city have never been fixed. Although much criticism can be levelled at the development of the city so far, my opinion is that in its main lines it is a sound basis on which to work. For example, I do not think that Canberra could be developed purely as an administrative centre, and there are many sociological reasons why there should be other activities in the city. Canberra could be developed, even with the vast expanses of water that Griffin envisaged, although possibly from a technical viewpoint they may not be realised, with a residential section on the north side of the water, an administrative centre where it is now, and industrial and other areas in the remainder of the city adjacent to the railway line. That would be a sound method of developing Canberra as a city containing all sorts of activities. Therefore, I feel that in its major principles the plan could be developed into a good city plan. The first thing to decide now is what we require. I think that we should have industry. People will not want to live in Canberra if their children have no alternative but to enter the public service, and I think it should be decided what industries are needed, what other activities are needed, and then steps should be taken - no matter how drastic - to ensure that those activities are attractive to Canberra. I have been told by Senator Vincent that it would be unconstitutional to offer a company taxation incentive to those companies which were prepared to go to Canberra, but I have such a thing in mind when I mention incentives. Subsidies, or complete exemption, in respect of transport charges on goods to and from

SENATE CANBERRA COMMITTEE

Canberra could also be considered. If you have an undesirable job to be done and you cannot get anyone to do it, you increase the wages until it is worth someone's while to take the job. Therefore, in my view you will decide what you want in Canberra and then set up circumstances to induce those activities to come there. Otherwise you will have a city full of public servants, a state of affairs which can never be completely satisfactory.

The main way to carry out my suggestions is to take the matter out of the hands of public servants. I agree that a representative commission should be set up, but I think that the actual planning can only be done satisfactorily by a competent individual in close touch with the commission. A city like Canberra is a work of art, and the buildings in it are works of art. Corporations do not produce works of art. Government departments do not produce works of art - works of art are only produced by individuals. Half a dozen highly-qualified individuals sitting on a committee do not produce works of art, in my view, because only one man can produce such works. I know it is a big job for one man, and I do not suggest that he should do the detailed work. However, I do suggest that he should be the planner for Canberra. For the first few years he will have a full-time job, but he should be a free agent and not an appointed public servant. Moreover, he should be a member of the commission. A commission/does not have such a man on it cannot study any questions in detail because it does not have the time to do so. Such a commission will meet perhaps once a month, will make its decisions then, but will have no time for the detailed study of planning. Such a study can only be done by a planner. I believe that the same principles should apply to public buildings. I do not agree that buildings should be rigidly controlled architecturally. I do not think that bodies produce fine buildings, I think that fine buildings are produced only by individual designers. Of course, I am not in favour of a free-for-all. Obviously, if a man plans a city his plan must be interpreted and the buildings in the city will interpret his plan. But I do not think that anybody should have

control over detailed matters of design. I believe that control of buildings in that manner produces mediocrity, and whenever architectural control of building design is suggested to me I try to think of the people who might be controlling it. When a man controls a town he does not want to have a 12-storey building fighting for supremacy with a 13-storey building. Therefore, he is entitled to volumetric control of the buildings in the town. He is not entitled to say that he does not like the look of a building and therefore the design will have to be altered. If he has volumetric control he can see that his plan is properly interpreted. The proper control of buildings is a control which ensures that they shall be designed by competent designers, whether they may be architects or not. I do not think that a government department should design buildings for Canberra. I believe that the government departments should have a say in the appointment of architects to design buildings, but I stoutly maintain that a department, a committee or a corporation, cannot successfully design buildings. I think that in the effort to get perfection in the buildings of Canberra, orderliness and so on, we shall only achieve a mediocre level. If we have such freedom we shall get some poor buildings, some mediocre ones and some remarkably good ones. Then we shall have contrast throughout the city. However, if we attempt to regiment the architect we shall have all medium class buildings and we shall be likely to achieve monotony. I believe that a few bad buildings in a city tend to contrast with the good ones. If you design a city in the way that I have suggested it is alive, but if you design it the other way it is dead - and will always be dead.

Those are the main principles that I desired to put before the Committee. The planning of the city must be the work of an individual. He could have a staff and be the captain of the team and still act as an individual. In that way we can produce a work of art. The big decision that has to be made of course, is the choice of a man to do the work. I do not think that that should deter anybody from

attempting to do it this way because that only means that you must make sure you appoint the right man. Such a man should be a town planner. After he has been putting his sketch plans before you for awhile, you can decide whether he is competent. I believe that Canberra started off the right way with the appointment of Burley Griffin. He may have been the wrong man, but the right method was adopted. I hold no brief for the architectural profession, although I am a member of it, and I believe that all buildings should be designed by competent designers, which is the only regimentation that I would introduce.

SENATOR VINCENT: Are some competent designers not architects?

MR. FARRINGTON: Some are.

THE CHAIRMAN: The press has given the impression that Burley Griffin was rather wrong in his ideas. I have come to the conclusion that he was a good man and that anything wrong with his plan was because of the time when it was drawn up. Do you agree that he was competent, artistic and imaginative?

MR. FARRINGTON: Yes.

MR. HERMAN: He was working with a set of requirements that at that time were rather nebulous, and he could not see Canberra in 1955. In his own sphere and time he did very well.

THE CHAIRMAN: The constitutional limitation that you mention is quite genuine. Apart from that do you not think that if the Government does certain things, and other things happen without the Government taking certain action, we shall go a long way towards getting a city with a variety of occupations? The Government will ultimately bring 15,000 to 20,000 public servants and their families to Canberra. The Australian National University and the Canberra University College will grow, and the latter may become a separate University. There are boarding schools in Canberra which will also grow, and there is a growing tourist traffic. Do you think that the market set up by

60,000 or 70,000 people will draw a reasonable amount of industry to Canberra.

MR. FARRINGTON: It might. If the organization is set up it will keep its finger on the movement of things and try to bring about measures that will forward the plan. If you are to have the industries necessary you must make the picture sufficiently attractive for those industries.

THE CHAIRMAN: Some of us like as little planning as possible and think that the law of supply and demand is not yet quite dead?

MR. FARRINGTON: Another danger is that you must have a many-sided city. There is a danger that people will dislike living in Canberra because their children can only become public servants.

THE CHAIRMAN: Are there not many cities in Europe that began as garrison or naval towns and which have grown up?

MR. FARRINGTON: Yes, but it took a long time for them to do so. Also we have peculiar circumstances here. For example, there is very little tendency in New South Wales for industries to move away from the Port of Sydney.

SENATE CANBERRA COMMITTEE

THE CHAIRMAN: Do you think that leasehold tenure is completely satisfactory or do you consider that there is any sound argument in favour of a change to freehold?

MR. FARRINGTON: I have no real opinion on that. I have seen the leasehold system work very well at one place in England. The area was owned by an estate company. The leasehold system worked very well because it enabled the owners to control their town but the control was tempered by the fact that they wanted people to go there. Therefore the control did not operate harshly.

THE CHAIRMAN: You believe in a one-man planning commission? Would you rule out altogether the idea of a fine arts commission?

MR. FARRINGTON: I would.

THE CHAIRMAN: Would you rule it out even as an advisory body?

MR. FARRINGTON: Yes. I would not have it at all because of the danger that it would restrict people who were designing buildings.

THE CHAIRMAN: Do you consider that the planner should have a direct charter from Parliament itself, or should he be under a minister or under the man who was the head of the city?

MR. FARRINGTON: I would prefer to have him not answerable to a minister.

THE CHAIRMAN: You suggest that he should operate under a statute and have certain defined powers?

MR. FARRINGTON: I would prefer that.

THE CHAIRMAN: Would he be also an administrator or purely a planner?

MR. FARRINGTON: Only a planner.

THE CHAIRMAN: But he would have to work in close touch with the administrator?

MR. FARRINGTON: Yes, and he would have to work in close touch with the advisory committee too.

MR. HERMAN: There is a precedent for that on the lines that Mr. Farrington has mentioned. A small committee which would be tantamount to a fine arts commission, was appointed to redevelop

SENATE CANBERRA COMMITTEE

Vienna. It did the executive work and it appointed an architect who was given a free hand to execute the work. The governmental work was done by the commission.

THE CHAIRMAN: I appreciate the point that if you do not risk having bad buildings you may not get the best buildings. But the point is that we are committed to a plan. We cannot say for the sake of contrast "Let us dump in a few bad buildings."

MR. FARRINGTON: That is so, but the advantages of freedom in design are so great that it is worth risking an occasional bad building. I agree with Mr. Herman that, during the next 50 years, we shall probably go through a period in which the standard of architecture will be very high.

THE CHAIRMAN: I am pleased to hear that opinion. You and Mr. Herman are the most hopeful witnesses we have had.

MR. FARRINGTON: I realise the enormity of what I am suggesting, but I maintain stoutly that it is the only way to do the job.

THE CHAIRMAN: If your view that careful planning tends to produce a dead city is right would you say that Washington is a dead city?

MR. FARRINGTON: I have never been in Washington but it has many of the signs of a dead city.

THE CHAIRMAN: What is your view, Mr. Herman?

MR. HERMAN: I agree with Mr. Farrington. If it were not for the industry that has accumulated about Washington, it would be very dead indeed.

THE CHAIRMAN: You are familiar with the Japitol at Washington?

MR. FARRINGTON: Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: Do you think it is a good building?

MR. FARRINGTON: For its time and class, it is reasonably good.

THE CHAIRMAN: It had four architects?

MR. FARRINGTON: Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: In pictures it looks very impressive.

I had a letter recently from a man who had seen the building for the first time and he described it as breath-taking.

SENATOR BENN: You are plumping for one man being in control at Canberra?

MR. FARRINGTON: Yes, to do the planning.

SENATOR BENN: A free agent, without restriction or control?

MR. FARRINGTON: That is so.

SENATOR BENN: Do you think that could ever be achieved in Canberra in the welter of present-day politics?

MR. FARRINGTON: I realise the difficulties and it may be that the answer is that we shall never have a good city at Canberra. I am afraid that unless we can do something on the lines I have suggested we shall never have a good city at Canberra. It is the same thing as a company employing an architect to design its building. He is a free agent and the matter is entirely in his hands. But he has all sorts of restrictions. For instance he has to bear in mind the wishes of his client.

SENATOR BENN: A restriction on capital as well?

MR. FARRINGTON: Yes. He has a lot of restrictions and the planner is in the same position. However, what I am aiming at is that you should not have a body of men meeting round a table once a month and deciding what is to be done. He is the man who is to work the plan of Canberra. I know it is difficult, but I can see no other way of achieving the desired result.

SENATOR BENN: You have been to Canberra?

MR. FARRINGTON: Yes.

SENATOR BENN: What is your idea of a proposal to construct eight-storey buildings of flats near Civic Centre?

MR. FARRINGTON: That is the kind of matter on which a wise planner would not give a decision without studying it thoroughly. However, as a first guess, I would expect the proposal not to be satisfactory because the flat buildings would be too close to and would vie with other important buildings.

SENATE CANBERRA COMMITTEE.

SENATOR VINCENT: I am interested in your thesis about controls. Would the one man planning commission be responsible only for the planning or would he also take some responsibility for building?

MR. FARRINGTON: He would be responsible for planning.

SENATOR: What about the implementation of the plan. Would he also be charged with that responsibility?

MR. FARRINGTON: I do not think that would be necessary. The implementation could be carried out by the Government Departments concerned.

SENATOR VINCENT: Do you think you are being consistent when, on the one hand you insist upon absolute control of planning by one man and, on the other, you say that in regard to architecture, responsibility should be taken from the single planner and given to a number of individual architects who would have complete freedom in carrying out their work?

MR. FARRINGTON: I do not see anything inconsistent there. It is entirely consistent. A city is a work of art and an artist is working on it. Each building is a work of art provided it conforms in volume to the original city plan.

SENATOR VINCENT: In the light of Mr. Herman's submission that public buildings should be closer together than they are in Canberra at present, what would happen if an architect were to design a building that was completely out of harmony with nearby structures?

MR. FARRINGTON: It depends on what you mean by completely out of harmony.

SENATOR VINCENT: An administrative building is in course of construction in Canberra. Say, in another 50 or 100 years an architect comes along and wants to erect a 10-storey glass and metal structure alongside it?

MR. FARRINGTON: The 10-storey part of it is something that I cannot agree with, but, so far as materials are concerned, I would have no objection to it.

SENATOR VINCENT: I think you said that the single planning authority should have complete autonomy but that in relation to the erection of buildings, the architect should be completely free. Therefore, that is not quite correct is it?

MR. FARRINGTON: He is completely free within certain limits. He is regimented to the extent that the planner could tell him how high his buildings should be and even where it should be.

SENATOR VINCENT: What other controls should be placed upon him?

MR. FARRINGTON: The control that I do not want to have imposed on him is the control of saying to him "You must design your building to look something like that one over there". There would be occasional exception to that. There are cases in which it would be necessary to insist on harmony between buildings in a specific group. That is town planning.

SENATOR VINCENT: To that extent your architect would be subject to control?

MR. FARRINGTON: In one or two cases of that kind.

SENATOR VINCENT: In circumstances where you wanted buildings to conform to a harmonious pattern some form of control would be needed?

MR. FARRINGTON: Yes.

SENATOR VINCENT: Surely such control would have to be imposed in the development of that very important part of Canberra known as the administrative triangle? You will agree that the pattern of the buildings in that triangle will ultimately form an artistic harmonious whole?

MR. FARRINGTON: Yes.

SENATOR VINCENT: To that extent your architect would be bound to conform to certain controls?

MR. FARRINGTON: The control I would impose in cases like that would be to have one architect carry out all the buildings in that group.

SENATOR VINCENT: But the erection of those buildings might be done over a period of 100 years.

SENATE CARRIERS' COMMITTEE.

MR. FARRINGTON: In a case like that I would have the buildings designed according to the spirit of the times. For instance if another administrative building were being erected 150 years from now I would not suggest that it should be designed to look like the administrative building now in course of construction.

SENATOR VINCENT: I am not suggesting that but the two buildings would require some artistic relationship one to the other?

MR. FARRINGTON: It does not necessarily follow that, to produce artistic effect, the buildings would have to be similar.

SENATOR VINCENT: I do not say they should be similar but that they should be harmonious?

MR. FARRINGTON: Yes, but harmony could be a complete break with symmetry and all those other things.

SENATOR VINCENT: The harmonious effect, I suggest, would have to be a subject of control?

MR. FARRINGTON: Let me give a classic example. The average Gothic cathedral was started in Norman times and finished about the end of the Gothic movement. Those cathedrals were built piecemeal and running through them you find three different styles of Gothic architecture.

THE CHAIRMAN: You even have un-Gothic styles in some Gothic cathedrals.

SENATOR VINCENT: I fail to see how harmony could be preserved, even if you have dissimilar buildings and different styles, without some form of censorship on the architects.

MR. FARRINGTON: To clarify my mind on the matter, what kind of restrictions do you envisage?

SENATOR VINCENT: Supposing in ten years' time we decide to erect two more buildings in that triangle, an instruction should be given to the architects to have regard to the present pattern of the building and to design new structures that will not be unharmonious.

MR. FARRINGTON: I would not do that because I think the result would be likely to be unhappy.

SENATOR VINCENT: Why?

SENATE CAMBERRI COMMITTEE.

MR. FARRINGTON: Because when a man is designing a building any restriction is likely to inhibit his ability. He has certain requirements for a building. He can bear in mind the surrounding buildings but if he has to start out on the basis that he must conform with the other buildings, he is immediately restricted and is likely to produce a mediocre building.

(Continued on page 880)

SENATOR VINCENT: Would that apply to all architects?

MR. FARRINGTON: There would be a danger of that.

SENATOR VINCENT: You believe that industry should be attracted to Canberra?

MR. FARRINGTON: I think that it should have some industry.

SENATOR VINCENT: Would you care to elaborate by saying what industries you would attract and what industries you would refrain from attracting?

MR. FARRINGTON: No. That is the sort of question which no expert should attempt to settle without a good deal of study.

SENATOR VINCENT: Would you suggest that a tannery would be desirable near Parliament House?

MR. FARRINGTON: I would not like to see a tannery in Canberra.

SENATOR VINCENT: Could you give the committee an idea as to what policy should be observed in relation to the establishment of industry in Canberra?

MR. FARRINGTON: I can only give an indication in general terms. It would be necessary to study the geographical position of Canberra and its relationship to the nearby parts of New South Wales. From the facts obtained it would be possible to deduce the most desirable industries and the industries most likely to succeed.

SENATOR VINCENT: Do you suggest that, within the framework of our federal system, it would be proper for the federal authority to encourage industry in competition with industry in the sovereign states?

MR. FARRINGTON: I think that it would be proper. I feel that it is desirable for Canberra to become a city and if the development of industry is essential to the development of the city, as I consider it to be, then the encouragement of industry would be a proper policy.

SENATOR VINCENT: Would you prefer industry to be encouraged in Queanbeyan?

SENATE CANBERRA COMMITTEE

MR. FARRINGTON: No. I should prefer it to be encouraged in Canberra because I think it is essential to the plan.

SENATOR VINCENT: Queanbeyan is not very far from Canberra.

MR. FARRINGTON: No. But it is a journey from one town to the other.

SENATOR VINCENT: Why do you want industries in Canberra?

MR. FARRINGTON: In order to provide a fuller life for the people and to provide employment for the children.

SENATOR VINCENT: Could they not go to Queanbeyan.

MR. FARRINGTON: Yes. But they would be better off if they could work in Canberra.

SENATOR VINCENT: Would you agree that we should endeavour to establish Canberra as a national cultural centre?

MR. FARRINGTON: Yes.

SENATOR VINCENT: Besides encouraging the university there should be a pursuit of the fine arts such as drama, literature and music?

MR. FARRINGTON: Yes.

SENATOR VINCENT: How would you encourage those activities?

MR. FARRINGTON: That is not an easy question to answer. For instance, it takes a big city to maintain an opera house. It might be a long time before Canberra could aspire to that sort of accomplishment. The best that can be done in this direction is to increase the population up to a certain figure and one of the ways of increasing the population is to encourage industry.

SENATOR VINCENT: How can the fine arts be encouraged other than by growing as Canberra grows as a city. How could the study of architecture be encouraged?

MR. FARRINGTON: By the establishment of a school of architecture.

SENATOR VINCENT: Would you advocate that?

MR. FARRINGTON: I see no reason why that aspect of Canberra should not be developed quite strongly.

SENATE CLERICAL COMMITTEE

SENATOR VINCENT: Would you suggest the establishment of a Conservatorium of Music, for example, in Canberra?

MR. FARRINGTON: Yes - probably with boarding facilities for students.

SENATOR VINCENT: How could the visual arts such as sculpture and painting be encouraged in Canberra?

MR. FARRINGTON: Schools could be established for those arts. That would be a little more difficult.

SENATOR VINCENT: Would you wait until Canberra was big enough to support those cultural activities or would you foster them artificially?

MR. FARRINGTON: I would endeavour to foster them artificially.

SENATOR HANNAFORD: Would you not agree that something more than the measures that you have outlined is necessary in order rapidly to bring the head offices of all government departments to Canberra?

MR. FARRINGTON: I should agree that that work should go on. It should not be suspended until this committee makes its recommendation. But, ultimately, the organisation that I envisage would take over that sort of activity. The departments concerned would become the clients of the Commission that would look after Canberra.

SENATOR HANNAFORD: Do you not think that an organisation such as you have envisaged would be somewhat superfluous for the continued development of the city if it had a local municipal organisation which could carry out the functions that you have outlined?

MR. FARRINGTON: As Canberra is the national capital, I do not think that it should ever be controlled by local government. Local government has never produced a fine city. Local government is too concerned with minor problems. I think that the commission that I have suggested should stay with the city for all times. For the first two or three years the commission's planner would have a

SENATE CANBERRA COMMITTEE

full time job. But for the next ten or 15 years he would not be nearly so busy. He would be paid a fee which would be in accordance with the amount of time that he had to devote to his task. I think that his services should always be retained.

SENATOR HANNAFORD: Do you consider that there is anything to be said for a more or less haphazard development of a city?

MR. FARRINGTON: I would agree with that contention up to a point. But haphazard development would only be suitable for small areas. The overall pattern of the city must be regular.

SENATOR HANNAFORD: Don't you think that that has been more or less achieved under the Griffin plan and that it would be difficult to get away from that overall plan?

MR. FARRINGTON: To a certain extent.

SENATOR HANNAFORD: If modifications to the plan had to go through certain channels, that would make it difficult to give effect to them without a certain amount of publicity?

MR. FARRINGTON: That is so. But there are probably modifications which should be made. A city the size of Canberra should have, not one, but many plans and all of them should be workable. It is not desirable to have a plan which will be all right when the population of the city reaches 150,000. The plan should be all right whether the population has reached 20,000 or 50,000 or any other figure. Under the Griffin plan, there are pockets of population everywhere.

SENATOR HANNAFORD: I find it hard to understand your suggestion that cultural and other activities should be artificially encouraged. Do you not think that these activities come about of their own accord as a city develops?

MR. FARRINGTON: Yes. What I really meant was that in a city which is a national monument some encouragement is a good thing.

SENATOR HANNAFORD: It seems to me that, as the average person in Canberra is better off than the average person in other centres and as the level of intelligence would be slightly higher than in the rest of the community, the activities that we have

mentioned would develop without any particular assistance.

MR. FARRINGTON: If that were found to be so, then artificial stimulation need not be recommended.

SENATOR WOOD: You consider that the town plan for Canberra should be revised?

MR. FARRINGTON: Yes.

SENATOR WOOD: You consider that it would be desirable to appoint a town planner who would revise the plan, act as consultant, and be the sole authority on the plan?

MR. FARRINGTON: The town planner would be a member of the commission that I have recommended. But he would actually give effect to the plan.

SENATOR WOOD: That is the procedure that the government has adopted at present.

MR. FARRINGTON: There is one essential difference. My planner would not be an employee of the government.

SENATOR VINCENT: Would your planner be an executive man?

MR. FARRINGTON: Yes.

SENATOR WOOD: Do you recommend the practice that is adopted in local government of engaging a town planner at a certain fee of so much per year for advice on planning?

MR. FARRINGTON: Not quite. In this case the basic plan is already in existence. However, the planner would necessarily have to do a lot of original planning. He would not be quite in the capacity of a consultant. A consultant does not try to alter the basic plan. My planner would continually make a close survey of what was happening with a view to altering the basic plan, if necessary. He would also oversee the work.

SENATOR WOOD: Do you consider that the rate of development in Canberra is fast enough to justify hiring a man for that job?

MR. FARRINGTON: It would not be fast enough after the first two or three years. But the planner's fee would be paid according to the amount of time that he spent on the job.

SENATE CANBERRA COMMITTEE

SENATOR WOOD: Should a city be planned for ease in finding your way about?

MR. FARRINGTON: Yes.

SENATOR WOOD: Is it easy for a person to find his way about Canberra on his first visit?

MR. FARRINGTON: No.

SENATOR WOOD: The circular road system has a lot to do with that?

MR. FARRINGTON: Yes, but it must be remembered that many of the roadways are not formed. Even so, it is still difficult to find your way around.

SENATOR WOOD: Therefore, do you not think that some of the curves should be removed from the plan, and that a combination of the grid system with a little of the circular system would be better than the present circular system in Canberra?

MR. FARRINGTON: I would not answer that question without close study of the matter, but that aspect should be thoroughly investigated.

SENATOR WOOD: Would the introduction of industry into Canberra give the people a broader outlook?

MR. FARRINGTON: I agree that it would.

SENATOR WOOD: You do not think that haphazard development should take place in regard to roads, and so on?

MR. FARRINGTON: No.

SENATOR RYAN: You heard the question that I put to Mr. Herman about the "second phase" of development in Canberra. I suggested that we should retain the Parliamentary triangle and concentrate development on the northern parts of the Molonglo. What do you think about that?

MR. FARRINGTON: That is another question which nobody would answer until he had made a complete investigation. You could quite easily jump into the wrong answer through using superficial impressions.

SENATE CANBERRA COMMITTEE

SENATOR RYAN: Would not the development of the areas that I have mentioned cover all aspects of communal life, because the community would be nearer Civic Centre or the heart of Canberra?

MR. FARRINGTON: If you mean that the rational thing is to develop the closer parts first, I agree. A planner might find sound reasons for the present development.

SENATOR RYAN: Have you given any thought to the consummation of the Lakes Scheme?

MR. FARRINGTON: I have heard a lot about it.

SENATOR RYAN: Does it not represent a sort of Sahara Desert in the plan because the authorities have not tried to implement the scheme?

MR. FARRINGTON: I am not satisfied that it is technically possible, but assuming it is, is it desirable to have it? Again, I cannot answer that without much investigation. But it could be a desirable thing. If Griffin had placed the residential part on one side of the river and the working part of Canberra on the other, then it would be just a matter of enough bridges to cross the river.

SENATOR RYAN: As there is no possibility of the immediate implementation of the water scheme, do you agree that the Lakes area could be used as a public domain or as parks for the people?

MR. FARRINGTON: You are in grave danger of trapping me into saying that the lakes should be there. On the assumption that they should, your suggested use would be a very good use meanwhile.

SENATOR RYAN: Do you think that the homes now in the Canberra area are suitable for the city?

MR. FARRINGTON: I agree with Mr. Ferman that they are of fair average quality. They could be worse, and, in some cases, a good deal better.

SENATOR RYAN: Should there be two-storey, three-storey and even higher buildings?

MR. FARRINGTON: I would have only such restrictions as

the town planner thought would interfere with the plan in the third dimension. If an eight-storey block of flats would fight for supremacy with a more important but lower building, the planner would be entitled to say the block should not be more than, say, three storeys. I would let such high buildings be completely accidental.

SENATOR RYAN: Is Adelaide Avenue a good road and one suitable for a main outlet from the city to the suburbs?

MR. FARRINGTON: I do not know enough about the activities of Canberra to answer such a question.

SENATOR RYAN: The main avenues should be, for public safety, wide roads?

MR. FARRINGTON: Yes, to take the volume of traffic and to do what they are supposed to do.

SENATOR RYAN: Adelaide Avenue should be of sufficient width to carry the required volume of traffic in safety?

MR. FARRINGTON: Yes.

THE WITNESS RETIRED.

THE CHAIRMAN: That completes our present Sydney sittings. I thank the witnesses for their evidence and I thank the gentlemen of the press and of Hansard for their attendance here.

D I S S E N T

HIGH FLATS

I disagree with the acceptance by the Committee of the present proposals for the erection of multi-storied flats in Canberra, and recommend -

That the proposal to erect an eight-storied block of flats near the Civic Centre be cancelled forthwith; and that only public and semi-public buildings be permitted to be of, or exceeding this height.

V. S. Vincent

V. S. VINCENT

D I S S E N T

Separate Report by Senator Wood.

(1) In presenting this separate report and recommendations, I do so because I differ with the report of the majority of the Senate Select Committee in some important aspects, as well as having a different basic outlook on the main subjects of the investigation.

(2) Firstly, I disagree with the undermentioned Parliamentary and administrative recommendations:

1. That a Minister should be appointed specially for the Australian Capital Territory.
2. That a Commissioner for Canberra be appointed.
3. That six permanent Directors of Town Planning, Surveying, Landscaping, Architecture, Building Engineering, Roads and Services construction Engineering, be appointed.
4. A Legislative Council for Canberra.
5. As future development of Canberra warrants - The establishment of :-

- (a) A municipality for the City of Canberra,
- (b) A Shire Council for the Balance of the A.C.T.

(3) These recommendations make a very imposing array, and in my opinion they highlight the tendency in Parliamentary affairs to run to the extravagant.

(4) As one who has had considerable experience in Local Government work as Mayor of a City, and as one who was responsible for the first town plan in Australia by a Municipality, and also sponsored two revision town plans, I say quite strongly there is no necessity for such a heavy Government and administrative arrangement, in connection with the Town Plan of Canberra.

(5) Experience in Local Government has taught me, that in a city operating under a town plan, the best way to achieve results is to have as simple or streamlined a set up as possible.

(6) I am not convinced that the development of Canberra needs a special Minister, with a Portfolio for the Australian Capital Territory nor do I think it needs the appointment of a Commissioner. In both cases it would not be long before we would have both appointments surrounded with an array of typists and clerks.

(7) The appointment of six planning and works directors would be even worse, and with the establishment of a Legislative Council, plus an expensive building for it, together with the consequent staff which would have to be attached to it, the Planning Development and Administration would involve highly paid administrators, Departmental heads and general staff.

(8) Nor can I see the successful working of a City and a Shire Council in Canberra. If such were created it would mean that -

- (a) The people of Canberra would have to pay much higher rates than they do at present;
- (b) The Government would have to heavily subsidise the Councils and the granting of that subsidy would

become similar to the annual fight between the Commonwealth and States, as to the amounts they should receive.

(9) As Canberra is the National Capital I cannot see it succeeding in its fullest and most attractive form of development, other than from Government finance. The Canberra community can be given their share of interest through a Canberra Local Town Planning Committee, representations by individuals to the Departmental Town Planner, and the suggested Department of the Interior Liaison Officer.

(10) We should strive for simplicity in administration, not to make it complex. The building of a city with a Town Plan is much easier than a city without a plan. It does however require someone in authority to see that the plan is carried out, and to me the simple solution so far as Canberra is concerned is to clothe the Departmental Town Planner with sufficient authority, so that he can prevent any of the Departments from contravening the plan.

(11) When a Town Plan is made law, there is no authority for any Department to sidestep the plan; the Departmental Town Planner should be its Departmental guardian.

(12) Any alterations proposed to be made to the Plan should be scrutinised and reported upon by the outside Advisory Committee; copies of same should also be sent to the Canberra Local Town Planning Committee. In addition any proposed alterations should be advertised in Canberra, in the local press, and thrown open for objections for a period of say 3 months.

(13) If a revision of the Plan is made, which I strongly recommend, and which must be done by a first class Town Planner, the amended Plan should be sufficiently detailed to prevent any ambiguity in its interpretation by the Departmental Town Planner.

(14) In my opinion the Secretary of the Department of the Interior or one of his deputies or assistants should be designated as a liaison between the people of Canberra and the various Departments, on matters outside of the Town Plan. Matters concerning the Town Plan should be dealt with by the Departmental Town Planner.

(15) These suggestions would make for a much simpler administration and much cheaper in cost than that suggested by the majority report of the Select Committee.

(16) The other major basic difference is that I do not agree that the present Burley Griffin Plan is so well conceived, that it must be Sacrosanct.

(17) The Plan as conceived by Griffin is now over forty years old. During this period Town Planning has made great progress. Our conception and mode of living has changed considerably. Transportation has made terrific changes. It was horse and buggy in those days. Today it is motor cars, motor transportation and aeroplanes. Economic circumstances and costs have changed. Gone are the days of spacious homes, and public buildings when costs didn't matter, architecture has changed, we have moved away from the ornate and quick dating type, to the simple cleaner form, which I believe is a striving on the part of our architects to express that open sunny and democratic Australian spirit. Today we go for brighter colours in our homes, furnishing, and dress, and our ideas of landscaping, massed gardening effects and city beautification have also undergone some considerable changes.

(18) I have always felt the Canberra Town Plan, which is designed in a now discarded geometric system of French origin, is un-Australian. It was a design created so that French Kings could by stationing their guns on the pivotal point shoot straight down each of the streets radiating from that point and so quell the rebellious mobs. It is therefore an Imperialistic design. It does seem strange that people want to cling tenaciously to such a design, when Canberra is a young National Capital, which should express in its designing a truly modern democratic outlook, because it is the Capital of a young democracy.

(19) We should be resilient and absorbent to new ideas. If the conditions and life of the people, living and working in Canberra are changing, if conditions generally have changed, all of which we accept readily, then why should we only resist the changing ideas in Town Planning.

(20) Canberra is a difficult place in which to find your way about. I found it so on each occasion I visited it before entering Parliament and, although I entered the Senate in 1949, I still find it a difficult place to find my way about.

(21) Mr. Gibson, the Departmental Town Planner, admitted he found it difficult when he commenced to live in Canberra but he said he didn't now as he has lived there five years.

(22) One of the world's recognised Town Planners, Dr. Karl Langer, formerly of Vienna and now of Brisbane, said he always has to use a map to find his way about Canberra.

(23) If Town Planners cannot easily find their way about Canberra without the use of maps, then what chance has the ordinary Australian citizen visiting his own National Capital of doing so.

(24) I believe that a world class planner should be engaged to redesign and improve the Canberra Town plan; three essential features being, to try and make it easier for the ordinary citizen to find his way about, to redesign the Government Triangle, and make it more liveable for the people of Canberra.

(25) Dr. Karl Langer, in his evidence, showed by placing scale drawings of the grand avenue features of Paris, Washington and New Delhi, that we had as much land held in Canberra for Government buildings as those three cities combined. The population of the three countries they represent would amount to approximately 800,000,000 people. The central avenues of each of these cities is on the grand and spectacular basis. I therefore agree with Dr. Langer that the population of Australia will never be large enough to require an area of land equivalent to the Governmental building and aesthetic requirements of those three countries combined, in their capital cities, which no one will deny are designed on the grand basis.

(26) Only one witness, a Departmental officer, indicated the balance of the buildings still to come to Canberra through Departmental transfers, and they are very few. Even allowing the addition of those Government Services the Committee has recommended in No.10 page 104 of their report and visualising the expansion of the various departments, I can only agree entirely with Dr. Karl Langer's statement that we have too much land held for Government purposes in Canberra.

(27) I am entirely in accord there should be spacious grounds for public buildings. This allows their best architectural features to be seen to better advantage. It also gives a park like setting. I believe there should be plenty of land near them for car parking of the staff working there and for the people transacting business there. I believe also that the avenues between the rows of public buildings should be wide enough for traffic, for impressiveness and for grand beautification effect, but I cannot agree that an oversupply of land should be held in the middle of Canberra, to the effect :-

1. That buildings are so far apart they have no affinity or contact with each other.
2. That the area is so spacious that it will not only never be filled, but that it :-
 - (a) Creates a vacuum in the middle of Canberra.
 - (b) That it forces people to live much further from their work than necessary.
 - (c) It thereby entails more time travelling to and from work for employees.
 - (d) Makes it more costly for people because of the longer distance required for transportation to and from work.
 - (e) Makes it uneconomical for the public bus transportation system running through so many miles of unoccupied land.

(28) As I have stated before, I am keen on the park like effect of Canberra being retained, with as much beautification as possible, in order to make it a national capital of which we will be proud. A proper balance must be kept in Town Planning with these things on the one hand, and the economics and more mundane things on the other hand.

(29) With the redesign of Canberra on more modern lines giving us a main street, which is surely an accepted Australian characteristic, and the allowance of a residential area closer to the centre, with a consequent reduction of the Government area, we will make it a more liveable place for those living in Canberra, it will appeal more as a human unit of living to the average Australian visitor, and it will become a more economic unit to administer and in which to live.

(30) At present Canberra is like a lot of limbs without a body. I know many people say it will be all right when it is completely built upon. Let any one go into the details of the buildings likely to be built there in the future and they will realise unless the plan is altered the centre will always be a vacuum.

(31) I noticed a fear in the evidence of several of the witnesses that we must hold all the spaciousness of Canberra we now hold, for fear we may require it for some unknown purpose. I sincerely hope fear will not hold us back from tackling the problem.

(32) An illustration as to what I mean might be given this way. Which is better, a small park or garden attractively designed and planted and very well kept, creating a delightful impression, or a park of a huge acreage, which it is always intended will be nicely designed and kept, but never reaches that desired stage because of its size and the finance required,

with the result it always remains a large park of tall grass and in an undeveloped state? A better and more compact design of Canberra could well be compared to the small park; the present design might easily resemble the good but never fulfilled intentions of the large park.

(33) The basic requirement for the best development of Canberra is a very good Town Plan.

(34) It is essential that the architecture of the buildings should be good, that the landscaping and beautification should also be first class.

(35) Everything is, however, just incidental to the plan, the rate of its development, the transfer of Departments, everything is secondary to that of a good Town Plan.

(36) It is therefore essential that Canberra should be built to a really excellent Town Plan and I believe the quickest, cheapest and best way to secure this is to do as Mr. C.J. Farrington, Architect and Town Planner of Sydney and Dr. Karl Langer, Architect and Town Planner of Brisbane, town planning witnesses whose evidence impressed me most, said "Let one man revise the plan and so express himself as it would be much better than having a commission to do the job".

(37) A Town Plan by an individual is the complete expression of that person, the plan of a Commission is at best a compromise plan of several people.

(38) Finally, the difficulty and expense of getting say three outstanding Town Planners together would be considerable.

(39) Let us get back to the reason for the setting up of this Select Committee. Did the mover of the resolution think there were major deficiencies in the plan which should be rectified, or did he do so for the purpose of confirming that the present plan was a good plan?

(40) It must surely have been engendered by the thought that something should be done about redesigning the plan. There must have been some positive reasoning.

(41) As I said before the basic requirement is an excellent plan. If we haven't got that, then everything else will be adversely affected. The slow rate of Canberra's development will not affect Australia adversely to any extent and it does not matter what administration of Canberra we appoint, it will not overcome a plan with defects.

(42) In my view the Committee has not dealt strongly enough with the real cause of the trouble, viz. the Government Triangle and the complexity of the existing Town Plan.

The Town Planner selected to revise the existing Town Plan of Canberra, should give consideration to the following:-

1. The roading system of Canberra, whether it can be improved for present and future traffic requirements. Whether the elimination of the circular system of roads or some of them would be an improvement.
2. What would be the best for the future of the City in the development of the lakes scheme, keeping in mind not only the aesthetic value to the city, but also the improvement of living conditions for the people of Canberra, by providing more amenities and recreational facilities, such as boating, fishing, aquatic sports, lakeside drives and lakeside picnic and park grounds. The Town Planner should keep in mind the distance Canberra is from the coast.
3. Whether there is too much land being held in the centre of Canberra for Government buildings which might never be filled.
4. If he decides there is too much land being held for Government buildings, whether it would make Canberra more liveable for its residents, if some of the land could be used - (a) to give Canberra a main shopping street, (b) to be used for good class residential areas, and so allow people to live closer to their work, and thus save the extravagant distances of travel to and from work, which the present sprawling or extended development of Canberra is forcing people to make. It must be kept in mind to what Canberra will sprawl, on the present basis of design, when it quadruples its population, which at present is small.
5. Whether there should be further industrial areas, designating them as noxious and non noxious industrial areas. It would seem to designate such as Heavy or Light industry areas is wrong, because a heavy industry is not always noxious, whereas a light industry could be noxious as to smell or noise etc.
6. The extension of the Community or Neighbourhood centres.
7. The preservation and extension as far as possible of the garden effect of Canberra. The maintenance of the best balance possible between Garden City effect, and the other requirements of Canberra as the National Capital.
8. That ample provision be made in the plan for cultural, educational, recreational sport, and organised sport requirements.
9. Whether the present site is most suitable for Parliament House, or should Parliament House be ultimately built on Capital Hill, or such other site as the Town Planner may consider.
10. Whether the centre of the area, at present known as the triangle, should be made into one central avenue, or two or three.
11. Consideration should be given as to which areas are the most suitable for flats, and whether the Town Planner considers limitation of height should be placed on flats.
12. Special consideration be given as to whether Duntroon College would be a military target in time of war, and if so, whether it would make Canberra a target of war. If not, should it retain its present site, with a permanent right of manoeuvre over the areas where it does at present, or to what area it should be confined.

SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS.

1. That the Town Plan of Canberra be redesigned and for this purpose that a first class Town Planner be engaged to do the job. It is desirable that the Town Planner should be an Architect, and have a knowledge of landscaping and, if possible, an engineering knowledge. Such men can be obtained.
2. The Town Planner should not be tied to any limitations on Town Planning imposed by this Committee or the Departments in the preparation of his design as no really worthwhile Town Planner would consider such an appointment, limited by a Committee or Department, with possibly no real expert knowledge on the subject.
3. That the Town Planner be one person and not a Commission of Town Planners. This will lead to a quick completion of the plan, a more effective unit of ideas, and much less costly than would it be with a Commission.
4. That when the Plan is approved by the Minister and gazetted, that an outside advisory body be set up embracing an architect, engineer, and the Town Planner who designed the new Town Plan. All of them to be men of high standing in their professions.
5. This Committee to be of a continuing nature, and where necessary, when dealing with particular phases of Canberra's development they have power to co-opt for consultation representatives of Art, the Theatre, Women's Organisations, Child Welfare Organisations, as well as business, industry and sporting bodies etc. The advice of this Committee must be treated with respect and serious consideration by the Minister.
6. If the Committee fails to secure agreement with the Minister on matters which they feel of sufficient consequence, then the Advisory Committee would have the power to refer their observations and decisions to a Senate Standing Committee on the Town Plan of Canberra.
7. The Senate Standing Committee on Town Planning to be comprised of seven Senators.
8. The Senate Standing Committee on the Town Plan of Canberra would act as a Parliamentary guardian of the Town Plan, scrutinising in detail any suggested amendments of the Town Plan. In addition it would have power to receive representations from the outside Advisory Council in the case of a dispute between the Minister and the Council and that it would have the right to make representations to the Minister on the subject in dispute and that where the Minister and the Standing Committee still disagreed it would be able to report the dispute to the Senate.
9. That a local Committee of say nine persons, representing various local organisations of a public spirited nature, such as the Chamber of Commerce, Women's Organisations, Child Welfare, Playground Associations, Sporting bodies etc., be set up for the purpose of watching the interests of the people of Canberra in the development of the Town Plan. Such members to be selected by the various organisations or group of organisations, which the Minister may desire to have represented. It is visualised that the members of this Committee which could be named the Canberra Local Town Planning Committee, would work in an honorary capacity, as is done in hundreds of local Municipal Councils. The system of appointment to such a Committee by elections, on the vote of the Canberra people is one to be avoided. It brings politics into town planning affairs, and

immediately tends to spoil the true public spirited outlook necessary to act on this Committee. Politics have been the greatest drawback to Town Planning in my own State of Queensland, and my own City of Mackay in particular. Town planning should be entirely free of politics.

My experience and observations in the making and operation of a Town Plan shows that women have a much keener and more sympathetic understanding of the aesthetic and community requirements than men. They have a much more highly developed sense in these matters than men and I would therefore stress that women should have a fairly good proportion of the representation on the Local Canberra Town Planning Committee.

10. That one Departmental officer of the Department of the Interior be designated as the Liaison Officer to all Departments, through whom local Canberra residents might place requests or other matters concerning living in Canberra.
11. The development of Canberra as the National Capital should be proceeded with as circumstances and the national economy will permit. That rate of development should not be of a speed, suggestive of a burning desire to complete the capital at top pressure, as some witnesses desired. In this widespread and sparsely populated nation, there are many areas urgently desiring just ordinary amenities, and I cannot exhibit a passion to have Canberra pushed at a headlong speed to the detriment of the people in many of those areas. Commonwealth Departments and Civil servants are comfortably housed where they are, so let us make Canberra development at a speed we can comfortably attain. I have in mind in particular shortages of loan funds for Local Authorities, and where in many cases residents of places have not yet got a water or electricity service. A slower and more orderly developed Canberra might well prove in the long run a much better designed Canberra.
12. ^{so} Finance should be made available for each project in Canberra that when commenced it should be carried through to completion.
13. Whilst architectural aspects would be referred to the outside Technical Advisory body, all Departments should be given to understand that buildings of their Department should be of a good architectural standard. No further disgraceful eyesores should be sponsored by any Department such as the Postal Building opposite the Kurrajong Hotel. The Postmaster General's Department seems to have fallen to a very low architectural standard.
14. No temporary building should be allowed to be built in Canberra, as there is nothing more permanent than a temporary building.
15. Architecture in Canberra should get away from the old style of densely packed countries overseas. It should be modern, clean of appearance, and expressive of the wide open spaces, and the sunshine of this country.
16. For the purpose of achieving the best in architecture, the best of our Australian architects, outside of the Government service, be engaged to draw the designs of major Government buildings.

17. Cultural Buildings. When an Opera House, Auditorium, National Theatre or whatever name is desired, is built, size should not be the main consideration. Any such hall should be large enough to accommodate a fairly large audience, but not too big to spoil the intimacy of the building which is so necessary. It is far better to plan a building for a repeat performance occasionally, than to have a huge half empty hall, on many occasions.

In the execution of such a building the Foyer of it should be large enough to hold the bulk of those attending, during the intermission.

The suggestion of Dr. Gertrude Langer, the Brisbane "Courier Mail" art critic, that instead of building a large and costly Art Gallery, which we must admit only a very small proportion visit, art be taken to the people, by the hanging of works in the Auditorium Foyer; and by continually changing and making special displays, that many more people, through attending concerts etc. would see the art displays, and so become more acquainted with art. For some time the Brisbane Courier Mail has made small displays of art in their ground floor entrance and this has I believe been very successful in attracting people's interest.



IAN WOOD.

16.6.

Minutes
of
Senate Select Committee on
the Development of Canberra

Pages 890 - 1084

<i>Page</i>	<i>Name</i>
890-947	R. Rowe
948-970	G. A. Colman
971-999	L. T. Gleason, J. M. Perkins, R. D. Footman.
1000-1013	Mrs E. M. Shankel.
1014-1028	J. C. Larrae, R. A. Godfrey-Smith, T. H. M. Love.
1029-1036	J. J. Casack.
1037-1062	J. Murphy
1062-1077	L. Mitchell
1077-1084	Mrs S. E. Harde.

SENATE SELECT COMMITTEE ON THE PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT
OF CANBERRA.

MINUTES OF EVIDENCE

(Taken at Canberra)

FRIDAY, 11th MARCH, 1955.

PRESENT:

The Chairman (Senator McCallum)

Senator Benn Senator Ryan

Senator Hannaford Senator Wood

ROY ROWE, ^{Representing} ~~Secretary of~~ the Canberra Chamber of Commerce, sworn and examined.

THE CHAIRMAN. - I understand that you have a written submission, Mr. Rowe. Will you be good enough to read it to the Committee and later elaborate on any points in it that you may wish to discuss at greater length.

MR. ROWE. - The Canberra Chamber of Commerce is pleased to have a representative give evidence before the Committee and put forward certain opinions of the Chamber. Our submission is made under three headings. There are many matters which could be mentioned and which would come under the main headings mentioned herein, but, as these are subsidiary to the main points raised, we feel that these may be mentioned later in my oral evidence. We wish to make the following submissions:

1. GOVERNMENT OF THE AUSTRALIAN CAPITAL TERRITORY.

Under the general control of the Commonwealth, the Territory has been administered under three different systems:

- (a) Initially under an Administrator
- (b) The Federal Capital Commission, appointed to complete works, development and to administer all services in order to facilitate the transfer of the Seat of Government in 1927, and
- (c) The Department of the Interior for more than twenty years.

There has been sufficient experience to assess the merits of each.

The development of Canberra since 1927 has been consistently rapid (except for a brief period in the 1930's) due to the progressive increase in Commonwealth activities in Canberra in the political, administrative and industrial spheres. The Australian Capital Territory and particularly the City of Canberra has reached a stage when the various elements which make up its population and corporate life make a continuance of the existing developmental administration both unsatisfactory and undesirable.

To be satisfactory in the unique conditions existing in Canberra any form of government must:

- (a) Recognise the rights and responsibilities of the people
- (b) Recognise the Commonwealth, national as well as State interest, and also that of the people in proportion to the contribution of each to the cost of development and administration of the Territory as a whole, and
- (c) Provide effective co-ordination of all services necessary to the proper development and administration of the Territory.

The Canberra Chamber of Commerce believes that the major problems in the Territory arise from this situation and will be resolved substantially by the adoption of the following proposed form of government.

1. The inextricably involved nature of the National, State and Local or Municipal functions and responsibilities in the Australian Capital Territory makes indivisible for practical purposes its administration and development.

2. The predominating contribution of the Commonwealth to the expenditure on the Territory confers on the Commonwealth the right to majority control of any overall administrative body as long as this financial condition prevails.

3. These basic facts suggest:

- (a) the impracticability of separating National and State administrative functions and responsibilities from those of local or municipal interest.
- (b) the necessity for a statutory administrative body, partly nominated - to represent the Commonwealth - State interest and partly elective - to represent the local or Community interest.

4. The Administrative body suggested is a National Capital Commission consisting of:

- (a) Four nominated members (full time) including:
 1. A chairman - a top-ranking executive with a knowledge of local Government and Town Planning - who would also be the chief Executive head of the Administration.
 2. Three nominated members (full time) being authorities respectively on (a) Works, (b) Finance, and (c) Property and Land Settlement.

I would stress here the fact that, if such a proposal were considered, it would be of the highest importance that only top-ranking men should be considered and chosen.

- (b) Four elected members, elected on adult franchise for a period of three years, to serve as part-time members without executive responsibility in the administration.
- (c) All members to have a deliberative vote. The chairman to have a deliberative vote and a casting vote.

5. The Powers and Functions of the Commission to include:

- (a) Law making in respect of A.C.T. Ordinances (subject as now to Parliament and the Executive Council - drafting to remain with the Attorney-General's Department)
- (b) Education (In association with the Department of Education for N.S.W.)
- (c) The present functions of the Department of the Interior and the Department of Works, and administration of the Acts and Ordinances administered by those departments.
- (d) A.C.T. Employment service as now performed by the Department of Labour and National Service in the A.C.T.

6. The Commission to submit an annual report to Parliament and be responsible to the Minister for the Interior.

2. CANBERRA PLAN AND DEVELOPMENT

Over the years many changes in the Burley Griffin Plan have become necessary. The public generally, and in particular people who desire to invest in various projects, are unable to procure an up-to-date plan embodying all these amendments. It is desirable that such a plan be prepared and be made available for public information. Such a plan, when drawn, should indicate areas set apart for future development for public, commercial and

residential purposes, and no deviation should be permitted except to provide reasonable flexibility within clearly specified limits.

Business Leases - There is need for clearer definition of the form future development will take and longer term planning in this respect is needed: as this concerns business areas, it should include clarification of access roads, parking areas, lease subdivisions and location of shopping areas. Such information is necessary when investments in commercial projects are being considered. Also there should be relatively comparable conditions concerning building covenants and lease areas for business sites used for similar purposes in close proximity to each other.

The significant deficiency and lack of balance in development from 1930, or perhaps a little earlier, to 1953 was the failure to provide any new business leases to enable commercial services to be extended to meet the increased needs of the growing population. The commercial community was therefore denied the opportunity of providing the urgently needed additional shopping facilities, notwithstanding repeated requests for such leases over the intervening years.

Banking Facilities - Also no sites have yet been provided at Manuka for any trading banks, notwithstanding that a site was provided for the Commonwealth Bank at Manuka many years ago. Until recently a somewhat similar situation existed at Kingston. These are two of Canberra's main shopping areas and, as the Committee will appreciate, adequate banking facilities there are an absolute necessity.

Fire Brigade - We urge separation of Fire and Ambulance Services in Canberra and the establishment of some service on the north side of the City. In this respect we would mention the fire in East Row in 1950 and again in 1953 when a fire caused extensive damage in West Row. On the latter occasion it is understood that the Fire Brigade was not able to attend promptly by reason of the fact that in their second capacity as ambulance attendants they were occupied by an accident on the Tharwa Road.

Railway Station - The provision of a permanent Railway Station for the Capital City of Australia is long overdue. The commercial interests wish to know where this will be situated and would require far superior facilities than are at present given by the temporary arrangements at Causeway.

Many of these difficulties can be overcome by consultation between the Administration and representative interests concerned and any future planning should acknowledge and adopt this as standard practice.

There should be accelerated provision of public utility services in new areas to enable leases to be made available more in accordance with demand. Wherever possible the method of securing leases should be by application - or in the case of more applications than leases available, by ballot, at the upset price. It should not be the function or practice of the Department to trade in leases either by auction or by tenders, for the purpose of gaining additional revenue in the form of premiums and thus inflating land values unnecessarily.

3. TOURIST TRADE.

There is need to expand in every possible way commercial and industrial enterprises to lessen the dependence of the Territory upon Government resources and to provide a more balanced and self-supporting community, as well as widen opportunities for employment. An important avenue for such development lies in the Tourist trade which is capable of considerable expansion conditional upon the necessary facilities, attractions and services being provided. This is a highly remunerative trade but to be further increased it will require suitable accommodation especially with private baths or showers; improved road access from all adjoining areas and States, including the Snowy Mountains and the South Coast of New South Wales; improved transport services and sporting facilities including fishing and snow sports, and the like.

SENATE CANBERRA COMMITTEE.

GENERAL.

It is in the best interests of Canberra and Australia that the tempo of development of the A.C.T. be rationalised so ^{that} extreme pressures on resources of materials and manpower, and finance are avoided and regularity of employment preserved. For this purpose acceptance of responsibility by the Government for the provision of funds to cover a sustained development programme over a period of years, rather than year by year, is highly desirable.

(Continued on page 896).

SENATE CANBERRA COMMITTEE.

MR. ROWE SPEAKING.- I should like to make it clear that any comments I have made concerning the present administration as being unsuitable and unsatisfactory for the future are not intended as a criticism of the Department of the Interior which, in my view, speaking from my experience of 29 years residence in Canberra, has done an excellent job under difficult circumstances. But it is just not properly constituted to develop and administer the Territory properly. It has been without essential authority to co-ordinate all services, which we maintain is vital to the satisfactory administration of the Territory. In numerous cases, it has had to rely on advice from bodies and people, acting in an advisory capacity, who accept no responsibility for the success or failure of the proposals they submit. Had there been one statutory authority as proposed, there would have been at least one additional shopping block, Brisbane Buildings, at City at least five years ago, when costs were a mere fraction of what they are today. I feel that public interest generally is considered by most, if not by all, public departments as an intrusion upon a department's authority. In greater or lesser degree, all tend to ignore it and to become dictatorships. The commission or corporation as proposed would recognise the public interest, and take decisions accordingly. Whilst elected members would have no executive or administrative authority under these proposals, I suggest they could act as members of sub-committees of the commission or corporation and in that way share responsibility in regard to specific matters. If Canberra is to have a soul, it must be found basically in its people. It can find expression only as they become a part of the real life of the city. In our evidence we have laid emphasis on the form of government, because we believe that most of the other problems stem from that problem and would be resolved by the establishment of a satisfactory form of government for the Territory.

THE CHAIRMAN.- Would you like to elaborate for us the advantages and disadvantages of each of the three forms of government - that is, if you can find any advantages in some of them?

Take the single administrator first. That form of government was in existence in the very early days of Canberra.

MR. ROWE.- I suggest that at that time the need for government administration of the Territory resolved itself principally into initial surveys and assessments of the resources of the Territory - its potential water supply and, in respect of water supply, its capacity, for example, to provide the necessary water for the lakes scheme, if developed. It resolved itself into an assessment of land resources, a consideration of the areas to be set aside for rural as distinct from city settlement, the sub-division of land for rural purposes, surveys of the adjoining mountain areas as catchment areas, and so on. I suggest that it was nothing more nor less than a necessary staging period in the early development of Canberra. It ceased when the Commission came into being in about 1924 or 1925.

THE CHAIRMAN.- Before Parliament came here?

MR. ROWE.- Yes. Then the Federal Capital Commission was constituted for the express purpose of preparing the City for the transfer of the seat of government. I think that can be broadly described as its function. I was associated with that Commission. I feel that it did a magnificent job under extremely difficult circumstances. For example, there were no labour resources here. It started from scratch in virgin country with literally none of the services and amenities that existed in any settled community. It provided those. It did the job that it was commissioned to do.

The Parliament was opened, as intended. The Commission continued in operation for some little while afterwards. Then the form of government was changed.

I feel that the Commission and, in particular, the Chief Commissioner, Sir John Butters, have never received the credit due to them for a magnificent job done under extremely difficult circumstances. I believe there are lessons to be learned from the form of government conducted under the Commission.

THE CHAIRMAN.- Were there any serious disadvantages of that form of government?

SENATE CANBERRA COMMITTEE.

MR. ROWE.- If there were disadvantages, the principal one was that there was only a very minor representation of the people. That is probably explained by the fact that the people who represented the population of Canberra on the Commission up to and even after 1927, the date of the transfer of the seat of government, were principally government employees engaged in the Commission's own work. Substantially, there was no representation of commercial interests. There was some representation, but it was of an extremely limited form. I venture to express the opinion that it was not a very satisfactory form in regard either to the nature of the representation or the duties assigned to the elected members, and even perhaps in regard to the type of representative that was available to accept election.

I think the principal lesson to be learned from that form of government is that it was an all-embracing authority. It controlled and co-ordinated every section of the work that was necessary. I believe that was one of the main factors which helped it, together with its own administrative ability, to carry out the job satisfactorily.

THE CHAIRMAN.- What are the advantages, if any, of departmental administration?

MR. ROWE.- I have endeavoured to give some of what I think are the principle disadvantages. I do not think any government department, State or Federal, is properly equipped or has the resources to be the governing body of a city or a territory. Basically, I oppose that form of government because it is completely undemocratic and is a bureaucratic dictatorship. It is dependent upon the measure of consultation which it feels it requires from time to time. It obtains that consultation at its own discretion, from private citizens or from constituted bodies such as the Advisory Council, the Road Safety Council, the National Planning and Development Committee and so on, but in a great number of cases it promptly and arbitrarily disregards the recommendations it receives. Whether it disregards more than it accepts I cannot say, but it certainly disregards a great number.

SENATE CANBERRA COMMITTEE.

As I have said already, the weakness of that system, in my view, is that when people act in an advisory capacity they tend to be irresponsible - at least, they are not subject to the same measure of restraint and thoroughness as they would be if they had to accept some responsibility for carrying out the proposals they submit. I believe that, basically, it is an unsatisfactory system.

THE CHAIRMAN.- Is there anything further you want to say about the general matter of government? It is ~~was~~ one of the very important questions that we have to consider.

MR. ROWE.- I should like to give an example of lack of co-ordination. I do not think I should be telling tales out of school. The business community is vitally concerned with the provision of adequate shopping leases, and the general community is equally vitally concerned in receiving adequate shopping facilities and services. For quite a number of years, the Chamber pressed for the release of shopping areas, notably at ~~Givvo~~^{City}. Owing to the absence of one controlling authority, plans for the building of a new shopping block at ~~Givvo~~^{City} were delayed for no less than four years. That was due to divided control and a difference of opinion as to what form the shops should take.

SENATOR HANNAFORD.- Architecturally?

MR. ROWE.- Yes. That is a glaring example of what can arise under any system of divided control, where one department thinks it is right and another department thinks it is right and nobody ^{is able to say} ~~says~~ what shall be done. I think there is a need to cultivate among the Canberra people a sense of civic responsibility. I believe the Canberra people must learn, if they have not learned already, that they should not expect everything from the government. They should accept the responsibility as citizens which they would accept in any other city in Australia. Why should a resident of Canberra have his hedge cut at the government expense? I do not think he should. I think it should be stopped.

SENATOR HANNAFORD.- It has been stopped, has not it?

MR. ROWE.- Substantially. But now one sees in Canberra

SENATE CANBERRA COMMITTEE

hedges that have been cut and trimmed and, alongside them, hedges that have not been cut and that are five or six feet high. I should give to the authority controlling the Territory power to restrict the height of hedges to a specified maximum and, if a tenant does not cut his hedge, authority to cut it at the tenant's expense.

SENATOR BENN.- Who owns the hedges?

MR. ROWE.- I am referring both to privately owned homes and government-owned homes occupied by tenants. In either case, hedge cutting is the responsibility of the occupant.

SENATOR BENN.- Of what hedges are you speaking now?

MR. ROWE.- Front line hedges.

SENATOR BENN.- Of government-owned houses?

MR. ROWE.- I am speaking generally. I do not feel the government is responsible for maintaining hedges on boundary fences *or* in front of homes. I think the tenants or the owners should be required to keep them in proper order.

THE CHAIRMAN.- I have been told that because the government will no longer cut hedges, some people are trying to get fences. Would you recommend that there be no fences?

MR. ROWE.- I should. I have studied this matter throughout Australia, and overseas during the last year. I think it would be a retrograde step to provide front fences in Canberra. If there are no hedges, I hope there will be nothing at all.

THE CHAIRMAN.- Have you anything further to say about the system of government.

MR. ROWE.- I should like to say something about the *responsibilities of functions* overlap of national, civic and State *services* at a later stage.

(Continued on next page)

THE CHAIRMAN.- You say that the development of Canberra has been rapid consistently since 1927, but do you think that it has been rapid enough?

MR. ROWE.- It has not been, to the extent that it has not achieved its original objective of transferring all government departments, but I can appreciate, as a continuing resident, that there have been many good reasons why it has not been possible always to achieve that objective as rapidly as was first thought possible.

THE CHAIRMAN.- Somewhere you mention rationalising development. Do you want it to be quicker or slower?

MR. ROWE.- I should like to see periods of bust and slump avoided. I know that in the past this ^{largely} has been done and I think it could be done even now by following a plan. I think that the planned transfer of departments, for example, which is the major question, should be in specific stages and should not be departed from. That, I know, is easier to say than to carry out, but nevertheless, without such a plan it is impossible to proceed by stages with your objective. I know that it involves many considerations, not only of public office buildings. It involves housing, the extension of new areas, schools, hospital facilities and the like. It should be possible to set all that down in planned form and to have a plan adopted for a period that will permit steady and progressive achievement of that objective within a specified period of time. Therefore, it should be possible to set down the stages that will be reached ^{at} each given period of ~~that~~ overall ^{plan} period. It is also extremely important that in adopting such a plan the government is committed to provide the finance necessary to it. If it is going to be subject simply to an allotment each year - and I know the difficulties of doing otherwise under the budget - obviously the staging cannot be carried out, because the moment the necessary funds for each stage are withdrawn or withheld the plan is held up. I think that has accounted for some of the failure to achieve plans that were prepared in years gone by.

SENATE CANBERRA COMMITTEE

THE CHAIRMAN.- Would you say that the major aim in the whole of the considerations of Canberra should be to get all the public departments or their headquarters here as quickly as possible?

MR. ROWE.- I do, but I have stressed in ^{my} the statement that it should have regard to the pressures that it imposes upon the availability of manpower and materials, because the pressures exerted in post-war years were such that there was open abuse of many circumstances, and ~~certainly~~ almost blackmailing in regard to certain conditions of employment.

THE CHAIRMAN.- It would lead to bad contracts and it could be highly inflationary if it were pushed too far.

MR. ROWE.- It has imposed tremendously higher costs on building in the Australian Capital Territory.

THE CHAIRMAN.- The fact that we have to recognise at present is that the development of Canberra will inevitably add to the demand for men and materials, which are scarce throughout Australia.

MR. ROWE.- That is so.

THE CHAIRMAN.- But that is no reason to say that the development of Canberra is the particular thing that should be dropped entirely.

MR. ROWE.- That is so.

THE CHAIRMAN. - Do you say that plans should be laid so that, in the event of a recession, the development of Canberra could be speeded up to relieve unemployment elsewhere?

MR. ROWE.- I do. I think that is very sound.

THE CHAIRMAN.- Would you say that the great mistake of the 1930's - I think we can reflect on it comfortably because all the major political parties were involved - was the stopping of work in Canberra because of the depression?

MR. ROWE.- I do.

THE CHAIRMAN.- I think that that is generally recognised today.

MR. ROWE.- I would point out, too, that there are very real dangers in a case presented to me only this week in which a young married man seeking a ten square home in Canberra was tendered a price of £5,000 for it. If that is the alternative, we have to do

something about restricting some of the factors that are contributing to the cost of £500 a square for a dwelling house for a young married man.

THE CHAIRMAN.- Do you think that that problem is very much worse in Canberra than it is elsewhere? It is bad everywhere.

MR. ROWE.- I can only say on that point that some three or four years ago it was extremely acute in Canberra, and there was ^{blackmail} ~~blackmail~~ on both sides, both from employers and employees, for labour in order that week-end work could be built up, and the poor unfortunate tenant was the person who had to pay for the home.

THE CHAIRMAN.- You believe that the national, state and municipal functions for the Australian Capital Territory should be discharged by one authority?

MR. ROWE.- I do, emphatically.

THE CHAIRMAN.- You do not think that it is possible to have what was called in India in the stage of development a diarchy, that is a double government in which some authority such as you have mentioned could look after what are federal and state activities in the states and yet have a municipal council elected to deal with the purely local services such as water, sewerage and the like?

MR. ROWE.- Before coming to Canberra I had some experience in local government, and up to two or three years ago I was confirmed in the opinion that a local government was necessary and practicable for Canberra. I have completely changed that opinion after a closer examination of it. When you get down to see what would form the organisation of a local governing body as distinct from the other functions mentioned, you come up against a brick wall. You just cannot find a point at which you can divorce the national from the state and the state from the civic. I think your question is extremely important. I think you finally come down to a question of finance. If you take the plan of Canberra, can you assess, at any particular point of the plan, or any feature of ~~the plan or its development~~, what is a fair charge or proportion of ~~charges~~ ^{to debit as national, state or local} of the cost of a service? Take roads.

SENATE CANBERRA COMMITTEE

Take any of the public utility services, which here are so vastly more extravagant than they are in any city of comparable population anywhere else.

THE CHAIRMAN.- Would it not be reasonable to take an average of what people in towns of comparable population throughout Australia pay, and to say that the citizens of Canberra should pay that amount in rates and let the commonwealth have a subsidy to make up the difference?

MR. ROWE.- I would visualise very great difficulty in its being accepted what was a fair rating.

THE CHAIRMAN.- Suppose we took an average of what was paid in towns of comparable size, and even included some of slightly smaller and some of slightly greater population. The sum arrived at would be an average of what was paid by people elsewhere in Australia, and I think that the people of Australia would not object to subsidising Canberra for the rest.

MR. ROWE.- I would not deny that that is a sound theory. *But*
I believe it is not practicable here.

THE CHAIRMAN.- It is worthy of consideration?

MR. ROWE.- Yes, but I think that there are other aspects of the civic life of this community that are almost impossible to divorce from the wider responsibilities they possess as citizens of Australia. For example, if you say, "Here is a community of 30,000 people. Is it comparable with some other city of comparable size?", when you come to look into the social and the cultural life of the people here, it is totally different. Almost everything they do impinges on one side or the other - on the national, the state or the civic. The more I think about it, the more I am confirmed in the opinion that it is not practically possible to separate those forms of government.

THE CHAIRMAN.- It is a very important point.

MR. ROWE.- The point is partly answered by your suggestion. Every municipality is concerned to a greater or a less degree, and particularly in the large cities, at the absence of revenue from non-ratable government land, as you know. If you take that problem,

where do you begin and end?

THE CHAIRMAN.- We could alter the practice in Canberra, and make the federal government pay rates on all its properties.

MR. ROWE.- Possibly you should do so, but I imagine that there would be quite a few problems associated with assessing where that begins and ends.

THE CHAIRMAN.- I know that there would be a lot of opposition from public departments, but I cannot see any reason why it should not be done. Are you aware that we have had evidence from members of the former Federal Capital Commission that, in a form of government similar to that which you have recommended, the elected representatives in Canberra were in constant opposition to the nominated commissioners?

MR. ROWE.- Yes. I mentioned earlier that there may have been some fault in the class of representation that we had.

THE CHAIRMAN.- That form of government has been tried. Are you aware that from 1842 to 1855 New South Wales had that form of government?

MR. ROWE.- Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN.- A legislative council of which one third of the members were nominated by the governor and two thirds were elected. There was constant strife. Virtually, the government was the minority under Governor Gipps and his successor. Mr. Deas-Thomson, who was Colonial Secretary and was virtually what we would call the Premier, Wentworth, Lowe, Lang and all the able men who were elected, although they bitterly opposed one another, were all opposed in the main to the Governor.

MR. ROWE.- I can imagine that in this form of government those situations could easily arise, but I am encouraged by the quality of representation that has been forthcoming in Canberra from its citizens, on both the Australian Capital Territory Advisory Council and the Canberra Community Hospital Board, where I think tolerance and understanding are very much in evidence.

THE CHAIRMAN.- You think that it is a question of the quality

of the representation rather than of the form of the government.

MR. ROWE.- I think that the community is capable of producing representatives of a type big enough to play their part.

THE CHAIRMAN.- Do you think that whether we recommend the continuance of the present form of administration or whether we recommend a change, we should specify a period at which the whole matter should be open to review?

MR. ROWE.- I think that there is a lot to be said for that. If such a form were considered, obviously you would not get top-ranking men if the term were unduly limited.

THE CHAIRMAN.- I do not think that it would be unduly limited. Suppose the members were elected for five years. Do you think a man would be prepared to give five years' service?

MR. ROWE.- I think it would take a term of ^{seven to} ten years to attract the right type of man so that he would divorce himself from whatever he was doing.

THE CHAIRMAN.- Do you think they should give their services full time?

MR. ROWE.- The nominated men, ~~yes~~.

THE CHAIRMAN.- What about the elected men?

MR. ROWE.- They would be like members of parliament.

THE CHAIRMAN.- They would be elected for a term of three years, like members of parliament?

MR. ROWE.- Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN.- What powers would you give to the Chairman? Would he be first among equals, or would he be rather like the President of the United States of America, in that he would have power in certain matters, to act on his own initiative?

MR. ROWE.- I suggest that, subject to decisions of the corporation on policy and the general directive of the government, he be the permanent head and the boss of the show and have complete authority to make decisions.

SENATOR HANNAFORD.- The very fact that he would have two votes would be an indication of that.

MR. ROWE.- Yes, within the policy defined.

THE CHAIRMAN.- You would not regard the nominated men as being subject to direction, would you?

MR. ROWE.- No, I would not. I would hope that unless the right type of men were available the thing would fail, but surely there are men of such calibre and qualifications who are broad-minded and tolerant enough to see the merits of any meritorious proposal and acknowledge it. Therefore, as urging a democratic form of government, I would not be fearful that a body dominated by a majority vote of nominated men would be overpowering and would over-ride the just needs of the community.

THE CHAIRMAN.- Now we come to the question of finance. We have still to determine how much the citizens of Canberra should pay and how much the Commonwealth should pay. Would you leave that to the discretion of this body, or to that of the Federal Government, or would you try to lay down some general rules?

MR. ROWE.- I think that if the Government introduced any such form, ^{of development} ~~necessarily~~ there would be implicit in it an undertaking that it would be provided with reasonable finance for all necessary purposes. Of necessity, it would be required to be subject to the votes of Parliament. I think it would be impossible, in practical considerations, to remove the Commission from the ^{control} ~~responsibility~~ of responsibility through the Minister for the Interior, as the go-between between Parliament and the Commission, but I think that within that broad field the Commission should do its job in its own way. It should be provided with adequate finance for all reasonable purposes. I assume the Government would retain the right to determine the ^{general course} ~~plan~~ of development ~~tempo~~. For instance, presumably questions such as whether there should be a major transfer of services not hitherto contemplated would be a matter for the Government, but the moment that broad decision was taken they would be the responsibility of the Commission to carry them out.

THE CHAIRMAN.- You think that the relationship between the Minister and this body should be clearly laid down in the Statute?

MR. ROWE.- Yes, I do, and that the body itself should be

responsible to Parliament.

SENATOR HANNAFORD.- This Commission you are referring to would have revenue powers itself?

MR. ROWE.- Yes.

SENATOR HANNAFORD.- That is, in restricted fields?

MR. ROWE.- Yes. That would be covered by all the present fields powers of the Minister for the Interior.

THE CHAIRMAN.- In addition to this body, do you think there should be another body concerned with the overall plan, particularly with regard to the type of building, and general aesthetic considerations, such as the Fine Arts Commission in Washington?

MR. ROWE.- No, I am afraid I do not. I think that this body, whatever form it ultimately takes, should be charged with responsibility for the aesthetic scope, the local services, and the development of Canberra. I see no necessity for a separate body, if qualified persons are chosen for the high offices concerned.

THE CHAIRMAN.- Let us have a look at the qualifications of the persons you suggest. The main thing for the Chairman is that he should be a good executive. You have an authority on Works, Finance, Property and Land Settlement, and you have elected Members?

MR. ROWE.- And a Chairman with a knowledge of Town Planning.

THE CHAIRMAN.- I submit that every one of those could, if those are the only considerations, be persons who were completely blind to aesthetic considerations. They might not know a beautiful building from an ugly one, and they might not know much about parks, and things like that. We have heard evidence from Architects and Town Planners which has conflicted to a very great degree. The evidence of one witness has sometimes flatly contradicted that of another. I think it would be possible for such a body to be what I would call a body of Philistines - men who have no consideration for artistic things. Somehow or other, without impeding the effectiveness of this body, I want to ensure we are not going to have ugly buildings, and that our park lands are not denuded. Do you not think you want

something further than your set-up to ensure that?

MR. ROWE.- I think that at some stage you have to entrust these responsibilities to somebody or authority. I cannot see that you can divorce responsibility for that class of development from the constituted authority. What happens now? You have a National Planning and Development body, which advises the Department of the Interior and the Minister. I suppose, for practical purposes, ^{it can be said that} it advises the Secretary of the Department of the Interior, who finally makes the decision. I suggest that such a body as I have outlined would be infinitely more capable of making a correct decision

THE CHAIRMAN.- You would not object to these people having an advisory body?

MR. ROWE.- Not in the least, although, generally speaking, I think that advisory bodies lack responsibility.

THE CHAIRMAN.- One of the things I am greatly perturbed about is that we have had the National Capital Planning Committee, and we have had really capable officers making decisions; yet we find that there is a whole suburb which I consider utterly unworthy of a National Capital, we have temporary buildings, some of them of a disgraceful character, we have what is pretty close to a slum in a very good area, and we have the Postal Department somehow or other smuggling through buildings which should never go up in this city. What is the remedy for that?

MR. ROWE.- May I suggest that they exist because of varying conditions and pressures which have been exerted on the administering Authority over the years. For example, if you go back to the days of the Federal Capital Commission, you may remember that it did not favour temporary buildings, as Sir John Butters has told you. Nevertheless, it was compelled to adopt temporary buildings in order to meet a certain programme at a certain date because the resources to do otherwise did not exist. Circumstances do bring about these conditions. On the other hand, while I agree that there are certain areas in Canberra which are not much credit to the city, I think it will be agreed that the average homes in Canberra are a good deal better than that of any other city of Australia, if not of most other cities of the world.

SENATE CANBERRA COMMITTEE

SENATOR HANNAFORD.- Mostly because of the youthfulness of the houses?

MR. ROWE.- I think the quality is also better. There is a sameness about them that should not exist, but I think that sameness could have been avoided by leaving certain blocks for private building, instead of having whole street frontages for one type of building, such as with the Riley Newsome's in O'Connor.

THE CHAIRMAN.- I take it that when you have set up this body you are prepared to let them modify or alter the plan in any way they like?

MR. ROWE.- Only to the extent that we have put in this statement. I think there is a great deal to be said for Parliament having the final say in any major variation of the plan. Legally, Parliament will have the final say, because it can at any time introduce an Act to abolish the whole body.

THE CHAIRMAN.- What machinery would you like to see to ensure that Parliament was constantly aware of what was going on, and be ready without interfering with the body to take action if it found it was going seriously astray?

MR. ROWE.- I think that the general features of the plan should not be varied without the approval of Parliament.

THE CHAIRMAN.- Definite approval?

MR. ROWE.- Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN.- But not that sort of negative approval represented by tabling a paper and if no-one takes objection the thing goes through?

MR. ROWE.- I see no great objection to that. It does place the power in the hands of Parliament.

THE CHAIRMAN.- I have been forced to the opinion that while the mere tabling theoretically throws the responsibility on every Member of Parliament, it throws responsibility on nobody definitely. I am sometimes amazed to find that things have been done, and that papers must have been tabled without my being aware of it. Do you think it would be a good thing to have a Senate Committee on Canberra - we cannot speak for the other House - not to interfere

and to be constantly approaching the body and saying " You should do this and that", but to get a report from the body once a year, to consider all the reports from the Committee, and to report to the Senate on them?

MR. ROWE.- I think it would be a very good idea. I think what has been lacking in Canberra is the active interest of Parliament over the years. I think the formation of this Committee has been of very good service to Australia. On the other hand, I think that unless such a Committee approached the matter as I believe you are doing, on a high level, it could cause resentment and embarrassment.

THE CHAIRMAN.- We do not want a Committee of busybodies. I think the worst thing that could happen would be a Committee that believed that they could approach Parliament about petty matters instead of approaching their own Committee personally.

MR. ROWE.- Yes.

SENATOR WOOD.- I take it, this Committee would act more or less as a watch-dog?

MR. ROWE.- Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN.- Do you think that the present system of letting the State of New South Wales staff the public schools here is satisfactory?

MR. ROWE.- I think it has worked very satisfactorily. I am not an authority on the question, but I believe it has been to the advantage of the Territory.

THE CHAIRMAN.- At this stage you do not think there is any desire to have a Federal system of education?

MR. ROWE.- I do not personally. I am all for a Federal system of education ultimately.

THE CHAIRMAN.- But you think at this stage that the N.S.Wales Education Department is doing a good job?

MR. ROWE.- Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN.- We are very interested in what you said about leaseholds and the Government's policy. Is there any dissatisfaction among the business community with leasehold as opposed to freehold?

MR. ROWE.- I do not think there is any. I have not

heard any voiced in the long years I have been here. There is, of course, very considerable dissatisfaction with the nature of the leases and the size of them.

THE CHAIRMAN.- Would you tell us as much as you can about that?

MR. ROWE.- I think when you come to the evidence of Mr. Coleman, who will be speaking ~~you~~ to you as a trader in Canberra, he will give you more explicit evidence. However, let us take Civic Centre. If any trader wanted to get a major consignment of goods in there, he would first of all have to find some means of storing his goods. There are no adequate facilities for storing any quantity of goods. If he happened to use a semi-trailer, he could not get it into the rear entrance to his premises. That illustrates the unsuitability of the design. I realize that the design was prepared before semi-trailers were used to the extent they are to-day, but it does illustrate the unsatisfactory nature of the facilities, and the impossibility of providing a service which many traders would like to provide.

THE CHAIRMAN.- That is not because of the roads, but because of the buildings?

MR. ROWE.- It is partly due to the fact that the access road is inadequate. You could not turn a semi-trailer to get it in, and if you got it in to the access you could not get it round to where you wanted the goods.

THE CHAIRMAN.- That is universal, is it?

MR. ROWE.- That applies to the two main blocks at Civic, particularly.

SENATOR BENN.- We could see that at any time for ourselves, could we not?

MR. ROWE.- Yes. The areas provided for the shops are, generally speaking, totally inadequate in the original sub-divisions. It is not possible, for example, for Mr. Coleman's firm to garage its vehicles on its premises. He will tell you all that that means and the disability of it in organizing their business.

SENATE CANBERRA COMMITTEE.

MR. ROWE (Continuing). - There is practically no room for bulk storage in any of the business premises and some people have erected a sort of mezzanine balcony within what might be a 15ft ceiling height in order to have additional storage space for essential stocks. The business leases are, on the whole, unsatisfactory for the purposes for which they were intended. The depth of the areas provided has been inadequate. I have referred to the absence of banking leases. At Kingston a site for a Commonwealth Bank branch has been occupied. Trading banks require branch offices in that area. It is vital to the needs of the business community and the public generally. Yet the two sites ^{which} were offered, ^{had} with a 160 ft. frontage and ~~with~~ a building covenant of £40,000 for branch offices in the business area at Kingston. That is totally unrealistic. Yet at Manuka which was always intended to be one of our permanent shopping areas, which Kingston was not intended to be, although it will be, there is not a site for a trading bank and the terms of the lease for ordinary shopping leases make it impossible to operate any of them without a variation of the ~~site~~ ^{terms of the lease}.

THE CHAIRMAN. - Are there any wholesale firms operating in Canberra and in what businesses?

MR. ROWE. - There are some, but not a great number. They are operating in hardware more particularly than in other forms of businesses.

THE CHAIRMAN. - Do you think it desirable that wholesalers should come here?

MR. ROWE. - I think it is necessary. It has proved a very valuable service. There are traders who operate on a wholesale basis in the building trades, builders' hardware and hardware generally and they perform a ^{necessary} service, but I point out that they can only operate on that basis owing to the temporary accommodation provided ^{in permanent} for them ^{occupancy leases} in the Causeway area, which is ~~just~~ a blot on the landscape. However, because no other facilities are available, enterprising people desiring to meet the needs of the community could do nothing else but go there. They have no security of tenure and can be told to

dismantle their premises at any time.

THE CHAIRMAN. - Is it understood that their leases are for a definite period and is it the policy of the department that at the end of that period the original lessee is generally allowed to carry on?

MR. ROWE. - I think there has been a great deal of misunderstanding and a lot of uncertainty about it. *Some time back at Canberra* I am not informed *we used mainly to provide a security of tenure but they can be terminated on general opinion about it but I feel that that opinion is that at* *arbitrarily. Most of the leases are without any security of tenure. It is generally accepted* the termination of a lease the lessee would at least receive the value of improvements made up to that date.

THE CHAIRMAN. - Either the value of the improvements or a continuity of the lease?

MR. ROWE. - Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN. - How important is rail transport today for Canberra both in relation to goods and passenger services compared with other methods of transport?

MR. ROWE. - I do not think there is great need for railway facilities within the city, that is, as between one suburb and another, and I think that probably the city plan would make it very difficult to do that anyway unless it were embodied in a rail link between Canberra and Yass which seems to be far in the future. However, I think there is urgent need for a decision as to where the Canberra railway station is going to be. It is highly important that the authorities concerned should make up their minds about it. I know that there has been conflict of opinion all through the period of Canberra's history on that matter between the Department of the Interior, the Department of Works and the Railways authorities. It is high time it was resolved. The business community wants to know where the railway facilities are going to be because that is of vast importance to them.

THE CHAIRMAN. - Do you think the bus system will always be adequate for transport in Canberra?

MR. ROWE. - I had better not express *my own* ~~strong~~ opinion about bus services.

SENATE CANBERRA COMMITTEE.

THE CHAIRMAN. - Leave out the question of whether the type of bus now used is satisfactory.

MR. ROWE. - I think it is a very difficult question to answer. May I put it this way? Canberra lacks the facilities of transport services comparable to other cities. It needs them more because of its spread out nature, the lack of density of population, and the dispersion of its shopping areas. The dispersion of shopping areas also means an added transport problem for a trader who is operating in more than one centre.

THE CHAIRMAN. - Do you think that the Government or the controlling authority should definitely try to have one main shopping centre or should it leave that to competition between the three existing shopping centres which would decide which was to be the main one?

MR. ROWE. - I think that for practical considerations only, and not from the aesthetic point of view it is a pity that there was not a centralised shopping area.

THE CHAIRMAN. - Would you suggest a site for such a main shopping area other than the present one?

MR. ROWE. - I should find it very difficult to suggest a site.

THE CHAIRMAN. - Which of the three present areas is most likely to be a central or chief shopping area?

MR. ROWE. - It would appear that the major development will occur at Civic Centre as distinct from Manuka and Kingston. In my view the city cannot hope to provide, even ultimately all its shopping requirements in one major centre. I do not know whether I can suggest any alternative centre to the existing ones but I think that time may show the necessity for more thought than has been given to what form of development should occur at both Kingston and Manuka. In neither place at the moment can there be major expansion because there is no room and the question of resumptions may even have to be considered because as the city develops and, say, half of the population lives on the north side and the other half on the south side there will be real problems.

THE CHAIRMAN. - Do you think the water barrier is a disadvantage?

MR. ROWE. - Not as such.

THE CHAIRMAN. - We cannot abolish it, because we always have the Molonglo River.

MR. ROWE. - I do not think that is a material factor so much as the fact that the population is spread out in these two particular areas north and south of the river which I consider will become more and more self-supporting in themselves. I should like to stress the point that the dispersal of shopping areas is a very serious factor as far as business is concerned and the standard of service that can be provided to the people. Were there one centre a major undertaking could establish itself there and give a standard of service equal to ^{any} anywhere in Australia. But the position is today that when a large firm wants to set up business here, or is already established here and wants to expand, it must first decide whether to establish itself in one, two or three areas. If it has to split up its business there is not only duplication of costs but also a division of services and facilities available. Even at the best that is a tremendous burden and denies to the public the high standard of service which the business people wish to give.

THE CHAIRMAN. - Is it possible with any modification of the plan to have one shopping centre?

MR. ROWE. - I personally would like to feel that it was, but I cannot see any solution to it. The only solution is the development of two areas, one on the north side and one on the south side and the ultimate joining of Manuka and Kingston into one big shopping area.

THE CHAIRMAN. - Do you think they could become one shopping centre because they are now so close?

MR. ROWE. - I think that is the only thing.

THE CHAIRMAN. - Would that involve any big modification of the plan?

MR. ROWE. - I think it would involve fairly considerable resumption.

SENATE CANBERRA COMMITTEE.

THE CHAIRMAN. - Perhaps a straight street making a clear-cut straight communication between them?

MR. ROWE. - I am afraid I cannot be very specific about it.

THE CHAIRMAN. - Do you think it is worth while our going into that aspect?

MR. ROWE. - I think it is worth considering. I cannot see the future development of Canberra along the line of one central area to serve the whole city.

THE CHAIRMAN. - It would be better to have two areas, than half a dozen?

MR. ROWE. - I think so. I think that the development of major shopping areas is in the interests of the people of Canberra because suburban shops cannot give the same high standard of service as can be given by better equipped shops in a major area. I suggest, therefore, that corner shops, as they are known, should be confined, though not entirely restricted, more or less to the essentials of everyday domestic life.

THE CHAIRMAN. - You would not object to corner shops for the little items that shoppers sometimes forget when they are shopping in a major centre and things that they might suddenly need such as collar studs?

MR. ROWE. - Not in the least. Shops that supply such goods should be brought nearer to the people.

SENATOR WOOD. - You have mentioned the upkeep of hedges by the Government. Do you think that the use of hedges of a particular variety in each street tends to make for monotony rather than variety, and that if people were allowed to remove hedges and have no break between their gardens and the footpath a more attractive form might be achieved?

MR. ROWE. - I understand that no tenant of a Government house can remove a hedge without permission. I cannot vouch for that but I understand that that is the position. The owners of some private houses have removed their hedges.

SENATOR WOOD. - Are people who build privately compelled to have hedges?

MR. ROWE. - No.

SENATOR WOOD. - I take it that some of them not having hedges they can do as they like?

MR. ROWE. - Yes.

SENATOR WOOD. - You have travelled overseas?

MR. ROWE. - Yes.

SENATOR WOOD. - What is your opinion of houses overseas whose gardens run to the footpath without hedges?

MR. ROWE. - I think they are very attractive and desirable.

SENATOR WOOD. - The picket fence is certainly a very unsightly thing.

MR. ROWE. - I think it is a thing of the past. Many of the hedges in Canberra, however, are very beautiful.

SENATOR BENN. - They are also necessary for shelter from the wind.

SENATOR WOOD. - Do you think they are necessary as wind breaks?

MR. ROWE. - I do not think that. I think that plantations and trees are greater protection against the wind if they are properly placed. I do not think that hedges can be large enough to be of real value as a protection against the wind. On the other hand they are depositories for hords of snails and so on and for that reason I should prefer their removal.

(Continued on page).

SENATE CANBERRA COMMITTEE

SENATOR WOOD.- What is the feeling of people themselves regarding hedges?

MR. ROWE.- One can only answer by referring to the practice, and the practice generally is to retain the hedges.

SENATOR WOOD.- That is the opinion of the people themselves?

MR. ROWE.- It is the practice.

SENATOR WOOD.- You said in your opening submission that, to be satisfactory in the unique conditions existing in Canberra, any form of government must recognise the rights and responsibilities of the people. Which people do you mean?

MR. ROWE.- The residents of Canberra.

SENATOR WOOD.- The administrative body that you suggested was a national capital commission including four full-time nominated members with a chairman who should be a top-ranking executive with a knowledge of local government and town planning and who would also be the chief executive head of the administration. You do not mean that the chairman should be the authority on town planning?

MR. ROWE.- He should not necessarily be a town planner by profession, but he should have sufficient knowledge of town planning and civic administration to give him a proper perspective and balance in regard to town planning proposals. I think that any such authority, and any such man, would of necessity have on his staff a competent and qualified town planning advisor.

SENATOR WOOD.- As a former local government man and also a Chamber of Commerce president for many years I am very interested in your statement. I think it must be accepted that such a commission must have an expert town planning advisor. You mean that the chairman should have sufficient knowledge to know whether the advice given is right or wrong?

MR. ROWE.- That is so.

SENATOR WOOD.- You mentioned the various things that were done for the Canberra people. I take it that you think that the Canberra citizens are let off lightly in comparison with the citizens

SENATE CANBERRA COMMITTEE.

of other communities; in other words, that lots of things are done for them that other communities probably have to do for themselves?

MR. ROWE.- What I feel is that there is a danger that there is growing up in Canberra an atmosphere of "Let the government do it" - of spoon feeding. I feel that the citizen should be prepared to carry his own weight in the community here as he does everywhere else.

SENATOR WOOD.- Do you not think that some form of local representation could be given to the people on the municipal side? Would this not build up their self-reliance and make for better citizenship if they had to do more things for themselves instead of relying on the government?

MR. ROWE.- I am sure it would. I think that is a deficiency that needs rectifying, but it does not respond, in my view, to representation on such a body as the A.C.T. Advisory Council. I was a member of the first Advisory Council, and I think it is abortive and just an outlet for letting off steam. I do not think the community seriously accepts it as a means of providing adequate representation of the people in the affairs of Canberra.

SENATOR WOOD.- Of course, they do not have the power for action.

MR. ROWE.- No. They are only advisory.

SENATOR WOOD.- A local government body, of course, would have the power for action.

MR. ROWE.- It would.

SENATOR WOOD.- Therefore do you not think that you would get a better response from the people because they would have to rely more on themselves?

MR. ROWE.- I do.

SENATOR WOOD.- The Chairman made a very good suggestion, I think, in regard to local government, but do you think, considering other possibilities, that it might be a good idea to create local government control of Canberra, with a subsidy from the Commonwealth government calculated in view of the special circumstances of the

area? For instance, you have mentioned the great amount of parks and gardens and general beautification. Do you not think that local government would work with a Commonwealth subsidy to cover such aspects as that and the value of Commonwealth government property?

MR. ROWE.- as a member of the first Advisory Council, in 1934 I think, I made such a proposal. I put up a proposal for an assessment of the relative responsibilities of national and civic government, envisaging a form of local government based on a subsidy. I believed that to be the right and proper thing then, but I have come to the conclusion that it would not be practicable. Neither do I believe that it would be desirable to attempt to divorce the civic from the other responsibilities that exist in Canberra's administration.

SENATOR WOOD.- Do you not think, though, that that line should be investigated to the fullest degree? Can you think of any other way that would develop the people's initiative to do things in Canberra?

MR. ROWE.- I think it should be developed under the form of government I have suggested, with a commission, particularly if elected members, although not possessing any executive or administrative responsibility, were given an opportunity, say, of investigating particular proposals as members of sub-committees which would report back to the authority itself. In that way they could accept responsibility for formulating plans and, as members of the commission or corporation, accept their share of responsibility for the decisions taken and given effect to.

SENATOR WOOD.- You cannot help feeling that there is, as you have said, a reliance on the government. It has been pointed out to me, for example, that the Canberra Repertory Society gets a subsidy from the government.

MR. ROWE.- That is true.

SENATOR WOOD.- I think it is the only such society in Australia that gets a subsidy from the government. In most

SENATE CANBERRA COMMITTEE

communities, repertory societies are more or less voluntary organisations which give entertainment and develop artists. Does it not indicate that the people of Canberra lack what the people of other communities have?

MR. ROWE.- I do not think that is necessarily so. There is a great deal of very worthy voluntary work being done in Canberra notwithstanding the fact that a subsidy is, I understand, paid to the Repertory Society.

SENATOR WOOD.- Why would they need a subsidy when other communities do it on their own?

MR. ROWE.- I am afraid I cannot answer that.

SENATOR WOOD.- A thing that rather astounded me in your earlier evidence was the statement that the Fire Brigade and Ambulance are under the one jurisdiction. Do you mean that the firemen are also the ambulance bearers?

MR. ROWE.- Yes, there has been an interchange of duties there. In fairness to the department, I understand that, if the matter has not already been decided, it is under very serious consideration that they be divided.

SENATOR BENN.- Do you have many fires here?

MR. ROWE.- Not many, but there have been one or two disastrous ones.

SENATOR HANNAFORD.- The last serious fire was the one at Civic Centre itself?

MR. ROWE.- Yes.

SENATOR HANNAFORD.- The fire risk there would be considered very high, I imagine?

MR. ROWE.- I do not know that it would be. That was a brick and concrete building with adequate fire protection measures - sprinklers and so on - installed. It was a comparatively recent installation of electricity, more recent than the remaining sections over there. It was the last portion of the building erected. On that score, the risk should not have been unduly great.

SENATOR WOOD.- The fire brigado and the ambulance people work in the one building?

MR. ROWE.- Yes. There is no fire service ^{in any building} ~~in the form~~ of any building existing on the north side of the river.

SENATOR WOOD.- What happens if a fireman is attending an ambulance patient and a fire breaks out? Does he have to leave the patient and rush off to the fire?

MR. ROWE.- This is a real problem, but I think the department is fully aware of it and at present it is trying to devise a solution.

SENATOR WOOD.- You have said that there was a delay of four years in providing business sites at Civic.

MR. ROWE.- It took more than four years. The plans were delayed for four years after authority had been given for them to be drawn. Then the plans that had been prepared were scrapped and new plans were drawn.

SENATOR WOOD.- I take it that the Chamber of Commerce made representations to the government about the delay?

MR. ROWE.- Repeatedly.

SENATOR WOOD.- What sort of replies did you get from the Department? What reason was given for the hold-up?

MR. ROWE.- I cannot remember, although I was the Secretary of the Chamber at the time. It was just a case of frustration because of no satisfactory decision about when the leases would actually be thrown open.

SENATOR WOOD.- Generally speaking, how do the government departments regard the interests of the people of Canberra? Do you think they take their interests into consideration very much?

MR. ROWE.- When the present Secretary of the Department of the Interior took up his position some years ago, he displayed a good deal of initiative in consulting various interests. He invited the Chamber of Commerce to a monthly conference on matters affecting commercial interests in Canberra. Unfortunately, that was discontinued after a time, but some very useful discussions indeed took place. That is the kind of atmosphere that we feel ought

SENATE CANBERRA COMMITTEE

to exist here, but I do not think it does exist, generally speaking. I do not think there is a sufficient degree of consultation with the various interests so that they can express representative views which, I feel, would be of great value to any administration.

SENATOR WOOD.- What is the attitude of the departments to representations from organisations like the Chamber of Commerce? Do the departments treat the representations with respect and take them into consideration, or do they treat you as though you were only an outside body which had no say in the matter?

MR. ROWE.- I should not like anything I say to be taken as a criticism of the Department of the Interior. I want to make that quite clear. By and large, our relations with the Department ~~of~~ and the Secretary have been happy and helpful. As typical of the departmental attitude, I think I would say that representations made have not always received the consideration that the interests making them feel that they deserve.

SENATOR WOOD.- What is the view of the Chamber on the availability of building blocks for private home building? Is it felt that there are sufficient blocks available?

MR. ROWE.- There are very strong views on the availability of building blocks. We feel that the policy of releasing a very severely limited number of leases for residential purposes, which has had the effect of creating a high demand for the new blocks, instead of releasing a greater number of blocks without regard to the premiums that might be derived from them, has in practice been a bad policy. We do not think the department should be party to any trading in blocks or to the receipt of premiums for them. We think that that is opposed to the whole spirit of the land settlement policy for Canberra, which was to cut out trading and profiteering in land. We believe that the department should not be a party to any system which, by reason of the limitation of the number of leases released, will create a situation where leases are in such demand that high premiums are paid for them.

SENATOR HANNAFORD.- Do you think the department has

SENATE CAMBERA COMMITTEE

restricted the issue of leases only for revenue purposes?

MR. ROWE.- I would not say that it has been done deliberately, but certainly the policy has had that effect.

SENATOR WOOD.- Do you think the department has been slow in making blocks available to people who want to build their own home?

MR. ROWE.- There is no doubt that, by and large, sufficient blocks have not been offered. However, I would not say that that was a deliberate policy on the part of the government, because I do not know the difficulties it has had to contend with in regard, for example, to the provision of drainage, sewerage and other services, the provision of which is a necessary preliminary to making the blocks available or even to the subdivision of areas. But the fact is that the number of leases issued has been substantially less than the demand.

SENATOR WOOD.- Leases are generally snapped up pretty quickly.

MR. ROWE.- Yes, and high premiums have been paid.

SENATOR WOOD.- It is possible that, if more blocks were made available for private building, the building of homes might be speeded up?

MR. ROWE.- One of the difficulties is that a limited number of blocks are made available at a particular sale. If 100 blocks are released under those conditions, almost immediately there are 100 new leaseholders rushing around the territory with plans, trying to get a limited number of builders to tender for 100 houses. That creates an undesirable pressure on builders and has the effect of creating a boom in building at a particular period. If, as we suggest, leases were granted on application, they could be made available progressively and there would not be the same concentrated demand for building at a given period. I think that would have a beneficial effect on the cost of building.

SENATOR HANNAFORD.- Are conditions imposed which specify that houses or dwellings must be erected on the blocks within a certain time?

SENATE CANBERRA COMMITTEE

MR. ROWE.- Yes, there is a building covenant..

SENATOR WOOD.- What is the position with regard to the construction of shops and business premises in the properly constituted shopping and business areas? Does the government erect those buildings, or does it allow private enterprise to do so?

MR. ROWE.- The government makes the leases available. It either prepares a plan to cover the whole area, as it did in the case of the Melbourne Building and the Sydney Building at Civic. In each area there were ^{some} ~~thirty, forty, or fifty~~ leases. The purchaser of a lease agreed, under the building covenant, to build his portion in such a way as to conform with the overall design, and to do so within a specified period. Sydney Building, for example, is one big building, but it is actually owned by ~~numerous~~ ^{many} individual leaseholders, each of whom built his section to a common design.

SENATOR WOOD.- The design is controlled by the department?

MR. ROWE.- The design is controlled. I have already mentioned the delay over the Brisbane Building plans. The delay apparently occurred because one department said it must be the same as the existing buildings at Civic Centre and another department said that that was not necessary because extravagant costs would be involved in building to such a plan today. The second department suggested that the plan should be modified. I think that was the basis of the disagreement. The Department of the Interior had two alternatives. One ^{to} ~~was~~ prepare a design which would harmonise with the existing building but would not necessarily be precisely the same. Finally it decided that it would allow the leaseholders to submit a common design for consideration and approval by the department. The department either prepares a design to which all leaseholders in the area must conform, or it permits the leaseholders of a given area, as a body, to submit a plan which is subject to departmental approval. I understand that in this case it accepted the design jointly submitted by the leaseholders and approved the plan of development,

SENATOR WOOD.- I gather that you consider the access roads to the rear of the existing premises at Civic to be too narrow. Has that problem been overcome in the new building that you are speaking of?

SENATE CAMBERRA COMMITTEE

MR. ROWE.- I have not seen the latest plans.

SENATOR WOOD.- This building has not gone up yet?

MR. ROWE.- It is in the course of erection. I suggest that you have a look at it.

SENATOR WOOD.- Semi-trailers require much more room to turn than an ordinary truck?

MR. ROWE.- They do.

SENATOR WOOD.- You have spoken of Kingston not being intended to be a permanent shopping centre.

MR. ROWE.- In the Griffin plan it was not set down as a permanent shopping area, although it was the first shopping area created.

SENATOR WOOD.- How did it arise there?

MR. ROWE.- I am afraid I cannot answer that question.

SENATOR WOOD.- Did shopkeepers just squat there?

MR. ROWE.- Leases were thrown open, but it was not intended to be retained as a permanent shopping area in Canberra.

SENATOR WOOD.- From the planning angle, do you think it would have been much better to commence Canberra with one central business centre, such as Civic, and then, as in other cities, allow that area to grow? As the city developed, various shopping centres could have been allowed to spring up in other areas. Do you think that the way in which it was done has stretched Canberra out into a lot of unco-ordinated centres?

MR. ROWE.- That has been our experience, at least during the period I have been here. I suppose it must be said in defence of the designer that he visualised the development of the city over a much longer period. The dispersal of these areas may prove ultimately to be quite practicable and satisfactory, but at this stage it is ^{felt that} difficult to see where the disadvantages outweigh the advantages.

SENATOR WOOD.- Why did all these different centres spring up so far apart and so far away from what should have been the central shopping area? Was it because of the policy of building homes of a certain value in one part of the area and homes of another value in another part?

SENATE CANBERRA COMMITTEE

MR. ROWE.- These three areas were set down in the late nineteen twenties during the administration of the Federal Capital Commission. Kingstoh, Manuka and Civic were all thrown open for settlement by leaseholders.

SENATOR WOOD.- Do you think that the tourist traffic in Canberra could be developed considerably?

MR. ROWE.- I do. I understand that whereas, according to the Tourist Bureau records, four years ago visitors were coming to Canberra at the rate of approximately 100,000 a year, the figure today is nearly 300,000. The tourist traffic has almost trebled since about 1950. I think a greater number of Australians want to visit Canberra, and I think they should be encouraged to do so. But, unless improved facilities are provided, I think the increase in the tourise trade that we could expect just will not happen. We have got to be more conscious of the services that the tourist needs and is entitled to have.

(Continued on next page)

SENATE CANBERRA COMMITTEE

MR. ROWE. (continuing)- I think in many respects we are not giving those services here. For instance, hotels, which I think are good by comparison with Australian standards, and are better than most Australian hotels, seriously lack hotel rooms with private baths. Most tourists are prepared to pay for a room with a private bath, because they like the privacy of it. After having travelled overseas, I think it is a necessity and not a luxury. We have to be tourist-minded when it comes to these things, and give the people things that will encourage them to come. There are other disadvantages in coming here, apart from accommodation which is perhaps the most serious one. Many thousands of tourists who come to Canberra each year have to go to Queanbeyan because they cannot get accommodation in Canberra. That raises the question whether we want more hotels here, and whether we want opportunities for hotel proprietors who are already here to increase and improve the standard of the accommodation that they already have. Some of the hotels, as you know, are under Government lease. The Committee might find it helpful to examine some of those leases to ascertain whether the lease-holders are subject to conditions that do not encourage them to provide these additional facilities. It is very important that they should provide them. Then there is the question of Transport. Canberra lacks the degree of transport facilities that exists in almost all other cities, and certainly in all other capital cities. That raises the question of parking. A great number of people come to Canberra by road.

SENATOR RYAN.- There is the question of the road to the Coast.

MR. ROWE.- Yes, and the road to the Snowy Mountains area. Anyone who goes to that area ^{by road} once ^{will not} go ^{back to} again. The road to the Coast also is generally in a disgraceful condition.

SENATOR WOOD.- Do you think that there is generally an insufficiency of parking space for tourists?

MR. ROWE. - I think there is an insufficiency for both residents and visitors, especially near the shopping areas, and particularly near Kingston. There has been a neglect of long-range forecasting of traffic requirements in that regard. It is no answer
H.1 929 R. ROWE

SENATE CANBERRA COMMITTEE

to a parking problem to push the motorist off the road. He should have parking space. In Canberra, one cannot, as he can in Melbourne, leave his car at Spring Street, or somewhere in that vicinity, catch a tram down to the city, and save time. One cannot leave one's car miles away from where one wants to go.

THE CHAIRMAN.- What about the tourist, who has a caravan and does not want to go to a hotel?

MR. ROWE.- He has a tourist park at Turner.

SENATOR WOOD.- That is a caravan park?

MR. ROWE.- Yes.

SENATOR HANNAFORD.- Is that the Black Mountain Tourist Park?

MR. ROWE.- Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN.- Is it adequate?

MR. ROWE.- I have recently come back from overseas, and by overseas standards it is not adequate. I should like to see a decent car-hotel, or motel, with really up-to-date standards such as North America provides. I do not see why we do not have them. We have to offer an inducement to private enterprise to provide them.

SENATOR WOOD.- Do you think that the services provided by the Tourist Bureau are of good standard?

MR. ROWE.- I think that the Tourist Bureau is doing a very good job. For many years it was controlled partly by the Government and partly by the Chamber of Commerce, but the cost became out of proportion, and the Chamber of Commerce was unable to make any larger contribution to it, and the Government took over the Bureau. It is now a Government department, which I think is a retrograde step, but there it is. There is an advisory body of the Tourist Bureau on which the Government, Commerce, and some other interests are represented. I am told - I cannot vouch for it - that a number of recommendations of the Tourist Advisory Board have not been acted upon. If you go to the top of Red Hill, you will observe a condition of roads there that would be a disgrace to any community in Australia. Sticking up out of the top of the road are stones that would tear the inside out of any tyre if one did not literally crawl over the road. That condition prevails over the entire observation area at the top

H.2. R. ROWE.

SENATE CANBERRA COMMITTEE

of Red Hill. I see no reason why it should not be corrected. I understand that that is a matter to which the Tourist Advisory Board has referred, but up to the present no decision favourable to improvement has been made. Many thousands of visitors go to the top of Red Hill every year. It is one of the sights of Canberra.

SENATOR HANNAFORD.- It is the best vantage point in Canberra.

MR. ROWE.- Yes.

SENATOR WOOD.- Do you see any difficulty in the way of making Canberra a regular staging-point or base for visitors to the Snowy Mountains area?

MR. ROWE.- It appears to me to be a great opportunity. There are not a great number of areas that would be suitable for that purpose, but the Snowy Mountains Area is definitely one, and Canberra could well be a staging-place for it.

SENATOR WOOD.- That objective could be combined with the tourist attractions in Canberra?

MR. ROWE.- Yes. In the winter months we have really attractive snow country here.

SENATOR WOOD.- It is suitable for skiing and other snow sports?

MR. ROWE.- Yes, at certain times. The period that it is available is limited, I admit, but it is very good during the snow-falls.

SENATOR WOOD.- You spoke of better access roads from all adjoining state areas, including the Snowy Mountains area, and the south coast of New South Wales. I take it that that is a sincere expression of opinion from the Chamber of Commerce.

MR. ROWE.- It is.

SENATOR WOOD.- The Chamber is not merely using the tourist angle as a bait to get an outlet road to the Coast.

MR. ROWE.- No, it is very sincere. The road to the Coast is one that we feel should be accepted as a responsibility of Government. I know that there is always the question of finance in relation to whether it is provided for in the Federal Aid Roads Grant from the

SENATE CANBERRA COMMITTEE

Commonwealth to the State. The road ~~is~~ generally ^{is} in bad condition. It is a deterrent. The people in the Australian Capital Territory are entitled to some consideration also. It is their nearest approach to a seaside holiday, and it is a good thing that they should take advantage of it. Having been over it recently I can say that it is a real deterrent.

SENATOR HANNAFORD.- Local residents prefer to go to Sydney?

MR. ROWE.- Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN.- What route does the road to the Coast follow?

MR. ROWE.- It goes through Bungendore and Braidwood to Bateman's Bay.

SENATOR WOOD.- A lot of people rely on tourist coaches from outside Canberra for tourist trips about Canberra.

MR. ROWE.- There is no local service that I know of for tourist trade within the Territory that provides a transport service.

SENATOR WOOD.- Do you not think that the establishment of such a service might foster the use of Canberra as a base for tourists?

MR. ROWE.- The Pioneer people used to, and I think still ~~do~~, run a tour for their visitors to Canberra, and at certain periods such as the week-ends and Sundays they used to run a special bus in the summer months to the Cotter River and back, and perhaps for a tour of the City.

SENATOR WOOD.- What is the feeling of business people in Canberra about the tourist traffic? Are they favourable to it?

MR. ROWE.- Most decidedly.

SENATOR WOOD.- They should favour it, but one does not always find that local business people favour tourist traffic.

MR. ROWE.- I am afraid that a justifiable criticism that is made is that our eating facilities are not all that they might be. One can only hope that the provision of additional shopping facilities, which is now in progress, will cause the situation to right itself by introducing a little more competition.

SENATOR WOOD.- Being interested in this trade, I am very

SENATE CANBERRA COMMITTEE

observant about it. A great number of the visitors to Canberra are here only one night and a day, and then depart. The problem seems to be to attract people here and hold them longer. Your tourist traffic is of people who call in transit and move on.

MR. ROWE.- That is so. Pioneer Tours, and, formerly, Murray Valley Coaches, arranged their tours so that they arrived at night or in the early morning, and departed the next day. That is unfortunate, but that is the limitation that is imposed on us.

SENATOR WOOD.- One cannot get a real tourist trade unless advertising is undertaken. Do the Commonwealth authorities advertise Canberra anywhere as a tourist centre? I have never seen any such advertisement.

MR. ROWE.- I must confess that I do not know of any.

SENATOR WOOD.- Do they advertise to attract people to Canberra?

MR. ROWE.- I do not know of it.

SENATOR WOOD.- Have the business people of Canberra thought of putting up to the Government a proposition that Canberra be advertised as a tourist centre?

MR. ROWE.- I do not think that any specific proposals have been made.

SENATOR WOOD.- The business people have never moved of their own initiative in that regard?

MR. ROWE.- I have mentioned that a few years ago they were more strongly represented and had a bigger control of the situation, when the tourist office was away from the Government. I think that they were more inspired to do something then, than perhaps they are now.

SENATOR WOOD.- I thought that that was perhaps one of the things that the business people themselves should do.

MR. ROWE.- I agree that a responsibility rests on the business community to sponsor it.

SENATOR WOOD.- It is done in other places.

MR. ROWE.- Yes.

SENATOR HANNAFORD.- From a down to earth practical point

of view, your evidence is some of the best that we have received. I think that this is really the first time that there has been any close investigation of the development of Canberra.

MR. ROWE.- In this form, anyway.

SENATOR HANNAFORD.- In the first place, you express your appreciation of the investigations of this Committee.

MR. ROWE.- I do.

SENATOR HANNAFORD.- Following that, do you consider that it is desirable to appoint a joint standing committee of both Houses of the Parliament to maintain a general surveillance over the general activities and development of Canberra?

MR. ROWE.- I do, with the qualification that it should restrict its activity to broad considerations and not provide a pin-pricking atmosphere for an administration. It would then do an extremely desirable service. If it became such a body that it was the avenue through which disgruntled people could express their views against an administration, you might find it a struggle to get people who would be willing to serve on the administration. I think it should be kept at a higher level.

SENATOR HANNAFORD.- It should confine itself to the national level of the development of Canberra as a national Capital?

MR. ROWE.- I think that would be very desirable indeed.

SENATOR HANNAFORD.- I do not know whether you want to qualify your remark that the departmental control of a city such as Canberra, or an area such as the Australian Capital Territory, is a bureaucratic dictatorship?

MR. ROWE.- I think that is a fair description.

SENATOR HANNAFORD.- Do you suggest that the present administration has been a bureaucratic dictatorship?

MR. ROWE.- I do not wish to infer that the present administration has been any more so than any other. In many respects, it has been very helpful and courageous in what it has done. I think that any departmental administration will inevitably develop into such a dictatorship.

SENATE CANBERRA COMMITTEE.

SENATOR HANNAFORD.- Do you suggest that it has been inefficient in the rapid or necessary development that has taken place especially in the years since the Federal Capital Commission went out of existence in 1929?

MR. ROWE.- I should not like to say broadly that it has been inefficient. I think there have been lapses that represent gross inefficiency at various stages, but broadly I prefer to say that it is not constituted and it does not possess the proper authority to enable it to do the job as it should be done.

SENATE CANBERRA COMMITTEE.

SENATOR HANNAFORD. - You agree that it has not been satisfactory, as far as the transfer of the Public Service to Canberra is concerned?

MR. ROWE. - If the blame lies with the Department, yes, but I doubt whether the blame does lie with the department. I think it probably lies with Government policy in providing the necessary funds over a prescribed period of years so that the various stages could be developed as they were reached, and also, it probably has been seriously embarrassed by unforeseen conditions, one of which, for example, is the housing shortage. It is not possible, from a practical point of view, because there are not sufficient resources or builders, to undertake a given programme at a given time. Therefore, it is in the position that it cannot physically provide the number of houses needed to complete a certain stage. There are many factors which come into that, due to unforeseen pressures. For example, during the course of a developmental programme it may be decided by the Government - and I think this has happened - that some new branch will be created, some new service established, thereby imposing the need to make available a given number of houses and accommodation in the form of buildings for something that was quite unforeseen. That has an adverse effect on a progressively planned policy for building up a housing programme.

SENATOR HANNAFORD. - And of course over-riding that were the depression years and the war years?

MR. ROWE. - That is so. It only requires a decision to undertake a major work not previously provided for to absorb what might be all the available building labour at a given period. That, again, might militate against the building of houses, schools, or something else.

SENATOR HANNAFORD. - You outlined the development of the shopping areas as they exist in Canberra, and you expressed regret that provision had not been made for a more central shopping area; in other words, a principal shopping area. Do you agree that the

SENATE CANBERRA COMMITTEE.

dispersal of the shopping areas puts a great handicap on trade and commerce? I was wondering whether the plan would permit, even yet, of a more centralised shopping area. I had in mind an area that is undeveloped at the present stage but which will eventually be developed. I refer to the so-called Duntroon area which, even though it is not central, is central from Duntroon through to Civic and also would be central if a proper line of communication were established between Kingston and City. Do you think that eventually a principal shopping area could be established there if inducement were given to commerce?

MR. ROWE. - That would be approximately in the area on this side of Mt Russell, near the American Memorial?

SENATOR HANNAFORD. - Yes. That is all laid out under the Griffin Plan. It was originally envisaged that a railway line would skirt that area. Is it impossible to extend the railway to that area, even now?

MR. ROWE. - I am afraid I am not competent to answer that question.

SENATOR HANNAFORD. - It is a moot point whether it would not be practicable or possible in the future.

MR. ROWE. - It would need to be a very long term project because of the commitments that have been entered into in ~~the~~ other areas.

SENATOR HANNAFORD. - I think it is worthy of consideration, nevertheless. Senator Wood spoke a great deal about tourist trade. I was wondering what you think of the present state of affairs that exists in regard to the licensing hours that apply in Canberra, compared with those in New South Wales. Do you not think it anomalous that the fixing of liquor hours should be left in the hands of the Minister, as they are at the present time, when there are different hours all round the Australian Capital Territory which encourage people to go elsewhere to satisfy their needs in this regard?

MR. ROWE. - Because of some very strong personal views on this question, I asked the Chamber of Commerce for specific directions.

SENATE CANBERRA COMMITTEE

I should say that if this question were asked the Chamber would say that it feels that there should be trading hours in the Territory comparable with those existing in the surrounding area of New South Wales. I do not agree personally with that view. I think that if this is a separate territory, as it is, it is entitled to decide its own destiny. I think, democratically, no decision should be made without consulting the people.

SENATOR HANNAFORD. - But the official view of the Chamber is that liquor hours should be on the same basis as in New South Wales?

MR. ROWE. - For practical purposes, I think they would say that the conditions which apply in the nearby territory should apply here.

SENATOR HANNAFORD. - Is it the opinion of the Chamber that it militates against the tourist trade of Canberra?

MR. ROWE. - I think the view is that it is disadvantageous to trade in the Territory while the present differing conditions exist.

SENATOR HANNAFORD. - What is your opinion of the interpretation of the Commonwealth Government in regard to Ansett Airways having the right to land their planes on the Fairbairn aerodrome?

MR. ROWE. - As far as I am aware, that has not been specifically considered, but I would feel that the Chamber would say there should be no undue restriction on any reputable and safe service.

SENATOR HANNAFORD. - The Commonwealth view is protected by Section 92.

MR. ROWE. - I am afraid I do not appreciate that. I cannot see the reason for that.

SENATOR HANNAFORD. - That has been mentioned in today's issue of the Canberra Times.

MR. ROWE. - I think that the view of the Chamber, generally, is for freedom of enterprise without any undue restriction on reasonable and fair competition.

SENATE CANBERRA COMMITTEE.

SENATOR RYAN. - You said in your submission that the Federal Capital Commission performed meritorious work and was disbanded in 1929. Do you know why it was disbanded?

MR. ROWE. - I think it was a change in the political approach to the question of the form of Government. I was here at the time and I know something of the circumstances. I think it was felt in Government circles that the Commission had done the job it was commissioned to do and that it was necessary to review the form of administration for that reason, if for no other. The review was made, and as the major transfer of Government departments had then been completed, the decision to disband it was based, I think, on the fact that facilities for administering the Territory were here with the departmental services that had then been established in Canberra, and it was decided to continue on a departmental basis.

SENATOR RYAN. - As far as you are aware, there has been no movement to restore the Commission?

MR. ROWE. - No.

SENATOR RYAN. - I presume your Chamber has given some thought to the matter of industries to be established in Canberra? Can you give the Committee the viewpoint of the Chamber in that respect?

MR. ROWE. - The viewpoint of the Chamber is, of course, that every possible encouragement should be given to the establishment of industry in order that there should be a more balanced development as between governmental and non-governmental services to the community. With that in view, it had some part in consultation with the secretary of the Department of the Interior in setting aside the industrial area at Molonglo some few years ago. That, we believe, was a very necessary provision, in fact long overdue at that stage. In the meantime, because of the absence of development of the formerly provided industrial area which was right out on the north of the city, there was pressure of demand for industrial leases, and that gave rise to the creation of ~~the~~ *the*

Causeway area of temporary tenancies. That, in our view as a Chamber, was highly undesirable. On the other hand, there was no alternative. They could not go anywhere else. The unfortunate thing now is that, having created, or by sanction allowed, this area to be established, there is a problem on their hands today. It would not be just, having permitted these people to go in and commit themselves to expenditure in establishing themselves in that temporary area, to brush them off and tell them to get out. On the other hand, they are being encouraged gradually, and even being given some preference, to go to the industrial leases in the permanent industrial area at Molonglo. I think that is commendable and that every encouragement should be given those people to transfer to the permanent area. The permanent area has been partially thrown open. Again, our complaint is that in making available industrial leases, they are making them available in smaller lots than the demand indicates. There were 72 applications for 39 leases recently. That indicates the demand for industrial leases, and we think there should be more leases made available more readily and more promptly.

(Continued on page 941).

SENATOR BENN.— The purpose of having the Canberra plan is to establish the seat of government here?

MR. ROWE.— Yes.

SENATOR BENN.— Otherwise it would be futile entirely to have any plan of Canberra?

MR. ROWE.— Yes.

SENATOR BENN.— You believe that the head office of each Commonwealth department should be moved here?

MR. ROWE.— I do. I think the decision was in the best interests of Australia and I think as time goes on it will be more and more vindicated.

SENATOR BENN.— Is that the official view of the Chamber of Commerce?

MR. ROWE.— Yes.

SENATOR BENN.— When I speak of the head of the departments, you are aware that departments are diverse in their establishments?

MR. ROWE.— Yes.

SENATOR BENN.— Would you say that the High Court of Australia should be in Canberra?

MR. ROWE.— Not necessarily.

SENATOR BENN.— Can you give me a reason why it should not be here?

MR. ROWE.— I am afraid that I cannot.

SENATOR BENN.— Have you given the matter any thought?

MR. ROWE.— Not particularly.

SENATOR BENN.— Would you like to think the matter over and come back tomorrow and tell me your opinion of it?

MR. ROWE.— I would be quite happy to do that.

SENATOR BENN.— Do you know where the High Court of Australia is domiciled now?

MR. ROWE. In Melbourne.

SENATOR BENN.— Can you give me any reason why you think it should be in Melbourne?

MR. ROWE.— I do not think it should necessarily be in Melbourne or any other particular city. I have not given any thought

to the matter.

SENATOR BENN.- Would you say it was in Melbourne because the Federal Parliament was originally located there?

MR. ROWE.- I think that would be the reason.

SENATOR BENN.- Do you think sufficient time has elapsed for us to move our High Court as soon as possible to the seat of government?

MR. ROWE.- I will agree with that, but I have not given it any particular consideration. I think, however, it is quite consistent with the conception of Canberra and the centralisation of services here. I do not know whether there are practical difficulties, but I cannot see them.

SENATOR BENN.- The Attorney-General's Department is here?

MR. ROWE.- That is so.

SENATOR BENN.- And you say now that the High Court of Australia should be in Canberra?

MR. ROWE.- The only practical difficulty that comes to my mind, and no doubt it could be resolved, would be that if it were here it would be here nominally only unless hearings were held here, which would impose some additional considerable expense to the parties to such hearings.

SENATOR BENN.- It goes on circuit at present, does it not, for a day or two in each year in various centres?

MR. ROWE.- I think the only question that arises is whether it would be here only nominally for administrative purposes or whether hearings would be conducted here.

SENATOR BENN.- Do you not think the High Court of Australia should be established permanently in Canberra?

MR. ROWE.- In principle, I do, but I have not considered the implications involved.

SENATOR BENN.- Would you say that the head office of the Commonwealth Bank should be in Canberra?

MR. ROWE.- Again I would agree in principle to that.

SENATOR BENN.- Can you give me any sound reason why it should be in Sydney?

MR. ROWE.- No.

SENATOR BENN.- The Treasury is here at present.

MR. ROWE.- It is.

SENATOR BENN.- Do you believe the head office of the Australian Broadcasting Commission should be here?

MR. ROWE.- Yes, in principle.

SENATOR BENN.- You are speaking on behalf of the Chamber of Commerce?

MR. ROWE.- I have not consulted it, but I should think that would be its view.

SENATOR BENN.- What would you say should be the locality of the Commonwealth Court of Conciliation and Arbitration - in Melbourne or Canberra?

MR. ROWE.- I think that is comparable to your suggestion about the High Court. It should be here for administrative ~~pur~~poses.

SENATOR BENN.- Would you say it should be here for all purposes?

MR. ROWE.- I should prefer to say "For administrative purposes" because I think that by coming here for hearings it would impose undue expense, and certainly increased expense on appellants. For that reason I think that its hearings should be conducted in the places most convenient to the appellants.

SENATOR BENN.- You are familiar with Commonwealth awards?

MR. ROWE.- Yes.

SENATOR BENN.- In some respects they are similar to legislative enactments in their effect?

MR. ROWE.- Yes.

SENATOR BENN.- You could not dissociate some of the provisions of these awards from the economic policy of the government?

MR. ROWE.- No, that is a very important factor in the economy of the country.

SENATOR BENN.- It is a purely Commonwealth instrumentality?

MR. ROWE.- Yes.

SENATOR BENN.- If you gave this matter some mature consideration would you say that you would be of the opinion that that

Court should be located in Canberra?

MR. ROWE.- I have not given it that mature consideration, so I cannot say.

SENATOR BENN.- What would you say to a proposal to establish the Commonwealth Court of Conciliation and Arbitration permanently in Melbourne?

MR. ROWE.- I think there is no more reason why it should be established permanently in Melbourne, Sydney or Brisbane than anywhere else.

SENATOR BENN.- Are you aware that plans are being prepared for a permanent court for the Arbitration Court to be constructed in Melbourne?

MR. ROWE.- Yes.

SENATOR BENN.- Have you thought of the national aspect of that?

MR. ROWE.- No, I am afraid I have not.

SENATOR BENN.- Your Chamber of Commerce has not given consideration to it?

MR. ROWE.- Not so far as I am aware.

SENATOR BENN.- It has not raised any official objection?

MR. ROWE.- No.

SENATOR BENN.- Do you think you could take this matter before the Chamber of Commerce and have it discussed?

MR. ROWE.- I should be very happy to do so.

SENATOR BENN.- Would you say it is a breach of the spirit of the intention to establish Canberra as the seat of government?

MR. ROWE.- I would not go so far as that without giving further thought to the matter.

SENATOR BENN.- You are familiar with all the localities in Canberra, the residential buildings and so forth?

MR. ROWE.- Yes.

SENATOR BENN.- Would you like to see a block of flats eight storeys in height, constructed in the neighbourhood of Civic Centre?

MR. ROWE.- I think the question of density of population

SENATE CHAMBER COMMITTEE

is very important and that the administration must be guided by expert opinion as to the most desirable means of overcoming that. The low density that exists at the moment arises, I think, from a somewhat lavish provision of home sites in respect of areas. As far as I am concerned I would gladly divest myself of some 20 or 30 feet of the area that I have in the interests of closer settlement. I think it is an extravagance and I do not think it should be continued. The whole design has been planned on a lavish scale of residential settlement which disperses population away from centres of business as well as from schools, sporting and other facilities.

SENATOR BENN.- Would you say that building an 8-storey block of flats is going from one extreme to the other?

MR. ROWE.- The Chamber of Commerce has given some thought to the question of multi-storey settlement.

SENATOR BENN.- Did it reach a decision on it?

MR. ROWE.- I do not think it has reached a definite decision, but my impression is that it is certainly not opposed to an increase in the density of settlement. It has not expressed any particular views in regard to the proposal for an 8-storey block of flats, but the idea has gained ground that a proposal which brings people nearer to existing facilities instead of putting them further out will appeal to a greater number of people on the ground that it would not be opposed to the best interests of those concerned. The proposals resolve themselves into multi-storey buildings of some kind or another. I know that there are objections to such buildings on the ground that they cultivate slum areas, but that is not the experience of overseas countries which are developing multi-storey buildings. It has not been the experience in New Zealand.

SENATOR BENN.- Would you say they are compelled to have such buildings because of the shortage of building sites?

MR. ROWE.- I believe that would be a factor. I believe that the community in Canberra is suffering because people are being put far away from the available services. If they can be brought nearer to such services by some such proposal and provided there are

SENATE CANBERRA COMMITTEE

adequate safeguards in the form of reasonable playing areas and facilities surrounding these multi-story buildings there would be no basic objection to them.

SENATOR BENN.- Do you think a railway should be constructed between Yass and Canberra?

MR. ROWE.- I think a great deal depends on what is to be the future of railways. I know that that was an initial conception, and indeed, a condition. As to the economics of that today I am not competent to express an opinion because it needs a lot of investigation.

SENATOR BENN.- You were speaking earlier about the future of Canberra in respect of tourist trade. Do you think a railway between Canberra and Yass would improve tourist traffic?

MR. ROWE.- I am not so sure that railways of the future are going to command the same passenger traffic as they have hitherto. I think a great deal would depend on the development of improved passenger conveying road vehicles, air services and the like. That is my reason for saying that I think the economics of it would require careful consideration but broadly I would see many advantages in completion of a rail link between Yass and Canberra.

SENATOR BENN.- Has the Chamber of Commerce considered this matter recently?

MR. ROWE.- Not for a long while.

SENATOR BENN.- What would your attitude be personally towards construction of a road between Canberra and Yass?

MR. ROWE.- A new road?

SENATOR BENN.- Yes, a trafficable road.

MR. ROWE.- I think it is highly desirable and I would hope that the Commonwealth might find it possible to approach that matter from the angle that there was some national responsibility for the provision of funds for it or at least for the provision of a substantial contribution to make the road possible.

SENATOR BENN.- Is that the view of the Chamber of Commerce?

MR. ROWE.- Yes.

SENATE CONFERENCE COMMITTEE

SENATOR RYAN.- I appreciate the answers that you have given to the questions I have submitted to you and I should like more specific information regarding the type of industry the Chamber of Commerce desires to be established in Canberra. Could you enumerate the various types?

MR. ROWE.- I cannot do so off-hand.

SENATOR RYAN.- They would be of a light, not heavy, nature?

MR. ROWE.- The industrial development which has taken place here so far has been more in the nature of light, or minor industrial development, mainly industries employing a relatively small number of people. We do not know of any major development which would employ a large number of people. I understand that there have been proposals from overseas about the possibility of having woollen mills here. I know that a great deal of scientific information is necessary before woollen mills can be established and therefore that is not an immediate possibility in my view. The Chamber certainly is in favour of the greatest possible expansion of industry in the Territory.

SENATOR RYAN.- You would not confine Canberra specifically to scientific purposes?

MR. ROWE.- Definitely not. I have not stressed the provision in the proposal regarding law making in the Australian Capital Territory. I content myself by saying that that is a vital consideration.

THE CHAIRMAN.- We might hear some more from you on that subject later.

Sitting suspended from 12.45 to 2.15.

SENATE CANBERRA COMMITTEE

GEORGE AUSTIN COLMAN , Manager, J. B. Young Ltd., Canberra, sworn and examined.

THE CHAIRMAN.- I understand that you have a statement to make to the Committee, Mr. Coleman.

MR. COLMAN.- I thank the Committee for this opportunity to give evidence on the difficulties of retail business in Canberra. It is the first such opportunity that a business man has had.

I shall begin with a brief history of J. B. Young Ltd. The Company had a small country store in Queanbeyan, which is seven miles distant from Canberra, when the Federal Territory was under way and, when the first leases for business purposes were available, it purchased the first site offered to it at Kingston at the first business lease sale, on 12th December, 1924. The object of the Company was to establish a general store in Canberra. I might add that, although I was young at the time, I attended that sale and wondered if ever a store would be established there. The site was on the broad plains. There were no trees and the wind whistled around us.

That was Block 1, Section 21, of the Kingston business area. The block has a 91 feet frontage and a depth of 145 feet. It was the largest business site offered at that sale. The block opposite - a residential block - measures 125 feet by 125 feet, which is roughly 1,500 square feet larger than the largest business block offered.

When I say that our object was to establish a general store, I mean that in the true sense of a general store as conceived in other country towns. A general business in any centre is part of the life of the community. It handles practically all lines, particularly builders' supplies, timber, netting and that sort of thing, and all other types of merchandise.

The Directors of the Company, when they found that this was the largest site offering, planned to put a building there with provision for a second storey and, when the construction went forward, the foundations were designed with that end in view.

SENATE CANBERRA COMMITTEE

This account is more or less a lowly history of the Company as it progressed from the time it started to build at Kingston and of the difficulties with which it was faced and which it had to overcome as best it could. It is not on the high plane of this morning's proceedings, but it has a big bearing on the life of the community in as much as any disorganisation in a store can be reflected in the service given to the public.

I come now to the difficulties encountered. First of all, there is lack of yard space. The store went up in two sections. The first section was built in 1925, and it covered half the block fronting Giles Street. With the object of establishing a general store, we proceeded to stock it with all the usual things required for a small community, and for a while it was reasonably successful. We had a small yard and we had a bulk store on the rear of the block, and so we were able to keep the usual requirements of a general store.

However, with the growth of Canberra, it was necessary to extend back another twenty or thirty feet. Then our difficulties started. We found that we could not carry the stocks that we needed there. Therefore, we had to revert to carrying them in Queanbeyan, where we had ample space, and transporting them to Canberra bi-weekly or weekly. Then it was found that we would have to have some other kind of storage handy to the store. We managed to get a weekly lease on a section at the Causeway semi-industrial area, which was opened up about that time.

This lack of yard space and bulk storage seriously hampered the Company, because it meant additional transport, lack of continuity of supplies to the area, and a tremendous amount of overhead which would have been unnecessary had we been able to store on the premises.

Garaging of vehicles was also a very serious point. The importance of vehicles in Canberra cannot be over emphasised. Because of the scattered nature of the city it was necessary to have a collector of orders with a vehicle, a vehicle for electrical service, a vehicle for deliveries and a vehicle for bulk handling, and these had to be garaged wherever we could find space to garage them.

SENATE CANBERRA COMMITTEE

To give some idea of the spread, at one stage we had two vehicles in two garages that we built behind a residential lease some two hundred to three hundred yards from the store, two vehicles down in the Causeway semi-industrial area, and another one in a private garage about half a mile away.

You can understand that these vehicles have to be collected and brought in each morning to start the morning's business. Carters do not like to walk, and you have to provide bicycles to get them to the vehicles. Then, inevitably, when a vehicle is garaged near the finish of the day, somebody comes in and wants something urgently and it is necessary to send someone on a hike to the garage to get a vehicle out and make the delivery. There is great loss of time. The problem arose day after day and year after year.

I shall deal with the store at Civic Centre later, but I point out in passing that we had the same problem there in relation to garaging. At present we have one vehicle that has to be put in a garage before it is locked up about six o'clock. We have another one in a private garage about half a mile away and a third one is taken home by the man who operates it.

The temporary nature of the Causeway semi-industrial area has caused us great difficulty. You can picture us at Kingston with no backyard and the need of some type of facilities for handling such things as cement and iron. Although we were able to get a block at the Causeway semi-industrial area, it was only on a weekly tenancy, which did not enable us to develop the area or to put a great deal of money into it as we did not know from year to year when it would be resumed and we would have to find another position. Thus the structure we put up was not satisfactory. We could not see that a better type of structure would be warranted.

For this reason, we fell back again on Queanbeyan for supplies and used this area as a transit depot to receive the goods and hold them until they were brought up to the store at Kingston. That space at the Causeway industrial area is at present used as a grocery packing department. We are faced now with the problem that,

SENATE CANBERRA COMMITTEE

when the area is resumed, we shall have to find space elsewhere. We understand that it is to be resumed in the near future, although this has been going on for twenty five years. Where are we going to put our grocery packing department? We certainly have no room at Kingston. It is impossible to erect premises for that sort of thing at the Molonglo industrial area. I mean that it would not be practicable to have a packing department staff operating in such an area. When that building goes, we will probably have to close down that packing department, unless, of course, we are able to put up a second storey on the Kingston premises.

Loss of time by staff, as you can imagine, is considerable, and the spread of storage and garaging facilities also means a great loss of time. The practical side is that you have to change staff around. If a truck comes in fully loaded, it is necessary to have additional staff to unload it. Therefore, we have the problem of taking staff probably half a mile to unload a truck and bringing them back again.

There is also loss of control. Everyone knows that a spread organisation has not the same control as a compact one. You can see that, in establishing a general store, we had these difficulties, which we endeavoured to overcome by supplying from Queanbeyan and from our bulk store at the Causeway area, but I am afraid we did not succeed in the plans that we envisaged. First of all, we had to make way for expanding in other departments by eliminating builders' supplies, iron, fibro and so on.

MR. COLMAN SPEAKING.- Then we found that we would have to eliminate produce. After that was eliminated, we found that we had to expand our normal departments again - those that sold vases, basins, and that sort of thing- again supplying from Queanbeyan if an order was placed with us. But gradually specialists came in and took over that type of business. We were unable to carry the normal stocks of things that country people require, and to this day country people go to Queanbeyan for their supplies.

Thus the Kingston store became gradually more or less a department store, but not the general store usually found in a country town, which, when all is said and done, Canberra was until just recently, I should say.

That brings me to the question of the specialist type of business. I think most of you realize that in Canberra the retailers are more or less specialists and that there is nothing that you could call a universal provider. The specialist trade is good trade, and it definitely has its place in the retail trade, but the people of Canberra have missed having a universal provider from which they could get their scraps of timber and the bits and pieces that they use in and around their homes. They have missed having one place to supply all their requirements. They go to the specialists, but there is a certain type of person who likes to go to a place where he is known and do all his buying in that place. We have a very good business in Canberra, but it is not what we envisaged in the first place. We were unable to carry out our plans. The fact that we were unable to supply all the things that people wanted, together with the fact that other traders were specializing, had the effect of making the public feel that shopping facilities in Canberra were not up to the standard they had been used to. Most of the inhabitants of Canberra came from Melbourne or Sydney, and were used to shops with large varieties of stock, but Canberra shops could not hope to hold the great variety of things that the people were used to. That, together with the fact that they had to go to three, four, or more shops to get their requirements, made them rather unhappy about trading conditions here. At that stage, and indeed even now, there is not

sufficient population in Canberra to make it suitable for full specialist trading, as Sydney is.

The problem of space was always with us. We did not have enough space. As our store at Kingston was designed to take a second storey, we applied to the authorities for permission to add a second storey to it, but the authorities refused to allow us to do so. They said that it would put the Kingston shopping centre out of balance.

They told us, "We are sorry, but we cannot do anything about it". We had a model made showing what the Kingston area would look like if a second storey were added to all the shops or to a shop at any one corner. I believe the model is still in Canberra. It was constructed by an architect who is practising here at the present time. We submitted the model to the authorities, but their answer was still "No".

The authorities then accused J.B.Young Ltd. of trying to develop Kingston as against the main shopping centre at Civic. That was rather funny, because we realized that Kingston was a suburban shopping centre, and that Civic Centre - or City, as we call it - was the main centre. Our directors at the time envisaged that it would be a long time before Civic Centre was any use for business. That assumption was borne out by the facts, because it is only now, some thirty years later, that Civic Centre is coming into its own as a business centre.

To overcome the difficulty caused by not being permitted to go upwards, our directors purchased two adjoining businesses, pulled down the two shops concerned as well as the residences behind them, negotiated a thirty year lease and built a store which opened into our original department store. The new store had a frontage of 35 ft. and the original store a frontage of 91 ft.

Let me turn to Civic Centre. My heading there is "The Slow Development of Civic Centre as a main business centre". We realized from the inception that Civic Centre would be the main business centre in the years to come, but development there was so slow that it was touch and go whether we could make a business pay if we went there. Many businesses were opened there, but closed

their doors very soon afterwards. There just was not enough trade there. This may be hard to believe now, but before the War there were "Vacant" signs on shops at Civic Centre, particularly during the depression. One remained up for nearly a fortnight. We found that it was necessary to spread ourselves into Civic Centre, and we acquired shops as time went by. Although some people may think that those shops were, so to speak, given to us on a platter, they were there for the asking. It was only a matter of saying, "There is a sign on that place. Can we raise enough money to put stock into it?" For quite a number of years, the shops that we had there just paid their way, and that was all. Indeed, we lost on them during some periods. It was not until eighteen months ago that Civic Centre really came into its own. So our directors were justified in developing Kingston at that time, because if they had gone to Civic Centre they would have been broke by now.

Now I turn to the practical difficulties encountered at Civic Centre. There is no depth in the place. Practically every shop is a lock-up shop, and it is right back to its boundary in the lane or quadrangle at the rear of the shop. Loading facilities are inadequate. I will not say that it is impossible to get a semi-trailer into the space of the rear of the shops. It might be possible to drive one in and drive it out at the other end, but it would be very difficult if any other vehicles were loading or unloading there. The shops there have no hope of expansion. There are no sheds. The traders can operate only as specialists, unpacking in the laneway and getting their rubbish away as best they can.

Lonsdale Street is a shopping area. The move by the Chamber of Commerce had some effect in that the authorities agreed that there should be more shops. There was definitely a need for more shops in Canberra. So the authorities decided to alter their plans slightly and to make Lonsdale Street a semi-industrial area. As you know, Lonsdale Street is very close to Civic Centre. It was intended to be used for semi-industrial purposes, by garages, workshops and the like, but I believe there were some loop-holes in the ordinance which allowed people to open retail businesses there, and

it is developing in that way. That is quite unfair to the investors at Civic Centre who, in the original stages, were faced with the problem of building or buying expensive buildings. Now, right on their doorsteps, they are faced with competition from firms occupying premises of a very much cheaper type of construction and, in some cases, possibly a more suitable type of construction. I think some better plan could have been worked out whereby there was more development at Civic Centre proper.

My next heading is "Junior Staff and Housing". In Canberra, there is a great shortage of junior staff for retail businesses, probably because the Government seems to have an unlimited demand for junior staff. Another factor is that the schools do not encourage their pupils to enter the retail industry after leaving school. In addition, parents desire their children to go into the Public Service, following in their fathers' footsteps in some cases. All those factors make it extremely difficult for us to get trained staff and so build up a backbone of trained staff. We must have trained staff if we are to give good service to the public. I was speaking to a man in Goulburn recently. I said, "How do you get on for girls to come into your business?" He replied, "I have a list of thirty at the moment, and every one of them is a pretty good type. I could pick any one of them I wanted at any time." We could advertise for girls in the newspaper here, but we should be very lucky if we received one or two applications. In most cases, the applicants would not be suitable.

The next question is the sixty-five dollar question—why large city retailers have not been attracted to Canberra. This is only my version of the matter, but I think it is somewhere near the truth. The shopping centres in Canberra are too spread out to induce city retailers to open establishments here. If they came to Canberra to have a look round, where would they go? They would have a look at Kingston, but they would say, "I cannot go there because there are no premises available, and in any case there is not much development there." Civic Centre is the logical place, but the large city retailer would realize that he would have to wait until

the next auction sale before he could hope to get the lease of a site there. That brings me to the point that any business man interested in a lease has to wait upwards of four or five years until an auction sale is held before he can buy a lease. There is a lack of depth in all the blocks at Civic Centre, even in those offered recently. This entails costly construction. If you look at the buildings that are under way at present at Civic Centre, you will notice that in all cases basements have been excavated to provide storage space underneath the shops.

(Continued on next page)

MR. COLEMAN (Continuing). -

Also, as far as the city retailers are concerned, there is insufficient volume of trade in any one centre to warrant their coming here—at this stage.

I come now to the neutralising effect of present Canberra shopping groups. I feel that Canberra, in its initial stages, should have had a central shopping group or a commerce centre, with the corner shops radiating out into the various suburbs to give convenience to the housewives in those areas. Strangers always ask, "Where is the main town? Where is the centre? Where are the shops?". There is no centre. We realise the ultimate plan envisages Civic Centre having the big shopping centre, but at the present time there is no definite area that we can say is the main shopping centre for Canberra. I think I can best illustrate this neutralising effect of the present shopping groups by a little sort of fairy story. Picture a business man from Goulburn, a business man from Queanbeyan and a business man from Yass coming to Canberra in the period between 1930 and 1936 and seeing in Canberra a central business shopping area developing with depth in blocks and wide frontages for those who wanted to establish a department store with it all its ramifications, and shallower blocks for those who wanted special businesses, laid out in a way that would attract business to Canberra. These business men looked at this and said, "This will be something. In years to come this will be one of the best shopping centres in the district. How can we beat this? We want our own towns to be competitive." We shall suppose that they were equipped with a magic wand and could do anything, but that they must leave shops in Canberra. Let us suppose that one said, "Let us leave this group at Civic Centre, let us put this second group at Manuka, and this other group at Kingston. So that they will be restricted again, we shall give them depth to their blocks right up to their existing buildings. When that is done we can go back to our own centres and forget them for some time to come as opposition as a

business centre". I think that is about all I have to say about it.

THE CHAIRMAN. - Can you tell me why Civic Centre was so long developing?

MR. COLEMAN. - I think it was in 1927 that they started the building at Civic Centre. For a long time Government departments held certain of those premises. Also, I feel that there was lack of growth on the north side and the need for additional shops was not so acute in the initial stages. Then, as Mr. Rowe mentioned this morning, the argument came up as to what was to be the planning in the future when costs increased and these expensive colonnade types of buildings were considered obsolete.

THE CHAIRMAN. - You have an inadequate block at Kingston? What was that block designed for?

MR. COLEMAN. - It was designed for a store. That is all I can say.

THE CHAIRMAN. - What is the size of it?

MR. COLEMAN. - It is 91ft by 145 ft.

THE CHAIRMAN. - It looks as if they never thought of a general store. They seemed to think that it would not be necessary.

MR. COLEMAN. - I think that that was due to a lack of knowledge of the requirements of a general store. You need a store proper and also space for all types of building material, rock salt, galvanized iron piping, line, cement and all that type of thing, which you cannot put into an expensive building.

THE CHAIRMAN. - What lines of merchandise do you sell at the moment?

MR. COLEMAN. - At Kingston we sell groceries, hardware - that is mainly household hardware - tools etc., kitchenware, men's and boys' clothing, underclothes, and we have a showroom and a smaller section of boots and shoes and also electrical goods.

THE CHAIRMAN. - What are the main lines that are lacking?

MR. COLEMAN. - The main lines that are lacking are builders' supplies, builders' hardware - that is baths, basins and that type of thing - produce, country supplies such as drenches and all that

type of thing, and we have no furniture.

THE CHAIRMAN. - Are those lines sold by other stores in Canberra?

MR. COLEMAN. - Not to my knowledge.

THE CHAIRMAN. - Is there a furniture store in Canberra?

MR. COLEMAN. - We have no furniture store, but there are quite a number of furniture stores. There is Cusacks Furniture Store at Kingston.

THE CHAIRMAN. - In what year did you make application for the enlargement of your store by the addition of a second storey?

MR. COLEMAN. - It would be over a number of years. I cannot state the exact year, but it would be prior to World War II.

THE CHAIRMAN. - In the 1930's?

MR. COLEMAN. - In the late 1930's. I should say about 1938.

THE CHAIRMAN. - Your firm has branches at Kingston, Civic Centre and Queanbeyan?

MR. COLEMAN. - That is correct,

THE CHAIRMAN. - The parent firm is at Queanbeyan. Are all the branches under the same management?

MR. COLEMAN. - They are all under the same management, with managers for each store.

THE CHAIRMAN. - You are the general manager of the whole business?

MR. COLEMAN. - That is so.

THE CHAIRMAN. - You have experience of shopping not only in Canberra, but also in Queanbeyan?

MR. COLEMAN. - Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN. - Have you had experience at any other centre?

MR. COLEMAN. - I had experience at Murrumbidgee and Lithgow.

THE CHAIRMAN. - Your entire experience has been in general stores?

MR. COLEMAN. - Yes, I have never been in other than a general store.

THE CHAIRMAN. - I take it that at Civic Centre you are presented with a ready-made design. You are given an area and that is

to be your shop?

MR. COLEMAN. - That is so.

THE CHAIRMAN. - You cannot alter the interior?

MR. COLEMAN. - In most cases the buildings were extended in recent years to the rear of the block.

THE CHAIRMAN. - Do you consider that those premises at Civic Centre are suitable for shops generally?

MR. COLEMAN. - No.

THE CHAIRMAN. - Why not?

MR. COLEMAN. - Because they have no facilities for unpacking purposes and no storage other than making available part of the premises proper.

THE CHAIRMAN. - Are there back entrances as well as the shop entrances?

MR. COLEMAN. - Most of the premises go right to the road way.

THE CHAIRMAN. - They are lock-up shops?

MR. COLEMAN. - They are lock-up shops.

THE CHAIRMAN. - They have only the one entrance, which is at the front?

MR. COLEMAN. - No, they have rear doors, but in most cases the trucks have to pull up in the laneway to unload.

THE CHAIRMAN. - What do you think of the colonnade design? Has it any disadvantages for the purpose of shops?

MR. COLEMAN. - It has no disadvantages so far as the actual shopping is concerned, but it is a very expensive type of building.

THE CHAIRMAN. - I rather like the colonnade myself, but I have heard objections to it. Provided it was not too costly, you would have no objection?

MR. COLEMAN. - No. Provided we had depth in those blocks, the frontage is very good.

THE CHAIRMAN. - Your complaint is that there is not enough space?

MR. COLEMAN. - There is not enough depth in the blocks to enable us to expand.

SENATE CANBERRA COMMITTEE

THE CHAIRMAN. - One of the arguments that has been put before us is that people are likely to become public servants in Canberra because there is nothing else for them to do, but you have told us that you offer alternative employment and cannot get staff. Can you not get some of the surplus young people from Goulburn?

MR. COLEMAN. - The question of housing comes in. I did not bring up the question of housing. It is one that is acute throughout the country generally.

THE CHAIRMAN. - That is a difficulty in getting people from other towns?

MR. COLEMAN. - I might add here that our company has a subsidiary company, which has built a lot of houses, but not so many in Canberra. Many of our staff are housed in Queanbeyan in company houses, and they travel to Canberra by bus. The reason the houses have^{been} built in Queanbeyan is that we are able to hold land there and build as the finance becomes available, instead of having to build within a specified time.

THE CHAIRMAN. - Is building cheaper in Queanbeyan?

MR. COLEMAN. - Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN. - Do you find the leasehold tenure satisfactory?

MR. COLEMAN. - It is satisfactory. We have no objection to it. I think I am right in stating that a short time ago there was an amendment to the Ordinance that gave tenants rights in improvements, and we have nothing to fear with regard to the end of the period of 99 years.

THE CHAIRMAN. - Are there many arcas in any of the three shopping centres big enough for a large general store of the type that you want?

MR. COLEMAN. - No.

THE CHAIRMAN. - Could you establish such a store by obtaining two blocks of land?

MR. COLEMAN. - I can bring this point up now. When the last sale was brought up at Civic Centre about 18 months ago the directors of the company considered whether they would purchase several blocks

and put up a really big department store, but the cost of buying those several blocks was considered completely out of the question. It would have cost possibly £25,000 or £30,000 for just the land before we started.

THE CHAIRMAN. - Would the leasehold have cost you more than freehold in Queanbeyan? How do the prices compare?

MR. COLEMAN. - There is a great difficulty in Queanbeyan, because land is difficult to purchase there.

THE CHAIRMAN. - I should think so, but your firm has it already?

MR. COLEMAN. - It has had it in Queanbeyan for years. It was then that the directors had to make up their minds whether they would go ahead and build a new store in Queanbeyan or build a new one at Civic Centre. It was worked out and considered that Queanbeyan would be a better proposition. We now have under construction in Queanbeyan a new store of the type that we should like to have in Canberra - about 27,000 sq. ft. in area.

THE CHAIRMAN. - Which has the bigger turnover - the Queanbeyan store or the Canberra business?

MR. COLEMAN. - Strangely enough, the Canberra and Queanbeyan businesses have been almost equal. The turnover of the three businesses is almost equal.

THE CHAIRMAN. - Do you mean the two Canberra businesses taken together or each separately?

MR. COLEMAN. - Separately. The Queanbeyan store, with the new premises, will surpass the Canberra store.

THE CHAIRMAN. - Have you any serious competitor in your type of store in Canberra?

MR. COLEMAN. - We are the only department store in Canberra. I would say, "no". We will have very shortly, of course.

THE CHAIRMAN. - The question of city retailers came in. Are there not two of the city retailers with branches in Canberra? Have not Snows a business here?

SENATE CANBERRA COMMITTEE

MR. COLEMAN. - Although it was formed by a brother, there was no connection with Snows of Sydney.

THE CHAIRMAN. - It is not part of the chain system?

MR. COLEMAN. - No.

THE CHAIRMAN. - What about Goodlands?

MR. COLEMAN. - Goodlands have three or possibly four places in Canberra. There again, it is a specialist type of business.

THE CHAIRMAN. - What is their business?

MR. COLEMAN. - Groceries.

THE CHAIRMAN. - Only groceries?

MR. COLEMAN. - Groceries, and provisions, of course.

(Continued on page 964).

SENATE CANBERRA COMMITTEE.

SENATOR BENN.- Do you do your own importing?

MR. COLLIAN .- We do a certain amount. We did a lot pre-war, but since the war we have not done as much as we would like to do.

SENATOR BENN.- How do the goods come - once or twice a year, or piecemeal?

MR. COLMAN .- They come in almost continuously, as the shipments come through.

SENATOR RYAN.- Has your firm made any inquiry about the purchase of space in the new area at Civic Centre?

MR. COLMAN .- Not at Civic Centre, no.

SENATOR RYAN.- Do you know whether the disabilities you spoke about, associated with the present quarters in Civic and Kingston, have been corrected in the new area?

MR. COLEMAN.- I would say not. Each building, to the best of my knowledge, is going right to the rear of the block, and their garaging will have to be at the expense of space they could use otherwise within the building from the rear, such as facilities for unloading. They will have to go into the building proper, the same as in the established premises.

SENATOR RYAN.- That seems bad planning.

MR. COLMAN .- Yes. To our way of thinking, business blocks should have sufficient frontage and depth to move back as times change and as business improves. The business sites seem to have been designed on city lines, that is, that you must get every inch of space available for buildings and not for anything else.

SENATOR RYAN.- What was the chief objection to your firm building a second storey on its premises at Kingston?

MR. COLMAN .- The objection was to the appearance of a second storey, with single storeys on the balance of the shops.

SENATOR RYAN.- Were not other firms desirous of doing likewise?

MR. COLMAN .- I am sure there would have been, but possibly not many at the time.

SENATOR HANNAFORD.- Were those hostile to it?

SENATE CANBERRA COMMITTEE

MR. COLMAN.- No, no business people raised any objection to it.

SENATOR RYAN.- Are the present quarters in Kingston overcrowded?

MR. COLMAN.- They are overcrowded. Our aim is to get bigger stocks for the people of Canberra to select from.

SENATOR RYAN.- It is obvious that with the bigger population the demand for your services will be greater and you will need additional space?

MR. COLMAN.- Yes. I believe that possibly we may be able to get over the objection to putting on a second storey, but we have not broached the question in recent years because of the fact that we expanded next door into these other premises.

SENATOR RYAN.- That is only a temporary expedient?

MR. COLMAN.- Yes. We hope to be able to put this second storey on it at a later stage.

SENATOR RYAN.- What was the attitude of the Chamber of Commerce to this refusal which had the effect of stifling progress?

MR. COLMAN.- I am very doubtful whether the Chamber of Commerce was approached in any way at that stage. I am sure they would have supported it if they had been approached.

SENATOR RYAN.- Your firm did not make representations to the Chamber?

MR. COLMAN.- As far as I know, they did not.

SENATOR HANNAFORD.- A new building, the Brisbane Building is being erected at Civic at the present time. Has all the space in that building been allocated?

MR. COLMAN.- All blocks were sold, as far as I understand, and all will be built on within a short period.

SENATOR HANNAFORD.- That is all being constructed under the one authority?

MR. COLMAN.- No, individual builders. Some builders may be doing one or more shops, but they would be on individual contracts.

SENATE CANBERRA COMMITTEE

SENATOR HANNAFORD.- That will be erected in a square, with a frontage to all four sides?

MR. COLMAN .- Yes.

SENATOR HANNAFORD.- On a similar basis to what already exists there?

MR. COLMAN .- There are no windows to the rear, to the north-east.

SENATOR HANNAFORD.- Business and professional chambers are occupying a building on the western side, are they not?

MR. COLMAN .- There are some on the eastern side - the Sydney and Melbourne buildings, which both have business and professional chambers. There are more in the Melbourne buildings than in the Sydney buildings.

SENATOR HANNAFORD.- Nothing has been mooted in connection with the establishment of large business and professional chambers which would be more suitable in a solid block type building?

MR. COLMAN .- Not that I am aware of, except that at Kingston buildings will be going up there shortly which will take a certain number of professional men and provide office space.

SENATOR HANNAFORD.- You will agree that business and professional chambers do not require yard space, storage space, and the rest?

MR. COLMAN .- Definitely.

SENATOR HANNAFORD.- If such a building were constructed, say, on the western side of Melbourne building, that would relieve the pressure on the retail trades?

MR. COLMAN .- It would, provided that the professional people wished to move there. You must realise that there may not be the flow there for some years.

SENATOR HANNAFORD.- It would be in almost the exact relation that Brisbane buildings occupy on the other side.

MR. COLMAN .- That should be quite satisfactory.

SENATOR HANNAFORD.- Not at some distance removed. I do not know whether there is room, but if it occupied a similar position

SENATE CANBERRA COMMITTEE

to that occupied by the Police Station at the present time, would not that be satisfactory?

MR. COLMAN .- It would be quite satisfactory there.

SENATOR HANNAFORD.- Do you think that if such a building were constructed there it would be a good move to relieve the pressure on retail space?

MR. COLMAN .- I do.

SENATOR HANNAFORD.- You mentioned also that you have a labour shortage, particularly of trainee staff. Did you say there was a surplus in Goulburn. .

MR. COLMAN .- A particular man mentioned to me that he had a number of girls offering to him, and I was rather amazed that we cannot get a lineup like he has.

SENATOR WOOD.- With regard to the shortage of employees, would one of the reasons be that the salaries of government servants in Canberra are higher than those of people engaged in the ordinary forms of business?

MR. COLMAN .- No, I do not think so. The salaries paid by most retailers are quite adequate, and in many cases would meet the government.

SENATOR RYAN.- Apparently it is just that people desire to be in the government service?

MR. COLMAN .- It is a matter of opinion.

SENATOR RYAN.- With regard to the design of shops in the City area, you told the chairman you had no objection to the colonnade. As a businessman, if you had the option of building shops to your own design would you go for the colonnade effect or the modern design?

MR. COLMAN .- I would go for the modern type of shop, right up-to-date as far as the frontage was concerned. When I said I had no objection to it, I meant I have no objection to it as a trading site at the present time. The colonnades do not obstruct business.

SENATOR RYAN.- Do you not think that colonnading is an

SENATE CANBERRA COMMITTEE

expensive type of building?

MR. COLMAN .- It would be very expensive. I have it on fairly good authority that the colonnade and the supporting structure of the top floor would account for almost a third of the cost of the buildings.

SENATOR RYAN.- Having regard to Canberra's climate and the cold winds that blow, do you not think that the high colonnade in the buildings at Civic Centre exposes the area to winds more than elsewhere?

MR. COLMAN .- I think when it is cold in Canberra it would not make much difference whether it was high or low.

SENATOR RYAN.- Does your firm intend to approach the department again with regard to that second storey at the Kingston premises?

MR. COLMAN .- Most definitely.

SENATOR RYAN.- Do you think that, from an architectural point of view, the second storey would give point to the skyline of the whole block?

MR. COLMAN .- That is one of the arguments we used - that Kingston has actually three corners and that a two-storey building on two corners would give it a castle effect. It certainly would not be an eyesore.

THE CHAIRMAN.- Would you say that competition in the retail business in Canberra is keen?

MR. COLMAN .- I would say yes, there is competition in Canberra. Although there appears to be a limit to the number of shops in Canberra, there must be a great number. I do not know the number, but I should say there must be over 250 retail shops. In 1927, there were 73 under construction, and I think the last census report in 1953 showed somewhere about 180 existing. Since then, a lot of buildings have been established, and I would say there would be very close to 250 retail businesses in Canberra.

THE CHAIRMAN.- Are they totally new businesses, or have they started as yours did - as a branch from Queanbeyan?

SENATE CANBERRA COMMITTEE

MR. COLMAN .- I would say most of them established new businesses.

THE CHAIRMAN.- Are there many others who came from Queanbeyan originally?

MR. COLMAN.- A few came out, but I am afraid they fell by the wayside. The other general store that was in Queanbeyan - Hayes and Russell - also opened in Kingston before the depression came on, but they went out of business.

THE CHAIRMAN.- Despite the difficulties you have had, the general story of your firm has been one of progress?

MR. COLMAN.- It has been one of progress right through, and we hope to keep it that way. There is no intermediate stage in business.

THE CHAIRMAN.- There is no possibility of your giving up the game, or anything like that?

MR. COLMAN.- Definitely not.

SENATOR RYAN .- Would you say that there is a definite lack of parking space in the Kingston shopping area?

MR. COLMAN .- Yes. The parking problem is very acute in Canberra generally.

THE CHAIRMAN.- And it is specially acute at Kingston?

MR. COLEMAN .- Yes, it is most difficult there.

SENATOR RYAN.- Have the business people there made any general protest about it?

MR. COLMAN .- I understand that at one stage an approach was made to have the rear park at Kingston turned into a parking area. That was deferred, and later they decided to allow shops to be built on that back portion.

SENATOR RYAN.- I have in mind the widening of the roads, dispensing with the lawns, so as to provide a greater area for transport.

MR. COLMAN .- As far as I know, no approach was made to widen any roads.

SENATOR RYAN.- But would you say that is most desirable?

SENATE CANBERRA COMMITTEE

MR. COLMAN .-. From a business point of view, yes.

SENATOR RYAN.- And from the public viewpoint too, because it is hazardous, dangerous, and will be intensified with the development of business transactions, particularly on Saturday mornings?

MR. COLMAN !.- Yes. It is rather chaotic at both Kingston and Civic on Saturday mornings.

(Continued on page 971)

SENATE SELECT COMMITTEE ON THE DEVELOPMENT OF CANBERRA.

Statistics supplied as evidence on behalf of
A.C.T. Parents and Citizens Council.

A.C.T. Public Schools - City Only.

Projected enrolments & notional school capacities.

1955.

School	Infants		Primary		Secondary.	
	Enrolments	Capacity	Enrolments	Capacity	Enrolments	Capacity
Turner	370	400				
Ainslie	425	400	810	600		
Telopea			727	600	520	400
Griffith	350	400				
Yarralumla	119	?				
Narrabundah	280	300				
High					526	500
	1544	1500	1537	1200	1046	900

1956

Turner	394	400		(600		
Ainslie	450	400	937	(600		
Telopea					585	650
Griffith	366	400	854	600		
Yarralumla	135	300				
Narrabundah	297	300				
High					591	650
	1642	1800	1791	1800	1176	1300

1957

Turner	418	400		(600		
Ainslie	473	400	1073	(600		
Telopea					651	650
Griffith	381	400	990	600		
Yarralumla	151	300				
Narrabundah	313	300				
High					657	650
	1736	1800	2036	1800	1308	1300

1958

School	Infants		Primary		Secondary	
	Enrolments	Capacity	Enrolments	Capacity	Enrolments	Capacity
Turner	443	400	1167	{		
Ainslie	497	400				
Telopea					746	650
Griffith	397	400	1084	600		
Yarralumloh	167	300				
Narrabundah	330	300				
High					752	650
	<u>1834</u>	<u>1800</u>	<u>2251</u>	<u>1800</u>	<u>1498</u>	<u>1300</u>

1959

Turner	445	400	1221	{		
Ainslie	499	400				
Telopea					924	650
Griffith	400	400	1138	600		
Yarralumloh	168	300				
Narrabundah	331	300				
High					930	650
	<u>1842</u>	<u>1800</u>	<u>2359</u>	<u>1800</u>	<u>1854</u>	<u>1300</u>

1960

Turner	448	400	1224	{		
Ainslie	502	400				
Telopea					1064	650
Griffith	402	400	1141	600		
Yarralumloh	170	300				
Narrabundah	332	300				
High					1070	650
	<u>1854</u>	<u>1800</u>	<u>2365</u>	<u>1800</u>	<u>2134</u>	<u>1300</u>

SENATE CANBERRA COMMITTEE

LEONARD THOMAS GLEESON, Public Servant,)
 JAMES MACGREGOR DICKINS, Geologist,) sworn and examined.
 ROBERT DOUGLAS GOODMAN, Research Scholar)

MR. GLEESON.- I appear in the capacity of President of the A.C.T. Parents and Citizens Council, which is an amalgamation of the Parents and Citizens Associations and similar bodies of the public schools in the A.C.T. It has been relatively recently formed but all associations and similar bodies, with one exception, have indicated their willingness to join it, or have already done so. The one exception is the body connected with the Canberra High School and at last week's meeting high school agreed to join in principle subject to an examination of whether there are any difficulties in its constitution which would prevent them from doing so.

[I propose to give evidence in accordance with ^{the} letter which I wrote, that is, I propose to draw attention to the overcrowding in the public schools of the A.C.T. and the lack of a sufficient building programme to overcome this present and prospective overcrowding. With me are Mr. Dickins, and Mr. Goodman. As you know, Mr. Goodman is a research scholar at the Australian National University and he is responsible for the bulk of the figures that we shall submit in evidence. Mr. Dickins is Secretary of the Progress and Welfare Council of the Australian Capital Territory and he will support my evidence in more general terms. [A large ^{pro}portion of Canberra residents are very interested in education and although I have been following the evidence submitted to this Committee I have been surprised that up to date this subject has not been raised. Possibly it is a larger than usual proportion who are interested in that an unusually high percentage of the population have had the benefit of extensive educations. They are education-minded. In addition a very high percentage of the population are school children. The figures that I shall give later will show that it is an extraordinarily high percentage. Table 2 of the recent 1954 census shows the age distribution in Canberra in 1954 compared with 1947 and I think the comment on that table by the Commonwealth Statistician is particularly relevant. He says -

The principal feature of this table is the increasing predominance of the younger age groups. In 1954 almost 20 per cent of the population of the Australian Capital Territory was less than ten years of age compared with 18 per cent in 1947. Approximately 39 per cent of the population was less than 21 years of age in 1954 compared with about 37 per cent in 1947. Increases occurred in all age groups compared with 1947 the smallest increase being in respect to the 15 to 19 age group which increased 12 per cent, and the largest being in the 0 to 4 years group which increased 14.2 %

We expect a considerable population increase but it is obvious that the population increase in the very young groups is really extraordinary.

In the past a fairly simple form of school structure was quite adequate in Canberra. The Ainslie school on north side catered for infants and primary, and Telopea Park school on the south side catered for infants, primary and secondary pupils as far as the Intermediate stage. In addition there was the high school on the north side which took children from both sides of the river. However, in more recent years the flood of population, and the age distribution of that population, have been such that a very extensive building programme has been necessary. In the past there was a very high standard of buildings and everything associated with them. There were specialist rooms that were not used other than as specialist rooms, class rooms were not overcrowded and so forth. It is natural that, with this flood of population, that standard has had to be reduced and the Department of the Interior has had a fairly large building programme to attempt to cope with this. My Council contends that, quite apart from the fact that this building programme is being executed too slowly, even when it is executed it will be insufficient for the immediately foreseeable needs. Whilst we shall be able to quote all sorts of figures I think that if the Committee had an opportunity it would be both entertained and instructed if it were able to visit a number of schools in the A.C.T. The Canberra High School is virtually a show place and I think you will find a visit there exceedingly pleasant. It will enable you to see what standard can be attained. On the other hand Telopea Park School, which, when first built, was also a show place, is now badly overcrowded and is in considerable difficulties. If you were in the

position to discuss with the headmasters the actual extent of their overcrowding and the various makeshifts they have to adopt on the spot, I think you might get a better impression than you will get from anything I could say indirectly. Standards of education, of course, can vary quite considerably. As I have indicated in the past there was a high standard of building and accommodation and it has dropped considerably. Nevertheless I do not doubt that it is still a higher standard than you will find in many other public schools, especially in slum areas. I do not think we should take these old buildings as a criterion. I hope that it may be possible to emulate the standards at present existing in the High School or in the new schools that have been built in the Northern Territory, which are up to, or above, those of the Canberra High School.

We sympathise with the Department of the Interior in its difficulties in obtaining sufficient works capacity to carry out a major building programme for schools in conjunction with supplying the needs attendant on the provision of housing and similar projects, but the difficulties that affect the works potential in the Northern Territory are far greater than similar difficulties in the A.C.T. and, despite that, model schools have been built and opened in recent years in the Northern Territory. If we are able to do that in the Northern Territory it would appear that it would not be an insuperable matter to adopt similar standards in the A.C.T. and to attempt to re-establish the standards we had in the past. I understand also that the State Government has in recent years built model schools. North Wollongong school has been mentioned to me in that respect, although I have not seen it personally. The State Government is ^{quite so} ~~equally~~ badly placed in regard to works potential as the Commonwealth ~~is~~.

I understand that at present it is quite possible to find a seat for every child in our schools, but that has been achieved only by using special rooms, like sewing rooms, music rooms, art rooms, domestic science rooms, woodwork or metal work rooms, either as classrooms or by doubling up classes at one time which is unsatisfactory. In addition various makeshifts have had to be adopted. For example a number of infants from the south side have to be taken by bus to what

used to be the old nursery school at Acton. One hundred and nineteen infants are taken there daily and that is about twice the number that used to be accommodated in the nursery. [It is very difficult to be able to compare in cold hard figures the actual amount of overcrowding. It is difficult to define exactly what the capacity of a school is because "capacity" is rather an elastic term. We have attempted to take out figures showing the current and prospective enrolments for the next few years and compare them, in a notional way, with what we think is the capacity of the schools, both those in existence and those to be completed in the near future. I must admit that this concept of capacity is one of our own and we think that we have been rather generous in giving high capacities for some of those schools. We have not been able to obtain direct data from the Department of the Interior of what the capacity is, although we have tried to do so on a number of occasions. I propose to circulate to the committee tables which might bring this figure concept into being.] The immediate outlook as far as we see it, quite apart from population increases some years ahead is that an additional infants school is needed on the north side, certainly by next year and an additional primary school will also be needed by next year on the south side. To give you some idea of the position I shall recount the present situation at various schools. I have treated the infants department as though it were a separate school. It may be easiest if I circulate these tables at this stage.

(Continued on page 974)

(MR. GLEESON CONTINUING)- Turner is an Infants' School. It was opened for the first time last year. It is practically full already, and will certainly fill during the current year. It is a characteristic of Infants' Schools that the enrolment at the beginning of the year is always lower than at the end of the year because children attain the age of six during the year and sometimes children are allowed to come along from five-plus onwards.

At Ainslie we have both an Infants' block and a primary block. The Infants' block is already filled and the primary block is over-filled. In fact, the primary block is worse off than the Infants' block and some primary classes are already in the Infants' block. The figures I have circulated are slightly higher than the actual current enrolments, by sixty. I have spread that evenly between the Infants' and the primary block. That is because a new hostel is to be opened in Ainslie, and the Department has been informed that there will be sixty children of Infants' and primary age to be catered for by the end of the month.

At Telopea Park we previously had an Infants' School, a primary School, and a secondary School, but the Griffith Infants' School opened at the beginning of this year and there are no Infants at Telopea Park at the present time. The primary school, as you see, is over-filled on our idea of notional capacity already, and the secondary school is in much the same condition. The plan is to move the primary block to a new school at Griffith, possibly next year. It will have a capacity of approximately six hundred, and, seeing that you already have over seven hundred and that there will be the flow coming into that school from the three Infants' Schools at Griffith, Yarralumla and Narrabundah, you can realize that the Headmaster there is starting from behind scratch immediately. He has been quoted in the paper to that effect.

Yarralumla, as put down here, is not in existence at the moment, and the 119 you see there are the kiddies who are transported by bus to the old Kindergarten at Acton.

Narrabundah is a small school already practically at capacity.

The one bright spot is the High School, which is approximately

at capacity at the moment, and can look forward to relief during the current year.

If we go on to 1956, here we do just a small amount of population projection but you can see, even without any intricate statistics, approximately the way it will go by reading through the present populations of the schools. Turner will certainly fill in the Infants', and it is hoped that at the beginning of next year, the Turner primary school will open. Some children will be taken from Ainslie, where some Turner children already go, and will be shared between those two schools. Ainslie Infants will still be in a bad way however. They will still be over-full.

At that stage, on departmental statements, Griffith Primary will be opened, and those primary school children will be taken from Telopea Park leaving only the secondary school at Telopea with a prospective enrolment of 585. Just notionally, I have increased its capacity to 650 owing to the additional rooms available as a result of the primary moving out. The Headmaster is reported to have said that to make it a school at the moment, even on present enrolments, he needs approximately seventeen new rooms. Therefore, I do not think we could say that its capacity would be 1,000 because we lose 600 primary units.

To continue down the table, you will see that the Griffith Infants School will be very close to full. The Griffith primary school will be well and truly over-full by the time it starts. On the Department's forecasts, Yarralumla will actually open as a school next year, and there the position will be eased. Narrabundah will be able to hold its own for the time being. We have increased the capacity of the High School from 500 to 650 because of the additions that are going on at the present time.

Now if we just go on to 1957 and no further we will exhaust the current building programme and see how we will be in that year. Turner Infants' will be over-filled, and the primary schools at Turner and Ainslie will be comfortably full. Ainslie Infants' School will still be over-full.

I think at that stage it is most obvious that an additional

Infants' School is needed on the north side. To get that additional Infants' School by 1957, on the usual routine of planning and designing, calling for tenders and finally letting them, and allowing the time-lag in the actual building, a start should possibly have been made last year. I do not know that any start has been made, and we are afraid that, if nothing is done until 1956 or 1957 when the overcrowding is most obvious, we will be in a bad position for the next three years so far as the Infants are concerned.

Telopea Park Secondary School will have reached capacity in 1957. Griffith Infants' School will be close to capacity and Griffith primary school will be in a very bad way. For the reason that I have outlined to show the need for an additional Infants' School on the north side, I think it is obvious that you will need an additional primary school on the south side, preferably in 1956, but, if that is not possible, certainly in 1957. Action will have to be commenced now to give us even a rough chance of an additional primary school on the south side in 1957.

Yarralumla and Narrabundah will not be so badly off, and the High School will reach its new capacity. I have taken this only as far as 1957 at this stage because that is the obvious and immediate future which anybody can foresee without juggling figures.

As you will see, the Department's proposals are for three Infants' Schools on the south side, but only two on the north side, two primary schools on the north side but only one on the south side, and a secondary school on each side. The school populations on each side of the river are approximately the same, and why that differential should be made I do not know. It appears that the obvious immediate pattern is three Infants' Schools on each side, two primary schools on each side, and a secondary school on each side.

I will not belabour you with the details of the further population projection in 1958, 1959 and 1960. I think Mr. Goodman will carry you through that with more detail at a subsequent stage. However, I draw your attention to the fact that, having reached 1957, the Infants population will remain relatively stable. You can determine that by extensive calculations or just by a glance at the census.

SENATE CANBERRA COMMITTEE

You will see in the break-up of the age groups of the Census that the females at present in the fertile age-group are a little more than one-third of the population and that the females in the "school-age and after" age-group represent approximately the same percentage. When you are doing population projections, they are nearly always done as so many females in the fertile age-group.

THE CHAIRMAN.- Are you allowing for an increase of population through the transfer of other Government officials to Canberra? What allowance are you making for possible increases of the population in that way?

MR. GLEESON.- I am sorry. I should have explained that earlier. This population projection here is based purely on actual population at the moment plus migration at the same rate as has prevailed over recent years. It makes no allowance whatever for "Operation Admin.". If "Operation Admin." comes into being, the position obviously will be chaotic. We are attempting to say that this is on a most conservative basis in every way. We do not feel inclined to forecast whether those Public Servants will come to Canberra, the time they will come, and the number of children they will have. I think our forecasts might then be vulnerable. By the way, as a rough rule of thumb, I think you will find that the number of children averages out at one child per Public Servant if you define Public Servants in a very wide way, including typists and everything. At least that has happened with previous census returns. If you bring 2,000 Public Servants to Canberra, you will increase your school population by 2,000. These figures, by the way, are not quite the same as those Mr. Goodman will give the Committee. These deal only with the city school position.

THE CHAIRMAN.- What do you mean by that?

MR. GLEESON.- We have cut out Duntroon, on the fringe of the city, and the schools at Hall, Uriarra and Jervis Bay. We have also cut out the denominational schools. An additional point I should have made on that is that an exceedingly large percentage of the school population is at present catered for by the denominational schools - namely 30 percent.

THE CHAIRMAN.- Does that refer to primary or secondary schools, or to both?

MR. GLEESON.- To all.

SENATOR HANNAFORD.- That is a high percentage, is it not?

MR. GLEESON.- It is exceedingly high. It has been made possible as a result of the opening of a very big school - St. Edmunds - recently. If the denominational schools can maintain a building rate in future sufficient to maintain that percentage I will be very surprised. Nevertheless on this forecast we have still gone on the assumption that they will be able to maintain that percentage. I doubt it myself, but our figures are conservative.

THE CHAIRMAN.- Are you including in that category boarding schools which may cater for outside people?

MR. GLEESON.- Yes. The boarding schools are St. Edmunds, the Boys' Grammar School, and the Girls' Grammar School. As I was saying, by these forecasts and also by a cursory glance at the recent census figures, you will see that the Infants population will stabilize somewhere about 1957-58 but that the flow of population will continue for an additional year in the primary group to stabilize about 1959, and that the final flow of that school population will hit the secondary schools in full force eventually in 1959 and 1960.

The six Infants' schools that I have mentioned as being immediately necessary may be sufficient to see us through the whole of the time of this wave of school population, but additional primary schools and secondary schools will be necessary before that wave is totally absorbed. The wave will stabilize but not decrease appreciably after 1960. There may be a slight decrease in 1961 because the females in the age-group 15-19 years reduce slightly but build up again with quite a rush from then onwards.

Just to close off these figures, you will see that the population for the Infants stabilizes at about 1,850 in 1960 and is much the same for the previous two years. The primary school population stabilizes also, about 1959-60, at approximately 2,400. The secondary population reaches its peak, or rather the top of the plateau, in 1960 at 2,100.

SENATE CAMBERLA COMMITTEE.

By 1960, which is not far off - only $4\frac{1}{2}$ years - I think it is fairly obvious that we will need the six infants schools which I nominated as being necessary in 1957 and on which an immediate start is necessary, the four primary schools which I nominated as being necessary by 1957 and on which an immediate start is necessary, and, in addition, the full quota of four secondary schools, which I have not mentioned before.

(Continued on page).

SENATE CANBERRA COMMITTEE.

MR. GLEESON (Speaking). - What form those secondary schools take is a matter that I do not want to pursue at this stage.

THE CHAIRMAN. - I do not think we need to go into that now. Whether we have multi-purpose schools or separate high schools is a matter of general education policy in which I am very interested, but I do not think the Committee should touch that subject.

MR. GLEESON. - We realise the difficulty that the department is up against in the way of establishing, maintaining and building up a works potential, but we are a little afraid that, in the many competing needs, schools are receiving too low a priority. Despite the fairly extensive school-building programme, we contend it is preferable to have, say, accommodation for 400 children in a school as against the equivalent absorption of works capacity and money represented by approximately 20 houses. Married folk can live in hostels, admittedly under certain difficulties, and put off the joy of a home of their own for a year or two. But children insist on growing up, and the facilities should be there for the children whilst they are growing up, not after the position has become acute and they have been in a bad position for some years. We suggest also that, in the planning of suburbs and buildings, the department should not wait until there is an obvious need for schools and then necessarily take several years to build them. We believe that a school site should be chosen and work actually commenced on it when you have, say, 150 houses, because from there you will get an obvious and immediate flow of children, predominantly in the infants group, and it is desirable to have infants schools fairly close to the houses rather than to ram the children into buses and take them to schools a considerable distance away. That could be done if a form of neighbourhood planning were adopted, but that is another subject that I do not wish to pursue now.

THE CHAIRMAN. - To help this Committee, any estimate must take into consideration the increase of population caused by bringing additional public servants here. I cannot say what our recommendations will be, because we shall keep an open mind until the end of the

evidence, but there has been very strong evidence to the effect that we ought to bring the head office of every department here very quickly. I should say that by 1960 a big part of that plan would have been carried out. That would mean that there were some thousands more public servants here. We have already considered to some extent the other demands that influx of population would make apart from the demand for the building of houses and schools. In those circumstances, your estimate must be taken as an under-estimate?

MR. GLEESON. - It is, definitely.

THE CHAIRMAN. - You say that a reasonable basis for an estimate is one child for every public servant?

MR. GLEESON. - Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN. - Did you work out the school capacity by allowing so many children to a classroom?

MR. GLEESON. - We did not work on that basis. From time to time, when the announcements of the building of these schools have been made, global figures, so to speak, have been mentioned. It has been said that this school will accommodate 400 children and that school will accommodate 600. For the most part, we have worked on the basis that an infants school accommodates approximately 400 children, a primary school about 600 and a secondary school about 650. There is an obvious exception in the case of Narrabundah, which is a small school, designedly so. On the admission of one of the people in authority, its capacity is less than most other places because it has not got a library or specialist rooms which the authorities can fill up when they are in their usual accommodation trouble.

THE CHAIRMAN. - You mentioned the school at Alice Springs. I saw it in the course of erection. I heard an enormous sum mentioned as the cost of it. Do you know what that school did cost?

MR. GLEESON. - I have not brought the papers with me, but the cost was a little under £150,000, in round figures.

THE CHAIRMAN. - When finished, it may look much finer, but looking at it as the walls were going up, it struck me as a very

SENATE CANBERRA COMMITTEE.

ordinary brick building.

MR. GLEESON. - Naturally the choice of materials would be rather restricted because of the difficulty of importing timber and that sort of thing. The point I was making in regard to the Alice Springs school is that there are a large number of specialist rooms, a very fine ablutions block, large playing areas and all those ancillary things that make a school. Much the same applies to Darwin.

THE CHAIRMAN. - There are some schools where the enrolments go beyond the capacity. Have you any knowledge of what happens in those schools? Are the classrooms overcrowded, or do they use rooms for classrooms that should not be so used?

MR. GLEESON. - It is generally the second course. They use rooms that should not be used as classrooms. For example, at Ainslie school there are a sewing room, a music room, an art room and a special general utility lecture room, all of which are now occupied as classrooms.

THE CHAIRMAN. - Are you satisfied with the policy of allowing the New South Wales Education Department to staff the schools here?

MR. GLEESON. - That is a little beyond my brief. I think Mr. Goodman will have something to say on that.

THE CHAIRMAN. - You mentioned a second secondary school. That is Telopea Park, I presume?

MR. GLEESON. - Yes, Telopea Park is to be a full secondary school.

THE CHAIRMAN. - What are they going to do with the Telopea Park primary school - move it elsewhere?

MR. GLEESON. - Yes, the Griffith primary school is to take over.

SENATOR WOOD. - I think you said there were three Grammar schools and three other denomination/^{al} schools. The Grammar schools are run by the churches?

MR. GLEESON. - Yes, the Grammar schools are run by the Church of England and the others are Roman Catholic schools.

SENATOR WOOD. - There is nothing projected by any of the

SENATE CHAMBER. COMMITTEE

other churches in regard to schools?

MR. GLEESON. - No. The Catholics are going to build at least two, possibly three, additional schools. I do not know if they are to be infants schools or primary schools, but they will not be secondary schools. Although they have recently opened a large secondary school for boys, ^{it is filled} ~~they have reached the peak again~~ already.

MR. GOODMAN. - There are denominational boarding schools in both Goulburn and Yass, which are fairly close to Canberra, and they may take some students from here.

I have been asked by Mr. Gleeson, representing the Council of the Combined Parents & Citizens Associations of Canberra to supply evidence relating to the probable school population of the A.C.T. up to 1960. It is in that advisory capacity that I now appear. I did not intend to make any comment, criticism or suggestion in regard to the present educational scene in Canberra, but I should like an opportunity to appear as a private citizen because I have some evidence, which, if possible, I should like to produce to you at a later stage. I should like to produce it as a private citizen so that no confusion will arise by anything I say in that capacity being construed as the policy of the Council which Mr. Gleeson represents.

Now I am just objectively presenting some statistics on which I have been working. Mr. Gleeson approached me because I had been working on problems of educational importance at the National University. A couple of years ago I made a detailed study of Canberra's school population - that was before the 1954 census - and presented it in a paper to the New Education Fellowship. My forecast was fairly close to what has happened in the last two or three years.

As an introduction, I should like to draw your attention to some aspects of Canberra's population as they are likely to affect school population. Mr. Gleeson referred briefly to them, and I should like to present them to you in a little more detail. I have tried to keep these matters as simple as possible. They may be known to you, but I think they are relevant and that it is worth while to

SENATE SELECT COMMITTEE ON THE DEVELOPMENT OF CANBERRA.

Statistics supplied as evidence on behalf of
A.C.T. Parents and Citizens Council.

TABLE A.

GROWTH OF POPULATION OF A.C.T. 1930 - 1954

(1911	1,921)	
1930	8,719	
1934	9,456	
1939	13,033	
1944	14,605	
1947	16,905	(Commonwealth Census)
1949	22,113	
1950	23,629	
1951	25,036	
1952	28,481	
1954	30,315	(Commonwealth Census)

TABLE B.

AGE COMPOSITION OF POPULATION A.C.T. AND AUSTRALIA.

	1947 Census		1954 Census	
	A.C.T.	Aust.	A.C.T.	Aust.
0 - 14 yrs	25.5	25.1	31.43	
15 - 49 yrs	59.0	51.7	55.44	
0 - 49 yrs	84.5	76.8	86.87	

TABLE C.

A.C.T. BIRTHPLACES OF THE POPULATION 1921, 1933, 1947, 1954

Birthplace.	1921. % of total	1933 %	1947 %	1954 %
N.S.W.	1,491	4,297	8,807	11,988 (39.5)
Vic.	221	1,601	2,026	2,655
Qld.	38	192	472	918
S. Aust.	35	153	397	591
W. Aust.	22	85	264	492
Tas.	24	194	264	348
N. T.	3	1	10	22
A.C.T.	140 (5.4)	986 (11.)	3,160 (18.2)	6,686 (22.5)
Europe	403 (15.7)	1,223	1,674	5,817 (19.1)
Asia, Africa, America ..	56	176	290	650
Other.	138	37	201	148
Totals	2,572	8,947	16,905	30,315

TABLE D.A.C.T. POPULATION 1954-1960 Age Groups 0 - 17 years.

(Without Migration)

	1954 Census	1955	1956	1957	1958	1959	1960
0	801	()					
1.	807	800					
2.	845	805	798				
3.	782	845	803	796			
4.	770	780	841	801	794		
5.	754	768	768	839	799	792	()
6.	716	752	766	766	837	797	790
7.	751	714	750	704,	764	835	795
8.	567	749	712	748	762	762	833
9.	502	565	747	710	746	760	760
10.	492	500	563	745	708	744	758
11.	426	490	498	561	743	706	742
12.	459	424	488	496	559	741	704
13.	426	457	422	486	494	557	739
14.	392	424	455	420	484	492	555
15.	355	390	422	453	418	482	490
16.	345	353	388	420	451	416	480
17.	373	343	351	366	418	449	414

Adjusted totals for school age population 5 - 17 yrs.

5,685	6,071	6,427	6,793	7,166	7,472	7,792
-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------

TABLE E.PROBABLE SCHOOL POPULATION 1954-1960 (Without migration).

	1954	1955	1956	1957	1958	1959	1960
Infants	2,050	2,084	2,137	2,195	2,228	2,256	2,260
Primary	2,456	2,728	3,008	3,255	3,518	3,713	3,798
Secondary	1,179	1,259	1,282	1,343	1,420	1,503	1,734
Total	5,685	6,071	6,427	6,793	7,166	7,472	7,792

TABLE F.POPULATION 0-17 Years 1947, 1954-1960

(Assuming migration rate per age group 1954-60 remains the same as for the period 1947-54)

	1947 Census	1954 Census	1955	1956	1957	1958	1959	1960
0.	429							
1.	320							
2.	303							
3.	340							
4.	280							
5.	346	754	788	834	883	862	(865)	(900)
6.	202	716	787	806	860	900	880	(880)
7.	265	751	752	822	824	886	919	900
8.	273	567	797	782	857	842	912	940
9.	253	502	602	843	814	892	860	938
10.	263	492	532	637	889	845	927	878
11.	235	426	513	562	672	935	876	962
12.		459	447	534	592	707	981	907
13.		426	475	468	555	622	742	1,037
14.		392.	458	491	489	576	652	777
15.		355	410.	490	507	510	597	682
16.		345	362	428	522	523	531	618
17.		373	358	374	446	554	539	551

TABLE G.

COMMONWEALTH CENSUS AND SCHOOL CENSUS A.C.T. 1954

	Comm. census.	School census	Percentage at school	Smoothed percentage
5 yrs	754	667	90	85
6.	716	602	85	94
7.	751	783	105	100
8.	567	681	122	100
9.	502	447	90	100
10.	492	463	96	100
11.	426	430	103	100
12.	459	461	102	100
13.	426	455	109	100
14.	392	406	106	100
15.	355	229	65	65
16.	345	118	35	34
17.	373	43	12	12

TABLE H.

POPULATION 5-17 (Smoothed percentage) in School groups.

	1954	1955	1956	1957	1958	1959	1960
Infants	2,085	2,218	2,356	2,497	2,643	2,656	2,692
Primary	1,997	2,444	2,824	3,232	3,514	3,675	3,683
Secondary	1,652	1,815	2,010	2,207	2,494	3,026	3,447
Totals	5,734	6,477	7,190	7,936	8,651	9,357	9,822

Public and Private Schools

	Public Schools				Private Schools			
	Infants	Primary	Secondary	Total	Infants	Primary	Secondary	Total
1954	1,390	1,332	1,102	3,842	695	666	551	1,912
1955	1,472	1,628	1,210	4,310	736	814	605	2,155
1956	1,570	1,882	1,340	4,792	785	941	670	2,396
1957	1,664	2,154	1,472	5,290	832	1,077	736	2,645
1958	1,762	2,342	1,662	5,766	881	1,171	831	2,883
1959	1,770	2,450	2,018	6,238	885	1,225	1,009	3,119
1960	1,782	2,456	2,298	6,536	891	1,228	1,149	3,268

School Attendances.

Actual enrolments.

1952	4,374
1953	5,596
1954	5,928

SENATE CANBERRA COMMITTEE

recapitulate them while we are discussing this problem

In Table A, I have set out the figures relating to the actual growth of the A.C.T. from 1930 to 1954, and I have included the 1911 figure for the area just as a starting point. I think the table shows clearly the unchecked growth that has gone on in the population of the A.C.T. In 1934, the figure was 9,000; in 1947, it was 16,000; in 1952, it was 28,000; and according to the Commonwealth Census, it was 30,315 in 1954. If you compare the official Commonwealth censuses of 1947 and 1954, you will see that the population of the A.C.T. increased by 79.33 percent in that period. I think we referred previously to the city area and the country area of the A.C.T. For our purposes, I think the terms city area population and A.C.T. population are almost interchangeable, because the 1954 census showed that 93 percent of the population of the A.C.T. lived in the city area known as Canberra and its suburbs. This section of the population increased by 87 percent since the 1947 census. Looking at the table, I know there is a temptation to continue the figures and determine what the population in, say, 1960. I have seen a number of what appear to me to be wild guesses at this figure. But it was necessary in my projections to keep that figure in mind to see whether the school population did in fact bear some actual relationship to the overall population.

(Continued on next page)

MR. GOODMAN (Continuing) - You could not, for example, estimate 20,000 school population and perhaps maintain the total population at 40,000. On a cross-check on those, and projecting the total population through, my estimate of the total population of the Australian Capital Territory in 1960 would be somewhere between 45,000 and 48,000, assuming a slightly lower rate of increase than took place between 1947 and 1954. I say the lower rate of increase partly because there is some slight evidence of a slowing down in migration, and moreover, by a mathematical twist, as you get a larger denominator in your population, it is more difficult to maintain the percentage increase, although you may maintain a numerical increase.

THE CHAIRMAN.- Have you allowed for the transfer of public servants?

MR. GOODMAN.- Not in that group. That has been excluded. The next relevant point about Canberra's population is seen in Table B. The distribution of age group patterns in Canberra differs from that of the population of Australian as a whole. At the 1954 census, Canberra had 31.43 per cent of its population in the 0 to 14 age group; ^{and} 55.44 per cent in the 15 to 49 group; which makes 86.87 per cent in the 0 to 49 years group, which is commonly known as the fertile age group. I do not know what the comparable figure is for the rest of Australia for the 1954 census. The figures are not available yet. But it is worth looking at the 1947 census. In 1947, 84.5 per cent of the population of the Australian Capital Territory was in the fertile age group, compared with 76.8 per cent for Australia as a whole. In plain terms, this means that Canberra has a greater percentage of its population in this lower age group and in the school age group than has Australia as a whole. This is an indication of the influx of young people and their families to Canberra. But it is also a reminder that the quantitative natural increase is also likely to be higher in Canberra than for Australia as a whole.

The third relevant point about the population is contained

in Table C. This refers to the birth places of the population. On the one hand, when you are looking at the distribution of the population, where they are born, and what has happened to them, you can look for those who were born in the Australian Capital Territory and who have moved out of it. At the 1947 census, 37.5 per cent of the 15 to 19 age group born in the Territory were resident elsewhere. This side of the picture does not appear in that table, by the way. In the 20 to 24 age group 46 per cent, and in the higher age group more than 60 per cent, of persons born in the Territory have moved out of it. Comparable figures are not yet available for the 1954 census. That is the migration out of Canberra. Of course, that is counter-balanced by the migration into Canberra, and it is the migration into Canberra that is causing the rapid increase in population generally and in the school population in particular.

To turn now to Table C, in relation to persons who are now living in the Australian Capital Territory and who were born elsewhere the table sets out the birth places of the population in 1921, 1933, 1947 and 1954. It is a most interesting table. In the first place, in the Australian Capital Territory group you will find an increasing percentage in the population born in the Territory remaining in it at the time of each census, increasing from 5.4 per cent to 11 per cent, to 18.2 per cent, and finally to 22.5 per cent. This suggests that a greater degree of permanency is developing in Canberra. This is going to affect the net migration figure, because you will not have so many bodies moving out of Canberra, and you will have more remaining here and more coming in.

Also, there is the large percentage of the population born in other Australian States, particularly in New South Wales. The 1954 census showed that some 39.5 per cent of the population of the Australian Capital Territory had come from N.S.W. This is an important factor when the question of school policy arises, because, as you know, all the schools here follow the pattern set by N.S.W. If "Operation Admin." comes into being, it will be an important matter of education policy to note from which State

SENATE CANBERRA COMMITTEE

the public servants and their families are likely to come. If, for example, they come from Melbourne in a block, there are a number of education problems involved. For example, the secondary school system is a little different in Victoria. It commences a year earlier. It has a different system of matriculation, involving two years instead of one year, and so forth. If any large movement in the population comes from Victoria, it will bring up a number of matters of education policy, which I think should be noted.

The third point in this table is to note that the European born section comprised 19 per cent in 1954, compared with 10 per cent in 1947. I suppose that that is a reflection of the overall immigration policy, and it must be taken into account also when we estimate the population of the Australian Capital Territory. I am assuming that the immigration quota as it has appeared in this section under review will continue at the same rate. If the immigration programme is stepped up or lessened, there would be corresponding changes in the influx of people from overseas. Incidentally, the 1954 census shows that European born persons comprised 19 per cent of the population. That can be split up, although it does not show in the table - England and Scotland, 7.9 per cent, and Poland and Germany, 3.6 per cent.

We come then to the main part of the evidence, and that is the school population. There are two conditioning factors: (1) the natural increase, and (2) the net migration. While in fact both of these factors operate at the same time, it will assist in obtaining a clear picture if we view them separately. I draw your attention to Table D. In the first column is set out the population of the Australian Capital Territory in age groups from 0 to 17 as indicated by the Commonwealth census of 1954. It is relevant to notice the size of the younger groups compared with the older groups. Take the lower part of the group first. If you add the 8 to 14 age groups, you get a total of 3,264. In 1954 the 8 to 14 age groups constituted the bulk of the school population. These are children ⁱⁿ actually/being in Canberra in 1954. They will move through the school population in the next six years. In six years' time

the 8 to 14 group shown in the first column will be practically off the education map. That is 3,264 in that group passing through. If you add the 0 to 7 age groups in that same column, you get a total of 6,226. If you could project those 6 years on as they stand, the school population block of 3,264 would be replaced by 6,226. The 1954 census group shown there, if it is moved on, could be affected by mortality rates or by migration.

We are disregarding migration for the moment, and we are assuming that those bodies in existence last year continue to exist year by year up to 1960, and that the one year olds of last year become the two year olds this year, the three year olds next year and so on. You can move each age group along in that way. With a large age group such as you have, say, in New South Wales, you would have to take account of mortality rates, but here the group is so small, and when you multiply 800 by .9943 for one year you get a decrease of only one or two. However, I have made allowance for that just to show you how the picture changes. I have moved the age groups along year by year up to 1960. You will notice that it is not until 1960 that the school population is affected by any births that we do not know of at the moment. In 1960 - I have left a bracket - the bodies born this year will be 5 year olds, and some of these will enter the school population. So that there is only one figure in actual births up to 1960 that we do not know of. All the other figures in that first column are in being and alive, and all being well they will continue on their merry way through their school careers in the Australian Capital Territory.

This, I think, eliminates a certain margin of error in estimating what the births are likely to be in future years. You will understand that if I were projecting this along 20 years I should have to estimate births in Canberra for 1956, 1957 and 1958, and that would tend to throw the projection out. At the moment we have the bodies in being and we are moving them along year by year up to 1960, and from that point of view our estimate can be fairly accurate.

SENATE CANBERRA COMMITTEE

MR. GOODMAN.--(Continuing) For this reason I have not discussed the question of the birthrate of the Australian Capital Territory, because it does not come into the immediate picture.

I refer then to Table E. From that previous table, showing the actual bodies in existence in 1954 and to see what happens to them in the years up to 1960, including any migration, it is possible to construct a table showing the overall figures and showing how they will increase. Of course, it is necessary to use a certain table which I shall show you later. You have to make certain allowances for the five year olds to see how many of them are to be included in your system, and you have to make allowance for the wastage that occurs at 14, 15 and 16, because the whole of these age groups do not come into the picture. Thus, the first conclusion is that if there were no migration in the next six years Canberra would have to provide for an increase in school population solely due to the natural increase which will take place in those years from 1947 to 1954 onwards. However, the figures that I have given you there we know are not in accord with the facts, because we know that they are being affected by migration and that they will be something more than that. The problem is to see by how much more.

One method of obtaining this is to examine carefully the official census figures for 1947 and 1954 in age groups. I refer again now to Table F. If I had the space and the typists I would set out on a big sheet "1947, 1948, 1949, 1950 --" each year up to 1960, and I would take the 1947 census and move these age groups along year by year. When we moved or projected the 1947 age group along, we could move it along to 1954. For example the one year olds in 1947 would be eight year olds in 1954, and the two year olds in 1947 would be your nine year olds in 1954. If these known totals are moved along on a lifetable, decreasing slowly each year, it is possible theoretically to arrive at a figure to 1954 of the surviving group from 1947. Thus, if there were 202 six year olds in 1947, without migration one would expect that there would be 200 of them left in 1954. But when you look at the 1954 figures, you find 426

T.1 990. R. D. GOODMAN.

SENATE TERRITORY COMMITTEE

instead of 200, which means that somewhere in the intervening years 230 additional bodies have joined that age group by migration. From this fact it is possible to work out the percentage age group increase per year. This percentage can be crosschecked in 1952 by comparing the results of the unofficial Canberra census with the census of school enrolments which took place in that year. That means that a number of minute calculations at each age group for each year from 1947 to 1954 must be made to assess the percentage age group increase. The results of this crosschecking are reasonably consistent to conclude that the percentage increase per age group is continuing to operate. Assuming that the same rate of migration continues, the age group will grow as in Table F.

The year 1954 is a useful key year because it enables us to crosscheck our calculations with 1947. The census figures, compared with our projection from 1947 reveal that the percentage increase due to migration has held since 1952. In 1954, as well as the official census there was also a census of school enrolments in the A.C.T. I have set that out in Table G. I cannot tell you how the census is conducted, or how accurate it is, but it was useful to have this figure to compare with the official figures of the Commonwealth census. There you will see them set out in age groups.

You will notice a number of discrepancies. In fact, you will notice, that, according to the school census, in some cases there are more in the age group than appear in the census for the Territory. The only explanation I can offer for that is that the school census may relate back to the age at the first January, and the census was taken in June. The discrepancy between school ages and census ages may explain that, because when you add up the total in a number of age groups, say from 5 to 17, the overall total shows that that discrepancy disappears. However, from that, in order to avoid absurd results, I have had to work out a smooth percentage of those at school in relation to those in the age groups, and they affect mainly the fives and sixes. In some cases five year olds are accepted into school, although it is not compulsory. It is useful

T.2. . 991. R.D.GOODMAN

to have the percentage of the five year olds at school, and also the six year olds, and I would assume that of those in the compulsory age groups, 6 to 14 will be almost 100 percent. When you come to 14 plus, you have a wastage which is common to all educational systems in Australia. The fifteen year olds begin to drop away, the sixteen year olds more so, and you get a smaller group in the 17 year olds. However, I have had to construct that table in order to smooth out apparent discrepancies between the two censuses.

From that, and applying that percentage table to the figure I ascertained as the school population, including migration, it is then possible to work out Table H, which is of course the climax of all these calculations. It shows the probable school population from 1954 to 1960, divided up into infants, primary and secondary, in large totals and then broke up again into public and private schools. The first thing to consider is how accurate is this forecast. We have actually worked on population figures and made projections based on actual births and assumed migration rate from 1947 to 1960. When the forecast on this basis is compared with the actual enrolments in 1954, it is found to be within 2 per cent of accuracy, on the conservative side. That is, it is two per cent lower than the actual enrolments. When this error is divided between all schools, public and private, the effect is negligible. So that in the immediate years, I think there is a very high degree of accuracy in the projection.

I might add that some adjustments and refinements might be made as between infants and primary. In New South Wales, the classes known as kindergarten, Grade 1 and Grade 2 are regarded as infants departments within the primary school, and I prefer to recognise them in that way, not as separate classes. However, it sometimes happens in the case of new schools that the infants department is built first, as happens in Canberra, before the primary section, and for that reason you can have certain difficulties in dividing your children up between infants and primary.

The age grade tables published by the Australian Council for Educational Research show that the average age for children in grade 2 in New South Wales is 7 years 11 months, and for grade 3, nine years and one month.

THE CHAIRMAN.- What do you mean by "grades"?

MR. GOODMAN.- School classes. I am speaking of the classes right through the school.

THE CHAIRMAN.- Using grade as relating to class?

MR. GOODMAN.- Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN.- Is that usual in New South Wales?

MR. GOODMAN.- Yes.

The eight year olds come right in the middle, and you have then to go to the dissection which is possible in the eight year olds by looking at the age grade distribution table for all ages, which appears at the back of the Ministry of Education reports each year. Then you will see that 30 per cent of eight year olds are in Grade 2 and seventy per cent are in Grade 3. Against this, you get some of the under eights in Grade 3, so there is that backlog between the two. This, of course, applies to the whole of New South Wales. How far it is true of Canberra would require closer investigation of the age grade classifications. For this purpose I have included the eight year olds as primaries, although there could be a slight discrepancy between the two. For example, if you have a child who is eight years and six months in June, she could well be in Grade 2 in the Australian Capital Territory, and after the end of the year she would be in Grade 3 and she would spend the second half of her eighth year in Grade 3. So there is no way of overcoming that discrepancy.

However, I have included eight year olds in the primary totals, but I am not greatly concerned about that difference because, as I say, infants and primaries virtually form one school, and it is the overall total of infants and primary, so called, which is important, because you can make adjustments as between infants and primary within the school itself. That is not a great difficulty. It could be more difficult at the completion of the primary school year to decide where you are going to make the break between twelve year olds and thirteen year olds, because they go to different places. However, the Australian Council for Educational Research table I referred to previously puts the average age in Grade 6 as 12 years and

SENATE CANBERRA COMMITTEE.

two months, and first year secondary as thirteen years and three months; so I think it is safe to include all twelve year olds as primaries and thirteen year olds as secondaries, but again, I say you would need to have the full details of Canberra's school population by age groups in order to be certain on that point. These refinements, of course, do not affect the overall school population. The forecast again has been based on that wastage in the secondary school system at 14 and 15 plus. If anything should happen to the secondary education system so that it suddenly became very popular and children stayed at school, I do not know what would happen to the forecast.

SENATE CANBERRA COMMITTEE

(MR. GOODMAN CONTINUING) The break-up between private and public schools is based on the 31-34-37 percentage. That is 31 per cent of Infants go to private schools, 34 per cent to primaries, and 37 per cent to secondaries. This distribution is a little different from what occurs in the main capital cities which shows a higher percentage of Infants and primary children going to private schools here than is the case with the schools in the large capital cities where you get a smaller percentage of primary children going to private schools and a relatively larger percentage going to secondary schools. In order to put these conclusions in perspective let me briefly summarize the points I have made. -

Canberra has an expanding population and there is every probability that it will continue to expand during the next ten years.

Canberra has a larger percentage of its population in the fertile age group than is the case with the whole of Australia so that a large school population can be anticipated.

There is considerable movement into Canberra from N.S.W., Britain and Europe. Birthplace statistics suggest a greater degree of permanence developing in the A.C.T. resulting in a greater gain by migration.

The 1954 Census shows a much higher total in the 0-7 age groups than in the 8-14 age groups indicating the actual increase which will be coming through Canberra's schools in the next 6 years.

Even if no increase due to migration, the effect of this movement will be a need for more school accommodation.

Migration influence is visible and measurable between 1947 and 1954 and if it continues at the same rate to 1960, then even more accommodation will be required.

The estimate I have made is to within two per cent of accuracy at present. It takes no account of "Operation Admin." or any large influx of population. The degree of accuracy, of course, will get slightly less as you go on to 1960. It may be three per cent out by 1960 but I do not mean that it is going to be wholly astray.

There are indications that the school population will stabilize in 1960, but this could be offset by other factors, such as the larger movement of population.

The minimum educational requirements for 1960 are for 10,000 children as against 5,900 in 1955. This means that private schools must increase their capacity by more than 1,000 pupils in the next few years. I repeat that 10,000 must be regarded as an absolute minimum by 1960. All through I have been most conservative in my estimates. I have avoided unknown quantities and "Operation Admin." in order to get the basic minimum upon which any Department should plan and I have put the figure at 10,000 in 1960. It will certainly be no less and it will probably be more. I think that Table H. is an indication of the number of school-children. How that is divided up and the number of schools concerned, Mr. Gleeson has already explained. I am not making any comment on the nature of the schools or otherwise. I was simply asked to produce and explain the statistics as objectively and simply as I could and I hope that I have not bored you too much with involved mathematics.

THE CHAIRMAN.- We have found it very interesting. Can you give us a rough estimate of how much more accommodation is necessary in class-rooms and grounds?

MR. GOODMAN.- I do not know the figures in relation to size of classes in schools in the A.C.T., but in Britain the figure set down in the English Education Act and the reports of the Scottish Advisory Council, and figures advocated by Australian educationalists such as Professor MacRae set the size in primary schools at between thirty to thirty-five. The size of the school is an important factor, and trends in Britain are to keep a primary school, which includes Infants' classes, at no more than 650 pupils. That would give you something like three streams of thirty to thirty-five Infants, and three to four streams of about the same number in your primary school. Once it gets beyond 650 all told it becomes educationally unsound.

THE CHAIRMAN.- That should be the aim. I think these schools in Sydney which have 3,000 or 4,000 pupils are more like factories. Thank you, Mr. Goodman. We shall take these figures and see what estimates are necessary.

SENATOR WOOD.- I think we are under a great debt of
U.2.

gratitude to Mr. Goodman for the trouble to which he has gone to prepare those figures which are most exhaustive and comprehensive, as well as to the Parents and Citizens Council for the information which it has presented. I would suggest that the Department has refused to give or to confirm these figures and that we should ask some Departmental officer to come along here in respect of them.

THE CHAIRMAN.- Do you wish to add anything, Mr. Dickins, to the evidence?

MR. DICKINS.- I am here as ^{the representative} Secretary of the Progress and Welfare Council, which is a joint body of the various Progress Associations in Canberra. During the last year a Committee was set up which arose from a meeting called by the Council of bodies interested in education in Canberra, and which made an enquiry into school accommodation. The findings we came to are substantially the same as those indicated by Mr. Gleeson. We were fortunate to be able to use figures already prepared by Mr. Goodman for the New Education Fellowship and our conclusions were mainly that not only was the present programme ~~insufficient~~ ^{inadequate}, but when it was completed it would not be sufficient. It was our estimate that by 1956 we would need another two schools, another Infants' school on the north side, and another primary school on the south side, as outlined by Mr. Gleeson. We need these at least by 1956 in addition to those already being built.

We based this estimate on the need for a second secondary school. We suggest that if another two schools could be completed for next year it would allow Telopea Park to be made into a full secondary school by next year and to have proper facilities for secondary students which it now does not have. Mr. Gleeson has stated that we did not take into account "Operation Admin.," and we based our estimates on the expectation that the private schools would retain their present percentage of pupils.

THE CHAIRMAN.- I do not think the State has any right to assume that. It is the duty of the Commonwealth to provide accommodation for the children of citizens who want to enroll their children in state schools. Still, one may take the general trend into consideration.

MR. GLEESON.- We thought we would be accused of exaggeration if we ignored the percentage who attend private schools.

THE CHAIRMAN.- All your methods are quite sound.

SENATOR HANNAFORD.- You have no doubt produced those figures to the Department concerned?

MR. GLEESON.- We sought to have a deputation to the Minister to present the figures, but he would not see us.

THE CHAIRMAN.- We can ask for those figures.

MR. DICKINS.- The only other thing I would like to say is that we are concerned about the space being made available for schools. It seemed to us that the sites for schools should be set out well in advance of the house-building programme so that adequate playing and sporting space can be made available. It seems that in the two schools at Turner and Griffith there may not be enough playing-space and we have not been able to obtain all the plans the Department has in connection with the space for those two schools. The parents concerned are somewhat worried that there will not be as much space as has been the case at schools built earlier. With regard to siting of schools, especially Infants' schools, we consider it is more desirable to have smaller schools close at hand than to have a big school some distance away. It is better to have two schools with 200 pupils each close at hand, rather than one school for 400 pupils which involves travel.

MR. GOODMAN.- One small point I should like to add concerns the siting of schools. I do not know whether it is purely an accident or an oversight but in two of the schools being built at present, at Turner and Yarralumla there is a dangerous drain. In the case of Turner there is a large open storm-water drain known as Sullivan's Creek which runs right through the playground. I think there is bad planning or selection somewhere. At Yarralumla two drains are in very close proximity to the school site. They will require covering or protecting in some way if we are to avoid the kind of tragedy or near tragedy that happens in capital cities every time there is heavy rain when children fall into drains. We have plenty of space, time and planning, and yet we produce schools with open drains nearby or in the playground.

THE CHAIRMAN.- With regard to that and other matters do you get a satisfactory answer from administrative officers dealing with schools when you put these considerations before them?

MR. GLEESON.- That is a leading question.

THE CHAIRMAN.- Who is the administrative officer you deal with?

MR. GLEESON.- The Assistant-Secretary, Mr. Lind, of the Department of the Interior.

THE CHAIRMAN.- Do all the schools come under him?

MR. GLEESON.- Yes. His immediate assistant is Mr. Wynn who looks after schools alone.

THE CHAIRMAN.- You approach him, and not the N.S.Wales Inspector of Schools?

MR. GLEESON.- All our representations are normally to the Secretary of the Department of the Interior and they are routed accordingly.

THE CHAIRMAN.- Thank you for your attendance gentlemen. I assure you there is no more important subject and that we shall give full consideration to everything you have said.

(The witnesses withdrew)

THE COMMITTEE ADJOURNED AT 5.2 p.m. until Monday, 14th March

SENATE SELECT COMMITTEE ON THE PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT
OF CANBERRA.

MINUTES OF EVIDENCE

(Taken at Canberra)

MONDAY, 14th MARCH, 1955.

PRESENT:

The Chairman (Senator McCallum)

Senator Benn Senator Ryan

Senator Hannaford Senator Wood

MRS. ELAINE MARGARET FRANKEL, Honorary Secretary of the Canberra Art Club, sworn and examined.

THE CHAIRMAN. - I understand that you wish to make a statement on behalf of the Canberra Art Club, Mrs. Frankel.

MRS FRANKEL. - Perhaps the Committee would like to know about the Canberra Art Club before I begin. It was established about six years ago and has about 40 members, which sounds small, but it is a thriving organisation.

The Club wishes to bring before you some aspects of the need for a national art gallery in the Federal capital. Most of the State capitals have art galleries with permanent collections but there are already in being certain collections which are the property of the nation and which should be housed in the national capital in a suitable building accessible to the public.

For instance the Hardy Wilson drawings of early colonial architecture and the collection of Australia, including paintings, made and still being added to by Mr. Rex Nan Kivell. Both these collections cared for by the Commonwealth National Library, give a pictorial record of the birth and growth of Australia. There are many

SENATE CANBERRA COMMITTEE.

such records in existence but in danger of being lost through the carelessness or ignorance of their owners. Should a National gallery come into being it is certain that many people would give or bequeath such pictures to it. With judicious selection an historical record of the development of painting in Australia could be brought up to the present.

Only recently the Gayer-Anderson collection of Indian paintings was given to the Nation. Canberra residents and visitors saw part of it displayed in Kings Hall - certainly not very suitable as a gallery. When the exhibition of French contemporary painting came to this country it could not be shown in Canberra as there was no suitable building.

In our opinion a National gallery would serve two main purposes; first to collect and exhibit pictures which would record the growth of Australia and the development of its art and secondly to provide a building where travelling exhibitions from abroad, as well as contemporary Australian painting, could be shown.

Canberra is becoming every year a bigger tourist centre - not only for Australian tourists but also for overseas visitors. Surely in the national capital such people expect to find the most important art collection in the country. *Except for the very specialized collections at the National War Memorial,* What is there now? *A few* pictures scattered around Parliament House and just two pieces of sculpture in the whole of Canberra. Sculpture for the beautification of our garden city could surely be commissioned and would add greatly to the interest of our open spaces. It should also be incorporated in the design of new buildings.

The experience of my club over the past five years shows that there is a large potential public interested in art. Our modest exhibitions are seen by about 300 people which is just over 1 percent of Canberra's population, but a much larger percentage than visits any but the most publicised exhibitions in the State capitals. For exhibitions such as the Blake Prize for religious art we have a much larger audience.

The renting of Riverside huts to cultural bodies has shown what the possibilities are and the grouping of similar interests in

SENATE CANBERRA COMMITTEE.

close proximity has been of considerable mutual benefit. This, we feel, should be done in future planning, i.e., concert hall, theatre and art gallery could be thought of together as a cultural centre as well as an architectural feature.

My club pleads that in the planning of Canberra a definite proportion of public expenditure should be set aside for buildings of cultural significance. Adapting Sir John Butters' phrase, the National Capital will not have a soul without a strong cultural life and consciousness.

THE CHAIRMAN. - You stated at the beginning of your submission that, in the opinion of the club, a national gallery in Canberra would serve two main purposes. Would you not also think that an additional aim, though perhaps one that it would not be necessary to reach at the moment, would be that of having a general collection of European and other art?

MRS. FRANKEL. - I think that would be very desirable, but I should say that the first aspect would be to collect the Australian historical records.

THE CHAIRMAN. - Are you aware that there is only one collection in Australia that could be considered a really good collection of European art - that is, the collection at Melbourne?

MRS. FRANKEL. - Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN. - I think all the other galleries are sadly deficient in really great paintings. Are you aware, too, that that is mainly due to the fact that one public-spirited citizen left a large bequest which enabled Melbourne to do that?

MRS. FRANKEL. - Yes, and I am also aware that the Melbourne gallery is the richest gallery in the British Empire as far as buying goes, and yet they pay their director as poorly as, shall I say, a C.S.I.R.O. technician.

SENATOR HANNAFORD. - Would that be done to enable them to buy more expensive pictures?

MRS. FRANKEL. - No, because the bequest was only for the buying of pictures.

THE CHAIRMAN. - Does the director's salary come out of ordinary revenue?

MRS. FRANKEL. - Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN. - Possibly that could not happen with the Commonwealth because the Commonwealth Government, I imagine, would have to pay a director a salary more or less commensurate with that of other public servants. However, do you think that the provision of a national gallery by the Government would be an inducement to public-minded citizens either to leave their own collections to the gallery, or else, or in addition, to leave a sum of money for the buying of pictures?

(Continued on page 1004).

SENATE CANBERRA COMMITTEE.

MRS. FRANKEL.- Yes, certainly, because it is very hard to leave a sum of money to something that does not already exist when you are making a will.

THE CHAIRMAN.- Do you think that, if an art gallery building is not constructed, there will be great danger that a public spirited citizen who might have a collection that he would be willing to leave to the Commonwealth might leave it elsewhere or even sell it?

MRS. FRANKEL.- I do indeed,

THE CHAIRMAN.- Do you happen to know that that has actually happened in respect of this city?

MRS. FRANKEL.- No.

THE CHAIRMAN.- On one occasion a public spirited citizen was willing to leave a good collection to Canberra, but there was no art gallery to house it. Had he not died so early in life he might have lived to see the time when one would be built. That is an important matter that I want the committee to consider. Do you think it would be satisfactory if the national gallery and the library were housed in the one building?

MRS. FRANKEL.- Provided that they had enough space and also room for expansion, because you would have to allow for growth with time.

THE CHAIRMAN.- Are you aware that the national gallery in Melbourne is housed in the same building as the public library?

MRS. FRANKEL.- Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN.- The museum also is in the same building.

MRS. FRANKEL.- But do they not very sadly want a new gallery?

THE CHAIRMAN.- Yes. I do not look on that as an ideal solution, but it is something that might be considered. Unfortunately, costs have to be taken into consideration.

SENATOR HANNAFORE.- Do you think that because so many institutions are housed in the one building in Melbourne, the gallery there is deficient in lighting and other respects?

MRS. FRANKEL.- I think so. I think that there is a move

SENATE CANBERRA COMMITTEE

in Melbourne now to have a new gallery for the pictures, because they have such a wonderful collection, and it has grown beyond all expectation at the time it was built.

THE CHAIRMAN.- I know that the lighting in some of the galleries is bad.

MRS. FRANKEL.- It is very bad.

THE CHAIRMAN.- Do you think that it would be a good thing at the present time for the government to take over for the displaying of pictures any suitable existing building that could be used to house a gallery?

MRS. FRANKEL.- I cannot think of a suitable building. Somehow I think that that is an unrealistic question.

THE CHAIRMAN.- One building was examined. I do not think it was suitable for the purpose. Do you know that?

MRS. FRANKEL.- There is always the danger that if you go into a temporary building you stay there for the rest of your life.

THE CHAIRMAN.- I do not suggest that a temporary building should be constructed. I have very fixed opinions on temporary buildings. Perhaps one of the old houses or hostels for the future of which there is no clear purpose might be suitable. Do you remember the building that the High Commissioner for the United Kingdom formerly occupied?

MRS. FRANKEL.- Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN.- Do you think that that building is quite unsuitable for an art gallery?

MRS. FRANKEL.- I happened to look at that building with Mr. White. We realised that it would be very difficult to hang pictures there, but we thought it would be better than nothing. We felt that it would make people think, "This is an awful place. Why do we not get a better gallery?"

The remaining members of the committee having indicated that they had no questions to ask,

THE CHAIRMAN.- You must not take it that because we have not asked a great many questions we are not interested. The reason is that you have put your case so clearly. We shall have to

SENATE CANBERRA COMMITTEE

consider it in relation to other claims for expenditure. We are glad that you have stated your case. It is right in the interests of both Canberra and the whole of the Commonwealth of Australia that we should give full consideration to the matters that you have raised.

MRS. FRANKEL.- May I ask you one question, Mr. Chairman? In your proceedings so far has there been any suggestion in the evidence on planning that an area should be set aside for the purposes for which my club has pleaded?

THE CHAIRMAN.- For special cultural purposes?

MRS. FRANKEL.- Yes; for a theatre and a concert hall.

THE CHAIRMAN.- I do not recall any request in the evidence for the setting aside of a specific area.

MRS. FRANKEL.- Does the Burley Griffin plan set aside a place for those purposes?

THE CHAIRMAN.- I am not aware of it. There is a governmental centre that would include government buildings, and from my study of the plan I have always understood that libraries, art galleries and a national theatre would be within the government triangle.

SENATOR BENN.- Burley Griffin did not particularise when he prepared the plan. I think he set aside certain areas for general purposes, and no doubt he had in mind the purpose that Mrs. Frankel has mentioned. I think it is well appreciated that the cultural centre would have to be in a central position.

MRS. FRANKEL.- Yes, so far as one can be central in Canberra. In discussions with our members, it has been suggested that that was his idea - that such buildings should be put in Constitution Avenue, which runs from Civic Centre past St. John's Church, in a park extending down to the water.

SENATOR HANNAFORD.- That would be Central Park.

SENATOR RYAN.- I should imagine that the national gallery would be situated in the big square of land that has been set aside for the national library.

SENATE CANBERRA COMMITTEE

THE CHAIRMAN.- Are you familiar with the plan that the Committee has before it, which is now displayed on the wall at the end of this room?

MRS. FRANKEL.- Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN.- If you will indicate on it any position that you think would be desirable we shall have it noted in the evidence and shall give it full consideration.

The Chairman and the witness having examined the plan,

THE CHAIRMAN.- Your suggestion is that the ideal spot would be on the northern side of the basin system, on the southern side of Constitution Avenue, in or near the parkland?

MRS. FRANKEL.- Yes.

SENATOR HANNAFORD.- Is that a recommendation made by the Canberra Art Club?

MRS. FRANKEL.- No. It is my suggestion now in response to the Chairman's asking whether we have any ideas. I recall a discussion that I had with some of the town planners. They said that they thought that that was the area that Burley Griffin had considered and included in his plan - in the park on the edge of the lakes scheme, on the higher ground above the lake. Just where you get into civilization again after passing the vast empty spaces between Parliament House and the Australian War Memorial you could have two important buildings - perhaps a theatre on one side and an art gallery on the other.

SENATOR HANNAFORD.- Do you not think that the gallery would serve Canberra more effectively if it were situated on the site of the present national library building?

MRS. FRANKEL.- That is an ungettable place at present.

THE CHAIRMAN.- In what respect?

MRS. FRANKEL.- It is not very well served by buses. I am thinking of Riverside, which is not far away. A lot of it is habit, but you get used to places. When we first went to Riverside we thought that we were doomed and that no one would ever go there to see an exhibition. But now we have very much the same audiences as we used to get at Civic Centre.

SENATE CANBERRA COMMITTEE

THE CHAIRMAN.- It is my idea that an art gallery, theatre or opera house should be near the main business centre of the city. The Sydney Art Gallery, which is in the Domain, is not very happily situated although people do go to the Domain on Sunday afternoons. The Melbourne Art Gallery is very happily placed. It is near the city and all one has to do is to get a tram and one can reach it in two or three minutes. Businessmen find it convenient, and it is also very close to the university there. Do you think that an art gallery in Canberra should be situated near the high school or the Australian National University? There it would be fairly close to Civic Centre, which seems likely to be the main business centre.

MRS. FRANKEL.- Where I indicated is not far from Civic Centre. No doubt a bus will run along there in due course. It is not more than half a mile.

SENATOR HANNAFORD.- We cannot overlook the grouping of a main cultural centre and the administrative centre in Canberra. A building to house a national art gallery would have to be impressive and would have to add to the general effectiveness of the city plan if it were placed in the position that I have mentioned.

MRS. FRANKEL.- Yes. Where would you like it?

SENATOR HANNAFORD.- Somewhere near the present National Library or the Patent Office.

THE CHAIRMAN.- It should be somewhere in or near the government triangle.

SENATOR WOOD.- As Mrs. Frankel has pointed out, the local government buildings at Civic Centre would be the civic centre. We have no civic authority at Canberra; so I suppose that that could be called the cultural centre. It is a matter for the town planners to decide ultimately. These buildings should be set out as a group and should make a very attractive feature. I am particularly interested in the arts. Has the Canberra Art Club considered the point that the development of an art gallery should not be as rapid as that of a national library? Books are being published all the time. I should imagine that any picture chosen

for the national art gallery would have to be of the highest standard.

MRS. FRANKEL.- Exactly.

SENATOR WOOD.- Have you considered that it might take many years to acquire a collection suitable for a National Art Gallery in an expensive building? Dr. Karl Langer told us in Mackay, when we were considering town planning, that we should build a first-class auditorium with almost as much foyer as seating space to allow the audience to move about at intervals. He suggested that works of art should be hung in the foyer so that art might be taken to the people much more vigorously and strongly than by housing it in a special building for art alone. Would the Canberra Art Club consider that the speedier construction of a national theatre with such a foyer for use in the display of works of art would assist in the development of a National Art Gallery? Dr. Langer's argument is that so many people would go to the theatre and would see the works of art hung in the foyer that they would unconsciously become art conscious.

MRS. FRANKEL.- Yes.

SENATE CANBERRA COMMITTEE

THE CHAIRMAN.- Do you think that the proper place for a picture, the main value of which is as an historical record, should be in the art gallery or the national library? Take, for example, that picture on the wall. I do not imagine that it has any great artistic value, but it has an historical value because it is a record of the gold digging days. I doubt whether it should be put in an art gallery, because if it were people might think it was there because of its artistic value.

MRS. FRANKEL.- Yes, I think that is a real difficulty, but surely there are, amongst the collections which are now held by the nation, enough pictures to make a small gallery of Australian primitives, shall we call them, and show the best of such. You group them separately just as the early primitive Italians were grouped.

THE CHAIRMAN.- But the primitive Italians had a great artistic merit. I should think that if the value of a picture lay in depicting the development of Australian art, its place would be in the art gallery, but if it is just a conventional picture of the time, whose sole value is that it portrays the gold diggings, its place would be in the national library.

MRS. FRANKEL.- Yes, I think that would be right. There would be just a few which would be worthy of hanging in the National Art Gallery because they would show the development of Australian art.

THE CHAIRMAN.- I think we should have examples of every Australian painter from Conrad Martens up to the present time. Melbourne is the only place that has such examples. We must see that in the national library there is sufficient space for displaying historical pictures. We might get a great many of them.

MRS. FRANKEL.- Yes, The likelihood is that it will be bequeathed all sorts of things which will have to go in the cellars. You will have to make provision for adequate cellars.

SENATOR WOOD.- The pictures in an art gallery should be well selected?

MRS. FRANKEL.- Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN.- Everything in an art gallery should have some artistic merit, whereas in an historical section that is not necessary.

SENATE CANBERRA COMMITTEE

MRS. FRANKEL.- Has nobody suggested that we should have more sculpture in Canberra?

THE CHAIRMAN.- Yes, that has been suggested. Do you make the further suggestion?

MRS. FRANKEL.- Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN.- What kind of sculpture?

MRS. FRANKEL.- I think it falls into two kinds. There is the kind you might have in the art gallery when we have an art gallery, and that which we might have now, putting aside, perhaps, part of the funds which are allocated for each building, as I think they do in Sweden, where 1 per cent goes into the decoration, ~~of it~~ to be paid to the sculptor or the ceramic artists who are adorning the building. Then, we might think of buying some sculpture that fits into the landscape. I do not mean statues of worthies, but something that is going to enhance the landscape.

THE CHAIRMAN.- Would you object to statues of worthies if they were good sculpture?

MRS. FRANKEL.- They so seldom are.

THE CHAIRMAN.- But they could be?

MRS. FRANKEL.- Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN.- Will you agree that there is no sculpture worthy of notice in Canberra?

MRS. FRANKEL.- No, I like "Relaxation" at the National University.

THE CHAIRMAN.- That is the only one you like? I don't think the witness I was thinking about had that in mind. I think he was thinking rather of the King George V. Memorial and the Burns' statue. Would you say they have no merit?

MRS. FRANKEL.- I think I would - very little, anyhow, except bulk.

THE CHAIRMAN.- One artist thought that as a statue the King George V. statue was quite good, but he did not like the placing. What about the "Burns' statue? I understand that it is a copy. Would you say it lacks any merit?

MRS. FRANKEL.- I do not think there is anything at all

SENATE CANBERRA COMMITTEE

unpleasant about it. It fits nicely into its corner. I do not think there is anything to grumble about with that one.

THE CHAIRMAN.- It is not ugly?

MRS. FRANKEL.- No, it is not unploasing.

THE CHAIRMAN.- From the point of view of the National Capital, one thing that we should be clear about is that any sculpture or Statuary should be of the highest quality?

MRS. FRANKEL.- Yes. Then, there is always the difficulty of who shall decide what artistic merit a thing has.

THE CHAIRMAN.- That is our great dilemma. We had a clash of evidence. Some evidence was to the effect that if you want good architecture the only thing to do is to get one architect and let him do his best or his worst. You must not try to hamper or hobble the man who is doing the job. Let him design the building and let that be the building. Do not tie him down with restrictions. If he is going to design the art gallery, let him decide.

Would you be prepared to accept that?

MRS. FRANKEL.- No, I do not think so. I should say that a responsible body of people should decide on what they want. If you are designing a house, you are going to live in the house, so you should have some say in what goes on. Therefore, think of what you want and do as much as you can before you hand it over to the architect. Do not just wait till he has made his mistakes and then tell him about them.

THE CHAIRMAN.- It has been definitely put to us by some witnesses that if you attempt to prescribe or in anyway hinder or limit the architect you will get something that is safe and mediocre but not of high artistic merit. Would you agree with that?

MRS. FRANKEL.- Yes, I think I would.

THE CHAIRMAN.- You have already stated that you would want a body of people who should say what was wanted, and yet you would also want an untrammelled artist.

MRS. FRANKEL.- No, not a totally untrammelled artist. Especially when you are designing architecture, you must be trammelled. You are trammelled by circumstances, for instance.

SENATE CANBERRA COMMITTEE

THE CHAIRMAN.- Do you think we could risk, in the National Capital, having a very important public building dictated by the taste and the inspiration of one architect?

MRS. FRANKEL.- I think you would be gorgeously bravo if you dared. Yes, I think you could, if you chose your architect.

THE CHAIRMAN.- There are some architects today with whom I should have nothing to do - just from looking at their products. That is my own personal opinion. You would have a body of people with artistic taste to say who your architect should be. Then, you think he should be allowed to go ahead?

MRS. FRANKEL.- Yes, as much as possible, because he is the one who has to lift it above being an ordinary four-walled box.

THE CHAIRMAN.- Supposing we chose an architect and he thinks that the building that is to go on Capitol Hill should be a big rectangular glass structure, something like the United Nations building in New York. What would be your impression if he did that?

MRS. FRANKEL.- It is so hard to visualise in Canberra. It would be fun, I think.

THE CHAIRMAN.- In some matters it is quite obvious that there is a dilemma..

MRS. FRANKEL.- Yes.

(The witness withdrew)

(Continued on page 1014.)

JOHN CHEYNE GARRAN, Farmer and grazier,
 ALISON ANNE GODFREY-SMITH, manager-producer for the Canberra
 Repertory Society.
 THOMAS HENRY MICHAEL LOWE, Public Servant,
 sworn and examined.

THE CHAIRMAN.- Would you, Mr. Garran, read to the Committee
 the statement you have prepared?

MR. GARRAN.- The statement reads -
THEATRE IN CANBERRA.

Under the term "Theatre" can be included straight plays,
 operas, ballet and concerts.

Along with the rapid growth of population in the Federal
 Capital has grown the need for supplying Canberra citizens with good
 and varied theatrical entertainment, apart from films.

That the standard and conditions under which such entertain-
 ment is presented should be high, is particularly important in
 Canberra, for not only is a large proportion of the population
 interested in cultural activities, but the city is continuously
 visited by overseas people and representatives of other nations, who
 would be likely to regard theatrical entertainment in the Federal
 Capital as representing the standard of theatre in Australia.

We submit that the development of theatre in Canberra falls
 into two definite categories:

1. The development of a permanent theatre in Canberra itself.
2. The improvement of facilities for visiting companies presenting
 plays, opera, ballet and concerts in Canberra.

1. The Development of Theatre in Canberra.

Theatrical activity in Canberra today is chiefly maintained
 by the Canberra Repertory Society. Although there are other organis-
 ations in the city which produce plays and opera from time to time,
 this Society operates continuously for all but six weeks in every
 year. Performances are given on Friday and Saturday nights, and
 each season, as a general rule, runs for five weekends, with a
 spare weekend between each production.

There are always two, and often three productions in rehear-
 sal and actually performing throughout the year, and the support
 given by Canberra people to the Society can best be indicated by

stating that in the year 1953/54 attendance for the year was almost 10,000 - approximately 1,200 per season. The programme was a varied one - both classic and modern plays being presented - as it is the policy of the Society to arrange the programme to cover as wide a range of drama as possible throughout the year. It is also Repertory's policy to encourage Australian dramatists, and to this end, whenever possible, an Australian play is included in the year's programme.

It cannot be too strongly emphasised that as well as providing entertainment for audiences, Repertory also provides an interesting and creative leisure time activity for people of widely varying interests. For every production that goes on the boards, people knowledgeable in, or willing to learn about - acting, carpentry, furnishing, scene design and painting, making of properties, lighting, sound effects and use of amplifying equipment, costume design and making, make-up, ushering, programme selling, scene shifting and so on, are required. More than 200 people take part in the above activities at Repertory each year. Of all leisure activities, the theatre offers the widest creative scope for men and women, and in this way alone performs a most useful service to the community.

Repertory's steadily growing programme of activity has been made possible by two main factors:

a) The Cultural Committee's annual grant to the Society, which makes it possible to employ a full time professional Manager-Producer.

Since 1950, the Cultural Committee, formed by the Department of the Interior for the encouragement of cultural activities in the A.C.T. has given Repertory an annual grant of approximately £950. This grant forms the annual salary of a full time professional Manager-Producer, whose presence is essential to maintain good standards of production, and to ensure that the continuous production of plays during the year is carried out. The time and effort involved in staging eight full length plays in a year could not possibly be given by voluntary workers. All other expenses, including a part-time Secretary, are met from revenue from box office takings and members' subscriptions. This grant is more essential than ever to-day

as Repertory is pledged to pay back a loan of £3,250 from the Department of the Interior, used for the reconstruction of the Riverside canteen into the present theatre.

b) The fact that the Society now has its own theatre and workshops at Riverside.

This second factor gives the Society a definite centre of activity. Today, not only is the theatre used for rehearsals, performances and play readings every night in the week, but the workshop at Hut 19 is also continuously in use, and in the rehearsal room at Hut 20, rehearsals, drama classes and social functions are held regularly. Any member now knows that he or she can come down to the theatre during week nights or in the weekend, and find some activity going on that they can either watch or participate in.

However, Repertory's present premises, by very nature of the buildings, which are reconverted wooden hostel huts, can only be temporary. In addition, with the growth of Canberra's population, the present theatre's facilities will in a few years become quite inadequate.

We submit that for the maintenance of a local Repertory organisation that will perform plays regularly for the public, and also provide an interesting leisure activity, a small and well equipped theatre, seating between 300 and 400 will become essential, a permanent Little Theatre, where Canberra people can not only come as audiences, but where they can also find, if they wish, creative and varied work in which to participate.

2. Facilities for Visiting Companies.

Such a theatre as envisaged above would, however, be unsuitable for visiting companies, who require a theatre of much larger seating capacity to cover costs of a short season, and in the case of companies presenting opera, ballet or concerts, also require a larger stage than that of a Repertory theatre.

The Albert Hall at present is used by visiting companies, and it is in many ways unsuitable, owing to the lack of space and facilities backstage, lack of heating in the winter months, and the

fact that it is widely used for dances and other activities, making it difficult for touring companies to obtain a booking for a particular night.

We submit that for the future, to cater for visiting companies and orchestras, a reasonably large (seating capacity about 900) and well equipped concert hall in Canberra will be necessary, with sufficient stage space and staging equipment to permit also the performance of ballet, opera and straight plays.

THE CHAIRMAN.- The obvious difficulty at first is how far we can separate the local requirements from those of the national capital. Do you think it is a function of the Federal Government to subsidize repertory and such activities?

MR. GARRAN.- The make-up of Canberra is such that you have to cater for more than just the physical needs of the people. As we have tried to point out, Canberra in particular has a large number of people of fairly extensive interests, and the number that take part in our society and various other societies shows that there is a great need for some activities to be available other than the general commercial activities that are available. For the general welfare of the community I suggest it can be claimed that it is a function of the Government to support, not entirely carry, such activities.

THE CHAIRMAN.- Every country town could put in a similar claim to the appropriate State Government if your argument is valid.

MR. GARRAN.- I think the structure of society in a country town is different, and the number of educated people in various grades of the services in Canberra puts the cultural level of Canberra on a considerably higher plane than you would expect in an ordinary country town.

THE CHAIRMAN.- But then, of course, one of the aims of repertory is to raise the cultural level?

MR. GARRAN.- Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN.- I was a member of repertory in a country town, and we got no help and we had to try to cover expenses. I am putting the question not because I am in any way hostile to your

proposal but because I want to see how this will be viewed by the ordinary taxpayer of Australia, which is a very important consideration. You have shown us that the Albert Hall is apparently not very suited for repertory or anything of that nature and that it is not always available. I think there is a case for another hall. You have made a very modest claim in your statement. Do you think there is a danger of building a hall that might not be good enough when this capital city is getting near its optimum population. You mention a hall to seat 900 people. For what general population do you think such a hall would cater?...

MR. GARRAN.- I think there are two definite factors. We suggest a small, active intimate theatre for continued playing. That is the first suggestion. The second suggestion looks more into the future and is for a larger hall to seat 900 people. The first theatre suggested would seat 300 or 400 people in comparison with the capacity of 900 of the second suggestion. I grant that it could be larger.

CHAIRMAN.- Would there be any objection to putting them in the same building?

MR. GARRAN.- Not to putting them in separate parts of the same building.

THE CHAIRMAN.- If the Government provided the building, do you think the local inhabitants would then guarantee regular production of good plays?

MR. GARRAN.- Judging by their present feeling, most definitely yes.

THE CHAIRMAN.- Repertory is very well supported here?

MR. GARRAN.- Yes. To the limit of our equipment and so on we have full houses practically always.

THE CHAIRMAN.- Would you say the standard of performances at the repertory is very good?

MR. GARRAN.- With modesty, yes.

THE CHAIRMAN.- I have not many questions to ask, because I think the sole thing we have to do is to consider this, balanced against other claims which may conflict with it, and also to decide

how far in the national capital the Government should go in subsidizing cultural activities;

SENATOR WOOD.- You mention an annual grant of £950 to the Canberra Repertory Society. I think it is possibly the only repertory theatre in Australia that is subsidized by the Government. Do you not feel that with proper theatre space the Canberra Repertory Society could be self-supporting without relying on a subsidy?

MR. GARRAN.- If you go into the financial aspects of the theatre you will find that at present with maximum seating capacity of 150, and charging 5/- a seat, the returns on that basis could not possibly provide the salary of the manager-producer. Assuming that the theatre was larger, naturally returns in relation to expenses would be considerably higher, but the possibility comes in that although you might be able to be self-supporting in providing salary for the manager-producer the rent of the theatre might be so much higher that you might not be able to provide both .

(Continued on next page)

SENATE CANBERRA COMMITTEE.

SENATOR WOOD. - Do you consider that the Repertory Theatre in the national capital should be subsidised by the Government when the people of other towns in Australia who are all taxpayers do not receive such assistance?

MRS. GODFREY-SMITH. - The majority of self-supporting repertory societies in capital cities are situated among populations infinitely larger than the population of Canberra. Canberra has only about 30,000 people. It is not that Canberra people are not willing to assist the Canberra Repertory Society but that Canberra has a small population. I think that that fact has to be taken into account. Also, Canberra has very few facilities for evening entertainment. It has only two picture theatres. For that reason, we try to keep our productions going continuously throughout the year and, consequently, we require a subsidy in order to do that.

SENATOR WOOD. - But many towns in Australia with less population than Canberra have repertory societies which do not receive help from the Federal Government.

MRS. GODFREY-SMITH. - That is so. I have worked with one myself. We were self-supporting but we could only do four shows a year. I think that there is a need for more continuous production than that in Canberra.

SENATOR WOOD. - You are limited by the size of your theatre, of course. You put on five week-end performances of each show which is seen by 1,200 people, which makes an average audience of 120?

MRS. GODFREY-SMITH. - That is about right.

SENATOR WOOD. - Do you think that that represents a good percentage of the population, in view of the standard of intelligence in Canberra, and in view of the lack of other evening entertainment?

MR. LOWE. - I do not know. I have no criteria by which to compare our attendances. Of eight plays that we produce each year, we find that one, having a good box-office appeal, will bring in 1,500 customers; two plays may each bring 1,300 customers; and the other five will bring 1,100 each. Those figures provide an average audience of about 1,200 for each of the eight plays. By

SENATE CANBERRA COMMITTEE.

coincidence, the auditorium capacity of our theatre matches our production capacity. It is physically impossible for us to produce more than eight plays a year because an amateur cast requires at least five or six weeks rehearsal. It is also necessary to have a break of a week between successive productions so that the stage can be struck and a new set erected. It is necessary to close down for at least five or six weeks over the Xmas period and there is no performance over Easter. For these reasons, it is impossible to have more than eight productions a year. At the moment, 4 percent of Canberra's population come to see each production. The exceptionally attractive play will bring 5 percent of the population of 30,000. Those figures suggest that when the population reaches 40,000 we might anticipate a regular average audience of about 1,600 and a peak audience of about 2,000 for each play. It is important to remember that we can only induce that 4 or 5 percent of the population to see our plays over a period of 4 or 5 weeks. We could not get the same percentage of the population in two or three nights, even if our theatre were large enough to accommodate it. When we used to play in the Albert Hall which has a capacity of 700 for two or three nights we would never get more than 800 people to see the play over the three nights.

SENATOR WOOD. - Do you find that attendances drop off over a season of five weeks?

MR. LOWE. - In general, people tend to come towards the end of the season. There is an incorrect impression in many people's minds that after the play has been produced for five or six nights it will be a better production.

SENATOR WOOD. - Do you think that you are getting the maximum possible attendances?

MR. LOWE. - I think that we are getting the maximum possible attendance of people who are aware of repertory. I believe that there is scope for spreading the gospel among a wider section of the population.

SENATOR WOOD. - Mr. Garran has suggested a little theatre

SENATE CANBERRA COMMITTEE.

with a seating capacity of 300 or 400 and a theatre with a seating capacity of 900 to cater for travelling shows. Would you say that those theatres would be big enough?

MR. GARRAN . - I should say that the suggested size of the little theatre would be big enough because a little theatre with a seating capacity of more than 400 results in a loss of the contact of an intimate theatre. The theatre that is intended for larger companies could be bigger than suggested, due regard being paid to possible revenue and other financial considerations. As a national theatre, it could be very large indeed.

SENATOR WOOD. - Would you favour the construction of a theatre big enough for travelling shows which could be reduced to intimate theatre size for the staging of local productions?

MRS GODFREY-SMITH. - It is important for the Repertory Theatre to have its own permanent premises in order to preserve the spirit behind the movement.

SENATOR WOOD. - But I am trying to ascertain the possibility of constructing one building in order to serve the dual purpose of theatre and little theatre. Attached to such a theatre there could be rooms for the use of the Repertory people. Would that not keep the spirit of the theatre going?

MRS GODFREY-SMITH. - But we present plays every Friday and Saturday night in the year so that the theatre would not then be available for touring companies.

SENATOR WOOD. - At present you can only accommodate 120 people each night. If you had a larger theatre, could you not reduce the number of performances?

MRS GODFREY-SMITH. - I do not think so. Canberra is growing and our audiences are increasing all the time. If this trend continues our present premises will be totally inadequate and we shall need a bigger theatre for the same season.

SENATOR WOOD. - You maintain you need a theatre and a little theatre?

MRS GODFREY-SMITH. - Yes.

SENATE CANBERRA COMMITTEE.

MR. LOWE. - A proposal was put before the Government and was considered by the Prime Minister in 1950 before the Korean disaster upset many plans. The proposal was for the construction of a basic stage area at one side of which would be a small intimate theatre with an auditorium capacity of 350. Ultimately, a large theatre would be built on the other side of this stage which would be big enough to serve such a theatre.

(Continued on page 1024)

MRS. A. A. GODFREY-SMITH.
T. H. N. LOWE

SENATE CANBERRA COMMITTEE.

SENATOR WOOD.- If a National Theatre were built, there would be no objection from the Repertory Society's point of view to the Little Theatre being incorporated in the same building?

MRS. GODFREY-SMITH.- No. I do not think that would matter at all. It would mean that we could economise on the main wall of the structure.

SENATOR WOOD.- Do you think support for the Repertory Society is growing in Canberra?

MRS. GODFREY-SMITH.- Yes, I think we can claim that over the last two years. I think Mr. Lowe can give more explicit information on the financial side.

MR. LOWE.- I have here some figures that I have abstracted from our audited balance sheets. Our accounts are audited by professional auditors, Messrs. Cooper Bros., Way and Hardie. In our audited balance sheet as at the 30th November, 1950, the society's current assets were £704 and its fixed assets were £588 making a total of £1,292. Set off against that was a total of liabilities to outsiders of £215, leaving an accumulated capital fund of £1,077. In our accounts as at the 30th June last year, our current assets were £935 and our fixed assets were £987, making a total of £1,922. Liabilities to outsiders amounted to only £77, leaving an accumulated capital fund of £1,845. I think that is indicative of the growth in stability and stature that the society has achieved over those four years, and, as you would expect, comparable progress is demonstrated in the number of attendances by the public at the shows. Where we were getting attendances of, say, 500 to 700 in 1948 and 1949, we are now, as you have been told, getting an average of 1200. At any rate, that is the figure we expect, and it is not uncommon to get somewhere around 1,500 people at a performance.

SENATOR WOOD.- It is four years since the society came into existence, is it?

MR. LOWE.- No. It is four years since the society became incorporated as a company limited by guarantee. It was in the year

SENATE CANBERRA COMMITTEE.

1950 that we first became recipients of this grant from the cultural committee. Our progress has been most notable since we have had the grant because we have had the organisation of two paid people - a manager-producer and a secretary to look after the business affairs.

SENATOR WOOD.- I take it that the Repertory Society generally considers that the necessity for a really good theatre in Canberra is very urgent?

MR. LOWE.- We do.

SENATOR WOOD.- I might mention that I visited the last performance by the Repertory Society, and I congratulate it on the standard of that performance.

MR. LOWE.- I should like to point out that it is no part of the policy of the society to expect to be spoon-fed, but the position at the moment is that I do not think it would be within our powers to pay the economic rent of an expensive theatre. Our margin of revenue over necessary expenditure at the moment is not more than £300 or £400 a year, so that if the subsidy of about £950 a year that we get at the moment for salaries were to be taken from us, we would be very hard put to it to maintain our present organisation. In particular, we would not be able to afford the services of a professional manager-producer.

SENATOR HANNAFORD.- I feel that there is some justification for a comparison to be made between Canberra and other cities. I know that Mrs. Godfrey-Smith has mentioned the disparity in population, but I have in mind the Younger Theatre Group in Adelaide, where private enterprise has stepped in, or at least assisted in providing a studio theatre that is taken advantage of by the various theatrical groups there. It has filled a long-felt want in Adelaide without any governmental assistance. Do you know Mrs. Cornell, of Adelaide, who has been very interested in art, particularly theatrical art, over the years?

MRS. GODFREY-SMITH.- Yes.

SENATOR HANNAFORD.- Would it be too much to assume

SENATE CANBERRA COMMITTEE.

That Canberra has been treated somewhat generously in the past by the government in providing this subsidy of £950 a year and at the same time facilitating things by providing the Society with quarters? I know that you had some expenditure in remodelling those quarters, but would it be too much to assume that you have been treated somewhat generously in the past and would it not be unreal to expect more from governmental sources?

MR. GARRAN.- I think the situation is this: when we were self-supporting, we were just an ordinary private organisation. We used to show three or four shows a year for about three nights to a few members of the society and odd members of the public who cared to come along. Now we are in receipt of a public grant - I do not say there is any generosity in providing a theatre because we are paying all that back - we are definitely providing a public service and paying regularly at the very modest fee of 5/- a seat. We are playing regularly to the public, not just to members.

SENATOR HANNAFORD.- You feel that you have an obligation to do that now that you are receiving assistance?

MR. GARRAN.- Yes.

MRS. GODFREY-SMITH.- In any case the National Theatre in Melbourne receives a grant of £5,000 a year from the Victorian Government.

SENATOR HANNAFORD.- That is information I was unaware of.

MRS. GODFREY-SMITH.- In view of that subsidy, I do not think our grant is excessively high.

THE CHAIRMAN.- And in addition to that, repertory in Victoria is done by the Workers Education Association, which is subsidised.

MRS. GODFREY-SMITH.- Yes. That is true.

THE CHAIRMAN.- In fact, the association is largely concentrating on that kind of work.

SENATOR WOOD.- Does the National Theatre in Victoria play outside of Melbourne?

MRS. GODFREY-SMITH.- Yes, it goes on tour.

SENATOR WOOD.- That is the reason for that grant of £5,000?

SENATE CANBERRA COMMITTEE.

MRS. GODFREY-SMITH.- I think it is.

SENATOR HANNAFORD.- I do not want you to assume that I am hostile to your suggestions. This is just an aspect that must come into the Committee's consideration.

SENATOR BENN.- Do local authorities throughout Australia, like town councils, city councils and shire councils, make contributions or donations to repertory organisations?

MR. GARRAN.- I am not aware of how other organisations are financed.

SENATOR BENN.- Have they provided financial support for associations such as your own?

MRS. GODFREY-SMITH.- I can really speak only for the Tasmanian repertory. Neither the Hobart Repertory Society nor the Launceston Repertory Society has received any money from the local councils or the State government, apart I think, from about £100 a year that we used to receive on occasions for conducting a State drama festival.

SENATOR BENN.- The contribution in Victoria was made by the State government?

MRS. GODFREY-SMITH.- Yes. The Launceston City Council has taken over the Launceston Theatre, but as a public theatre for hiring to anyone who cares to pay the rent; similarly in Hobart.

SENATOR BENN.- And other States have made similar donations?

MRS. GODFREY-SMITH.- Victoria is the only one I know of. The New South Wales government has subsidised the Opera Company in Sydney.

SENATOR BENN.- You feel that your submission of today is justified by the fact that Canberra is the National Capital?

MRS. GODFREY-SMITH.- Not necessarily so. It is chiefly because the situation of Canberra creates a rather special set of circumstances which makes it very difficult for us to do what we would like to do for the population without a certain amount of government assistance - not wholly government assistance.

SENATE CINDERELLA COMMITTEE.

SENATOR BENN.- The need for assistance at the moment would be just as real if you were not in the National Capital? If you were outside Canberra altogether, you would have the same handicap?

MR. GARRAN.- We could go on in the little private way as we did before, with a little voluntary assistance, when we produced practically nothing, and the public would see a play once in a while. Now we produce something regularly, and I think there is a definite service to the community. We consider that we are bound to produce regularly in spite of various hazards.

MRS. GODFREY-SMITH.- I think it is a combination of circumstances. We are the repertory in the National Capital, and there are these other circumstances which make it difficult. I think they should both be taken into consideration because, in the earlier part of our report, we mentioned the fact that Canberra has a tremendously high percentage of overseas visitors, not to mention members of the diplomatic corps from other nations, and we would like to think that we show them good theatre.

SENATOR HANNAFORD.- I refer to your evidence on the improvement of facilities for visiting companies presenting plays, opera, ballet and concerts in Canberra. Would you say that Canberra has reached a stage where the establishment of a theatre along the lines of a national theatre would be a profitable, or even reasonable project?

MR. GARRAN.- I am afraid not yet.

SENATOR HANNAFORD.- Would you have sufficient audiences to cater for that sort of thing at this stage?

MR. GARRAN.- For the main National Theatre, I think at present it would be an expense to the community for some time to come.

SENATOR RYAN.- Would it stimulate public support in Canberra?

MR. GARRAN.- Well, it is the show that stimulates the support. If the shows are good enough, they draw the houses.

SENATOR HANNAFORD.- You at least think that a site should be set aside for such a theatre?

MRS. GODFREY-SMITH.- Yes.

SENATE CANBERRA COMMITTEE

MR. GARRAN.- Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN.- You are interested in plays alone? You do not put on light opera or musical performances?

MR. GARRAN.- We have not done so.

THE CHAIRMAN.- Can you give me any information about any activity of that kind in Canberra?

MR. GARRAN.- There is the Philharmonic Society, which puts on musical comedy about once a year for two nights in the Albert Hall.

SENATOR HANNAFORD.- You have an Orchestral Society, have you not?

MR. GARRAN.- Yes.

SENATOR HANNAFORD.- They use the Little Freemasons' Hall I understand.

MR. GARRAN.- There has been a combination between, I think, the Choral Society and the Philharmonic Society in putting on some of these group plays.

MR. LOWE.- Before the Committee concludes its hearing of evidence I should like to say that the society did not receive the Cultural Committee's grant simply to enable it to present entertainment to the populace of Canberra. The underlying motive when the grant was first made available was to encourage community activity which provided the young people with the opportunity for self-expression. I think it is important to recollect the circumstances. At that time it was maintained, and perhaps with some justice, that we had young people sitting around in hostels with nothing to do. Here was an opportunity of giving them something creative to do.

THE CHAIRMAN.- Thank you very much for your evidence. It has been very valuable and will receive full consideration. I think your answers to our questions have been extremely satisfactory.

THE WITNESSES WITHDREW.

SENATE CANBERRA COMMITTEE

JOHN JOSEPH CUSACK, retired Coach Builder and Garage Proprietor,
sworn and examined.

THE CHAIRMAN.- You have a statement. Will you make it.

MR. CUSACK.- Yes, I have a statement. I appreciate the opportunity of laying before you my views. I have an ego that leads me to believe that I would propound a policy for Canberra and Australia that is worth hundreds of millions of pounds to the nation. In doing that, I want to make the statement that I think the Committee that you have formed is very well deserving of all the consideration the people of Canberra can give, individually and through corporate and other public bodies, and they should come forward.

I have the effrontery to say that if half of my policy is implemented by this Committee there will not be in Australia a man that will have the nerve to advocate the abolition of the Senate. We have heard that suggested very often. My policy for Canberra is that the main thing for a city is to have the food that is necessary for the population to grow healthy and virile. With that in view, when I was on the Chamber of Commerce I gave notice of motion that we should have the Shoalhaven River harnessed for the purpose of irrigating the land around Bungonia flats and Bungendore. There are miles of good land there capable of growing all the food that is necessary, milk particularly, and butter and vegetables. At the present time, we bring it from as far as Albury. That should not be the case, because we have rivers here that can be harnessed to irrigate those lands so that we will have an abundance of food for the population as it grows. I can give to the Secretary my notice of motion, which sets that out.

What I have been concerned about is that the Molonglo River could be harnessed with great advantage at a place where it would not cover valuable land, because it is very high. We could have it harnessed here and we could generate electricity and irrigate the flats down below Ginninderra. There are very rich flats there. In my opinion they would be capable of growing the food that we require, the same as at Leeton and Griffith. We ought to have the Molonglo River harnessed for that purpose. It might not be generally

SENATE CHINA COMMITTEE.

known, but when I was in the New South Wales State Parliament we had a report by a German scientist who came here. His report was that at Burbong there is the richest iron ore in Australia, but, of course, it is too far removed from coal. It requires three tons of coal to produce one ton of iron or steel. If the Molonglo River were harnessed there would be a possibility of having, as they have in America, the best of steel manufactured without coal - that is, with electricity from the Snowy River.

Whatever qualification I might have to give evidence on this matter is that when I was a garage proprietor I felt that it was very necessary to learn as much as I could about electricity. In addition to that, when I was elected to Parliament, my room mate was one of the best contracting electricians in Sydney. That was Harry ~~Willis~~^{to}. The biggest job that was done there was his. He made the electrical installation at the White City, which was a very big job at that time. He was so successful and did such a good job that he was able to marry one of the relations of Anthony Hordern and have a trip overseas for a honeymoon. He was my friend, and we talked electricity a lot.

In addition to that, many years ago we sent Neilsen, who was Minister for Lands in the McGowen Government, to America in order to find out what they did in Arizona and other places there with electricity. He was sent there for the purpose of learning that, and in addition he was asked to send to Australia an expert to report on the bulk handling of wheat, because the policy of the McGowen Government was to have bulk handling. As it happened, when Neilsen was away, I was member for Queanbeyan and de facto member for Yass, his electorate. In that way, I was given the job of taking Mr. Burrows^{all} from America around to show it to him. One of the places I showed him was Old Junee, where they had a very high stack of wheat right beside the railway line. The rain came, and three or four bags high was submerged. You could not get near the place for the smell of it and the whole of it was destroyed. That was evidence of the necessity for bulk handling of wheat in Australia.

When Mr. Burrows^{all} came here I travelled with him a lot in the train. He was very much interested in our policy on railways

SENATE CANBERRA COMMITTEE

and other things , and he impressed me with what he had to say about electricity. He told me what they did in America. He said that there was no stream, creek or river that could be harnessed that was not harnessed, and that the American people were in a position to have electricity for nearly every purpose as well as for power and light. In that way he impressed me with the necessity, if we could get it, of having electricity in Australia. He told me that his wife and he went to church, that before they went they put the dinner on the stove, and that when they came back it was ready. I think that those are only the amenities that we in Australia ought to have.

In Caucus and elsewhere I always had a lot to say about electricity and I pretended to be a bit of an expert. I had the satisfaction that in our party, when a minister was to bring in a bill for any purpose, such as to nationalise the railway refreshment rooms, we dealt with the minister. I was friendly with a family whose home was the meeting place of senators and everyone else in the Australian Labour Party, and we were in touch with a number of people. We would get in the car, go down to the Domain and talk over the proposed act, as we did in regard to electricity. Cann was the Minister for Works. We got him to refer all these proposals to the works committee. These proposals embraced the Burrinjuck Dam, and referred then to the necessity of harnessing Burrinjuck for electricity, the Snowy River, Gilmore, the Shoalhaven. Half a dozen or more of these places had to be reported on with the idea that if Labour were kept in office we would in time be able to harness the streams and have Australia more than America fitted up and capable of industrial development and development in other respects, as well as irrigation.

I have here copies of the New South Wales Hansard of 1916, ^(1/12/16 L 6-91) when Mr. Cann, as Minister for Works, brought in all these proposals, if you would refer to them. His proposal, of course, was to harness Burrinjuck. I had a lot to do with Burrinjuck when it was being started. The harnessing of it was delayed. They did not bring that in until 1916. In 1916 we passed a proposal to harness

SENATE CANBERRA COMMITTEE

Burrinjuck, Burrinjuck was to produce 8,000,000 units of electricity with the turbines that we were to put in. It was expected that for many years we would sell only half of that 8,000,000 units. It was estimated that when we were able to sell the lot we could sell it for three fathoms or less a unit within a radius of 100 miles, and that in that way we would be able to have a great supply of electricity from Burrinjuck, compared with the ~~turbine~~ ^{thermal} method of using coal to produce electricity, which was not in the same street. We have been sending electricity to Sydney. The way they are charging for electricity has been set out recently, I think, in the Senate. They have made more than ^{£200} £100,000 of profit and were making the people in Sydney pay for electricity an exorbitant rate, and were extorting money from the people of Sydney.

SENATE CANBERRA COMMITTEE

MR. CUSACK (Continuing) I think that if the Canberra people could get electricity in bulk they would be able to get it cheaper. In my opinion, the Snowy River scheme is one of the greatest projects that any nation could inherit. We will have electricity from Munyang. I had the privilege to represent most of the territory involved in that scheme when I was in the State Parliament, when I was member for Queanbeyan, and also when I was member for Albury. I know most of those places. I understand that we had blackouts not because there was not enough water to turn the turbines but because they wanted to save crops of rice or fruit. With half a million acre feet of water passing down there, I think that the Murrumbidgee will generate twice as much electricity as we are getting now.

I would like to bring to your notice the fact that in the New South Wales Parliament, Mr. Cann, as the responsible minister at one time brought in a bill with the purpose of obtaining electricity from the Snowy River. His proposal was that the dam should be at Jindabyne. Reference to the map shows that the proposal then was to put up a wall 186 feet high. My proposal is that we should have Canberra supplied with water by gravitation from the Jindabyne dam. We would then have an abundance of the best water in the world coming from the roof of Australia.

SENATOR HANNAFORD.- By pipeline?

MR. CUSACK.- ^{Yes} ~~No~~, it could come straight here. I think the map shows that you could get it from Jindabyne straight to Canberra. We could have one main that would deliver water 100 feet higher than the present reservoir, so that if there were another bush-fire at the Observatory, for instance, it could be fought much more successfully, and the people who live on these hills could have sewerage. If we had gravitated water, which we could get with greater ease than any other place in the world, we could discard the pumping plants at the Cotter, Cooma, Yass and Queanbeyan. With that saving, and also the saving on meters, much more money would be available. Steel pipes could be used to deliver water to our present reservoir, and we would never be short of water. Queanbeyan has been

SENATE CANBERRA COMMITTEE

talking about spending £90,000 to put in a 1,000,000 gallon reservoir, which would not be necessary if the scheme I have been speaking about were adopted. We could have the city of Canberra as well as Queanbeyan, Eden, Bombala, and many other places supplied with water. At the present time the water is full of mud and is not fit for use. We could have the best water in Australia.

I understand that a witness before this Committee recommended Molonglo water for the Canberra supply. I would not like to see it used even for a lake. We could have aqua pura from the Snowy River, but not from the Molonglo. I think we should not worry our heads about the Molonglo water. We could have a lake of the best Snowy water near the cemetery, which could also be a harbour. It is a difficult thing for people here to get sufficient firewood. If we had the Murrumbidgee running through the place we could bring wood down it and supply Canberra with the cheapest wood it ever had. The lake could also be made a source of pleasure. We could have speedboats on it, and other attractions for tourists. It is my idea that we could use the Murrumbidgee as rivers are used in America, to bring radiata and other timber down and the Forestry Department could grow trees such as hickory, spruce and English ash. In addition, we could have wood-pulping plant to make paper on the spot.

I think we should utilize the Snowy River to the full. Nature has supplied us with mountains right alongside us, and we should have water which could be used in our car batteries because it would be so pure.

I think the Committee deserves credit for giving the people of Canberra an opportunity to state their views. My idea is to try to form leagues in Canberra that will stimulate the ambition to make Canberra grow and which will induce everybody to take an interest in the city. So far, there are too few.

SENATOR BENN.- You think it should be the worthy capital of a great nation?

MR. CUSACK.- I think so. We want to have an enlightened democracy. I have advocated a domain opposite Parliament House, on the side of the hill. It would be a great attraction, and it also would be educational.

SENATE CANBERRA COMMITTEE.

MR. CUSACK (Continuing). - In my time I, and most of my colleagues, have spoken in the domain. I think it is very good for people even of the calibre we have as politicians to be able to go to such a place and listen and learn. I should like to see that kind of thing in Canberra. It could be a place where freedom and all other matters could be discussed. People would come here as tourists and be able to visit it and it would be very beneficial.

The plan to divert the waters of the Murrumbidgee River into the Yarrangobilly River is a proposal of which this committee should take cognisance. A fortnight ago a Sydney magazine, *i.e.*, (22/2/55) printed a history of the Snowy River and said that it was proposed to ~~bring~~ ^{divert} water ~~from~~ ^{through} the Murrumbidgee ~~forty miles~~ ^{and then through} through tunnels and so forth at a cost of millions of pounds and run it into the Yarrangobilly. This will change the Murrumbidgee from an Ole Man River into little more than a creek. It will mean that the second biggest river in Australia will become a Cinderella. It will be emasculated when it is taken for a joy-ride through mountains and *wilderness* tunnels and poured into the Yarrangobilly. I have ridden from Tumut up to Lobb's Hole on a horse and had to cross the Yarrangobilly river nine times on the way. I am not sure that it is not illegal to take water that we need from the Murrumbidgee and empty it into the Yarrangobilly. We want the Murrumbidgee to be a great river. We do not want its riverhood to be emasculated by a proposal such as this at the cost of millions of pounds which would mean that Canberra would be by-passed by the Murrumbidgee water on its way to the Murray. Everybody in Canberra should do his utmost to combat this proposal because that water is very necessary for us. It is a vital means and a great facility for bringing timber that we want for building and for fuel. The proposal will turn the Murrumbidgee from an Ole Man River into a "bodgie". It will become a river of which we shall be ashamed.

We have the wrong idea about what constitutes money nowadays. Cheques and similar documents represent money. Private banks have financed me all through my life and I could get the finance tomorrow

SENATE CANBERRA COMMITTEE.

to build a house by merely signing a piece of paper because I have a deed in the bank which represents money. That is sound banking at all times. It is always sound banking for a bank to advance 70 percent on real security. ^{one had} If ~~have here~~ a deed which represents ^{and} property worth £10,000, ^{only} during the depression I took that piece of paper to banks and they admitted that ^{it} was a sound proposition, ^{but} they had ~~not~~ ^{still could not give} the money ~~to let me have~~ ^{they did not}. There is one bank, the Commonwealth Bank, which has the money, which the Chifley 1945 Banking Act ~~filed~~ ^{offer} from private banks. It is time that ^{offer} coinage was considered obsolete. ^{offer} Coins should not be a unit of currency. I report that I saw recently said that copper had increased in value by 250 a ton. We should start, therefore, to mint our coins of aluminium and silver and our copper coins should be melted down. I think there is enough copper money in Australia to build 40 or 50 houses in Canberra.

THE CHAIRMAN. - Thank you, Mr. Cusack, We appreciate your evidence and we shall consider it.

(The Witness withdrew).

(Sitting suspended from 12.40 to 2 p.m.)

SENATE CANBERRA COMMITTEE.

JAMES BROPHY, Auditor-General, Sworn and Examined.

The purpose of my evidence will be to assist the Committee to have a better understanding of those matters of government finance and audit to which reference has been made in the course of evidence given before the Committee.

On page 350 of the Minutes of Evidence, Mr. E.J. Scollay suggests that styles of domestic architecture can be improved by giving the architects greater interest and stimulus of handling the whole project; by engaging good architects; and by giving them the handling of certain kinds of financial control.

My experience is that professional men, with few exceptions, have not the training to exercise financial control. The wise professional man ensures that he has a trained administrator, preferably with accounting experience, to take over that responsibility and to advise him. The financial structure of our Constitution provides that financial control shall be vested in the Treasurer and the Treasury. The general organisation of the Commonwealth Public Service maintains that principle and most of the officers who exercise any form of financial control are delegates of the Treasurer or the Minister of the Department. They are not the engineers and the architects - they are trained accounting officers. Any other form of financial control must inevitably lead to financial chaos.

On pages 356 to 358, Mr. Scollay referred to annual budgeting for Government projects and the rush to get works projects committed before the beginning of the next financial year and to get money spent on works projects before then. Mr. Scollay said that if there could be some form of project budgeting instead of annual budgeting, that need to rush into contracts would be overcome and artificial barriers would be obviated. I do not think that Mr. Scollay has fairly stated the position. The "rush" is rather to make sure that firms get their accounts in. An examination of departmental accounts would reveal that a large percentage of expenditure is paid in the last six weeks of the financial year.

SENATE CANBERRA COMMITTEE

That trend is not peculiar to the Department of Works.

It is a fallacy to believe that the liability to which the Parliament is committed within each financial year is limited by the annual appropriation of that year. Under a large proportion of the votes of the annual estimates, liabilities are incurred in excess of appropriation and are carried over to the following financial year. With administrative votes such as General Expenses, this is inevitable if the day to day administration of the department is to function smoothly. This is, however, a very minor form of project budgeting.

A major form of project budgeting has been in operation in large departments, with Government approval, for many years. Departmental programmes of expenditure extending well beyond the current financial year are in operation in the defence services and the Postmaster-General's Department.

Programme budgeting in the Department of Works reached such substantial proportions in recent years that I deemed it necessary to comment thereon in paragraph 110 of my Annual Report for 1951-52, and to refer the matter to the Attorney-General's Department. Further comment is made in paragraph 126 of my Annual Report for 1952-53 and the opinion of the Acting Solicitor-General is given in Appendix 'H' of that Report. He advised that the Government's practice of incurring liabilities under departmental works programmes is in conformity with Section 83 of the Constitution, which requires parliamentary appropriation for expenditure, the Audit Act and the Treasury Regulations. He states that there is no provision in the Constitution, or in the Audit Act or the Treasury Regulations, which precludes the executive Government of the Commonwealth from entering into a contract, otherwise within its power, by reason only of the fact that the Commonwealth thereby incurs a liability to pay moneys which have not at that time been appropriated by the Parliament to meet liabilities arising under the contract.

I would illustrate my point by the use of tables which

SENATE CANBERRA COMMITTEE

summarise the revotes and the new services in each of the last six financial years, comparing the totals with the respective appropriations for capital works and services under the control of the Department of Works throughout the Commonwealth and in the Australian Capital Territory as far as Part 3 of the Estimates is concerned. The tables read as follow :-

	1949-50 £M.	1950-51 £M.	1951-52 £M.	1952-53 £M.	1953-54 £M.	1954-55 £M.
All Commonwealth Departments.						
Revotes, representing liabilities carried over from previous financial year.	20.8	29.1	39.7	28.6	20.0	14.8
New services to be initiated in current financial year.	33.0	40.9	31.1	21.1	1.9	15.9
Supervision expenses	1.0	1.1	1.2	1.0	.9	1.0
Total programme	54.8	71.1	72.0	50.7	22.8	31.7
Amount appropriated for expenditure in current financial year.	26.8	27.2	21.9	19.5	16.8	18.0
Liabilities to be carried forward to next financial year.	28.0	43.9	50.1	31.2	6.0	13.7

(See page 1040)

SENATE CONSTITUTIONAL COMMITTEE

	1949-50 £M.	1950-51 £M.	1951-52 £M.	1952-53 £M.	1953-54 £M.	1954-55 £M.
Australian Capital Territory.						
Revotes representing liabilities carried over from previous financial year.	3.7	7.7	6.8	4.0	3.5	3.5
New services to be initiated in current financial year.	3.5	4.2	5.6	4.8	.2	3.4
Supervision expenses	-	.2	.2	.2	.2	.2
Total Programme	7.2	12.1	12.6	9.0	3.9	7.1
Amount appropriated for expenditure in current financial year.	1.8	3.5	3.5	3.6	3.3	3.7
Liabilities to be carried forward to next financial year.	5.4	8.6	9.1	5.4	.6	3.4

I wish to emphasise that these figures in each financial year were accurate only at the point of time when the estimates of the respective years were submitted to the Parliament; and that the figures for the Australian Capital Territory are not comprehensive of all Departments within the Territory. For example, Capital Works for the C.S.I.R.O., Duntroon and Harman are not included in the appropriation for the Australian Capital Territory. Duntroon and Harman are included in the votes for the defence services and there is a separate line for C.S.I.R.O.

It would be reasonable, therefore, to draw only the following conclusions from these figures: that a form of programme budgeting does exist, with full legal authority, in the Department of Works in respect of the Australian Capital Territory and the whole Commonwealth; and that the Parliament, in approving each appropriation for capital works and services, commits itself, in most cases, to a programme liability far in excess of that appropriation.

SENATE CANBERRA COMMITTEE

On pages 366 to 377 of the Minutes of Evidence,

Mr. N.H. Mussen comments as follows :-

The Auditor General held men's careers in the hollow of his hand.

Fear is at the root of it all - fear of what may be said in the Parliament, fear of the Treasury, fear of the Auditor-General.

Set rules of procedure, bowing and scraping to the Treasury and treating the Auditor General as though he were the Almighty are the implacable enemies of leadership, morale and psychological insight.

Could not the Auditor General have a sort of advice Department? There are many problems arise in building where the proper procedure is extraordinarily difficult to establish. I believe that if we had easy access to him it could do a tremendous amount to help. At the moment he lives so separate and so isolated from us that to do what we think is the proper thing to do often would be perhaps to risk the University for example.

The advancement and development of the University is in no small measure dependent on its continuing to enjoy good relations with Treasury and in avoiding criticism in the Parliament, the newspapers or by the Auditor General.

I think if you will read the Auditor General's remarks on instructions about architects you will find what I mean. I have not seen it myself. I have only been told of its contents.

Any suggestion that contact between the Audit Office and officers of the Commonwealth or Commonwealth Authorities causes fear is so much nonsense. The Auditor General does not criticise policy. He criticises inefficient methods and the uneconomical results in the carrying out of policy. He merely observes whether accounting principles in regard to public moneys and stores are put into operation by those whose duty it is to carry out policy. He reports to the Parliament where there is not observed that 'prudence' which the average businessman would observe in spending his own money and protecting his own property.

Prior to 1952, insufficient notice was taken of the Annual Report of the Auditor General to the Parliament. In 1951 the Public Accounts Committee Act 1913 was re-enacted with a very important addition which provided that the Public Accounts Committee should examine the Annual Report of the Auditor General. If any fear is engendered in the mind of any officer today, it is fear of his own inefficiency and the consequential examination by that

SENATE CANBERRA COMMITTEE

Committee. On the whole, I would suggest that that fear, if it exists, is a very healthy sign from the point of view of the economical administration of the Commonwealth.

The Auditor General, through his officers, is accessible at any time and on all matters connected with his duties. It is part of audit policy to establish and maintain close personal contacts, thereby increasing the efficiency of audit.

(Continued on page 1043)

(Mr. Brophy continuing)

The architect or the engineer is interested in those procedures which concern the actual building of the structure - he has no interest in accounting control procedures. His interest would not extend to, for example, stores control or stocktaking methods. These latter procedures, however, are of the utmost importance in the protection of public moneys and stores.

The Auditor General has been continually urging that procedures of internal control designed to prevent and disclose error or fraud should be established and maintained. Internal control is the very essence of sound accounting and is based on having more than one person concerned in each transaction. If internal control increases cost, it must be remembered that a 100% audit would cost considerably more. If the procedures are strict, even to the point of appearing unnecessarily so, they are so framed with a definite purpose. If they are faithfully followed, there should be no necessity for the Auditor General to refuse his certificate to the accounts.

THE CHAIRMAN.- Thank you, Mr. Brophy. I want to get clearly in our minds what can be done and what should be done in relation to what they call "project budgeting". I have the idea that, although you say there is such a thing in the departments, you yourself are not particularly happy about some of it. In your report for 1951/52, you quote Mr. Justice Isaacs as saying in 1922 - "Parliamentary discretion would be severely fettered if the executive could make a compact binding the Crown in law to pay away a portion of the public funds and leaving to parliament the alternative of assenting to the payment or disallowing a public obligation. That would be seriously weakening the control by the parliament of the public treasury". You accept that statement?

MR. BROPHY.- I did at the time, but I am afraid the Solicitor General has made me alter my view.

THE CHAIRMAN.- Why?

MR. BROPHY.- I can only accept the advice of the legal man placed there by the government.

THE CHAIRMAN.- Is it possible that the executive could enter into binding contracts and then, if it did not pay, it would be no defence to say, "Parliament has not voted the money"?

MR. BROPHY.- That is correct.

THE CHAIRMAN.- Has that always been the law?

MR. BROPHY.- I do not think it was known generally until the Solicitor General put his opinion on record. What I feared at that time was that the liabilities were increasing very rapidly up to \$72,000,000, and I felt that there should be some curb on the expenditure because re-votes were getting into high figures. They reached £50,000,000 at the end of 1952. In liabilities were going to increase at such a rate, it was going to completely beyond the capacity of the Commonwealth to pay, and I raised this question with the Solicitor General to get the legal opinion.

THE CHAIRMAN.- And we could say then that you could get a position where Parliament was not really a free agent - in which it was more or less committed to so much expenditure and could do nothing about it legally?

MR. BROPHY.- Yes. You could get into the legal position that you had a very large liability and you must pay.

THE CHAIRMAN.- You would consider that bad policy, would you not?

MR. BROPHY.- I would.

THE CHAIRMAN.- Is it possible in such a project as building the Australian capital city to find a way by which you could vote well ahead sufficient money to finance the project? I mean a way to vote more than you are likely to spend in the current year so that it is money already provided from taxation. A trust fund would be one method. Can you think of another method by which you could have a pool on which this body could draw?

MR. BROPHY.- The trust fund is the only method, but I do not support it.

THE CHAIRMAN.- Why?

MR. BROPHY.- It is not fair to the people for a start.

You are imposing taxation beyond immediate necessities.

THE CHAIRMAN.- I do not know whether this comes within your province: To what extent would you think it is legitimate to build the national capital out of loan money?

MR. BROPHY.- If the loan money is raised within Australia I would see no objection whatever. The argument that can be advanced is that posterity is going to have the use of the federal capital and should pay its share, but I do not favour borrowing overseas for such a purpose.

THE CHAIRMAN.- And is there not a further argument that, as the price level tends to rise and there is not much chance of it ever ceasing to rise because all we can do is to moderate it, we are actually getting things cheaper by building today for posterity than if we leave it to them?

SENATOR HANFORD.- That is a moot point.

THE CHAIRMAN.- Put it this way: In Melbourne you have a fine Parliament House built last century, and I understand that it cost less than £100,000. Of course the figure today would be £1,000,000 at least. Do you not think that it is very good for the citizens of Victoria that the citizens in the late part of last century decided to build that?

MR. BROPHY.- Yes, I do, but what you say appears to suggest that costs are going to increase considerably in the future.

THE CHAIRMAN.- Well, over the whole of civilised history has not the rising price level been the rule and the fall the exception?

MR. BROPHY.- Well, costs did go down considerably from 1932 onwards.

THE CHAIRMAN.- And they came down in the late 19th century in England, but in the main I think the tendency has been a rising price level.

MR. BROPHY.- Yes, I think that is true.

THE CHAIRMAN.- In your report of 1952/53 you drew attention to the large liability to which parliament is committed in excess of the provision in the estimate because of this method of budgeting. Do you remember whether that was a very big amount in 1952/53?

MR. BROPHY.- I drew attention to the 1951/52 and the 1952/53 figures. The particular figure I have already mentioned - the

£50,000,000 liability carried over from 1951/52 to 1952/53 - was rather alarming.

THE CHAIRMAN.- When you come to this method of checking on other bodies, do you think it is always necessary to demand the same type of accounting from different bodies? Do you take into account the methods they might have of checking, varying from department to department, or do you have a uniform method of checking which you think ought to be used?

MR. BROPHY.- The principles are uniform, but not necessarily the method of applying them.

THE CHAIRMAN.- When you get a man who is working on a contract why should he worry about methods of accounting? He keeps within his contract or he loses money. Is that not the principle? One of the men who objected to this method of budgeting was a man who, I think, was under a contract. Is it not a fact that, whether he makes money or loses it, he is only going to get a fixed sum? What would be the reason for his anxiety about the Auditor General if he is on contract?

MR. BROPHY.- Does he necessarily keep within his budget?

THE CHAIRMAN.- That is the point. Is it the general practice for men to make a contract and then find means of getting a little more? Has that become almost a custom?

MR. BROPHY.- I could not say that. A little more on top of his contract? I could not express an opinion on that.

THE CHAIRMAN.- I have got the general impression that although contracts are made, instead of sticking to them some deviations from the terms of the contract are found by means of which an extra payment can be made. Is that a common practice or not?

MR. BROPHY.- I think it is common at the present time.

THE CHAIRMAN.- Not only with government contracts but also with private contracts?

MR. BROPHY.- Yes, because of circumstances which prevent them from completing a contract within the time limit.

THE CHAIRMAN.- And it is in a case like that where the careful accounting on the part of the private contractor would be necessary?

MR. BROPHY.- Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN.- I should say that in the ordinary case it does not matter what his methods of accounting are as far as you are concerned. All you are concerned about is that he gets his contract price and nothing else.

MR. BROPHY.- Well, in most contracts is there not a contingency item?

THE CHAIRMAN.- Yes.

MR. BROPHY.- Well, why should he get the contingency item for being inefficient?

THE CHAIRMAN. - Exactly. You have studied Mr. Scollay's evidence, have you not?

MR. BROPHY.- Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN.- We listened to his evidence very closely. We think it was a very sincere attempt to draw attention to what he considered weaknesses. Do you think it would be possible, for instance on something within the national university such as the medical school, to meet necessary expenditure without considering the whole budget of the university, or must you consider them together?

MR. BROPHY.- Each building within the university could certainly be considered on its own as long as they have proper internal control to see that the materials for which payment is made were actually used in the building.

THE CHAIRMAN.- You, as Auditor General, have no concern in it except to see that money voted by parliament is properly expended and not wasted?

MR. BROPHY.- That is the point - not wasted. That involves considerable examination of what has actually happened with the stores which have been brought in on the contracts, particularly if those stores have been purchased from government money.

THE CHAIRMAN.- And you have to examine items to make sure that each item really does account for legitimate expenditure under that head?

MR. BROPHY.- Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN.- You could have a sort of general cover item

that could be a bit vague -

MR. BROPHY.- The auditor must satisfy himself that the assets which are shown in the balance sheet are actually there.

THE CHAIRMAN.- Yes. Now these are some points that were definitely raised by some witnesses. Although I think you have answered some of the points already, I will go through them. They have said that annual budgeting tends to create artificial stages in a building programme. Can you say anything on that point?

MR. BROPHY.- My answer to that is that there is not annual budgeting; it is programme budgeting. The only annual budgeting, as I have already indicated, is for the amount which the Department of Works feels that it can spend within the period of twelve months.

SENATOR HANNAFORD.- As outlined by your figures on page 2 of your submission?

MR. BROPHY.- Correct.

THE CHAIRMAN.- Suppose within a given year the department does not spend all that it is allowed to spend. Is it true that that leads to a danger of its total appropriation for the following year being reduced?

MR. BROPHY.- It depends entirely on the attitude of the government.

THE CHAIRMAN.- That is so. That again is not your business.

MR. BROPHY.- The Minister will look after his department and put up the case for the new year. It is a matter of discussion then in Cabinet.

THE CHAIRMAN.- Do you know if it is true that last year the National University's budget was reduced because of some such thing?

MR. BROPHY.- I would not know that.

SENATE CANBERRA COMMITTEE

THE CHAIRMAN.- Is it true that failure to spend one year's appropriation completely prejudices the appropriation for the next year.

MR. BROPHY.- I would say not in capital works, because it depends entirely on the detailed programme put up by the minister to Cabinet. In votes such as general expenses for the ordinary administrative expenditure of the department, when I was in the Treasury examining such submissions, my tendency would be, if they did not spend the appropriation of the previous year, to reduce them.

THE CHAIRMAN.- Do you not think that that might lead to the unwise spending, in order to justify a claim for the next year, of money that it would be better not to spend?

MR. BROPHY.- I do not think so. My experience has shown that they have hurried up the submission of the accounts - have persuaded firms to submit their accounts - so as to spend all the money for which liability has been incurred. There have been exceptions, but I do not think that as a general rule the departments spend money unwisely in that way.

THE CHAIRMAN.- Do you think that departments, after they have decided what their legitimate expenditure will be, add a fictitious element so that they can bargain with Treasury officials?

MR. BROPHY.- I do not think there is the slightest doubt about it.

THE CHAIRMAN.- I suppose it is like the bargaining in the eastern bazaar, and is a battle of wits. You know something about Treasury practices in dealing with departments. Do you think that the Treasury is always wise?

MR. BROPHY.- If I say that it is not, I shall condemn myself, because it was my job, while I was in the Treasury, to vet the estimates.

THE CHAIRMAN.- If you try to beat a man down, do you not encourage him to deceive you by building up his estimate?

MR. BROPHY.- Before you start to discuss the matter with an officer representing a department, you generally have behind you some ammunition with which to beat him down - perfectly good ammunition. He sees the force of the argument, and gives way. If it
N.1 1049 J. BROPHY.

is to his advantage not to give way, he will fight you.

THE CHAIRMAN.- Would the Treasury official not be better equipped when he dealt with an old and tried department with the practices of which he was familiar than when he dealt with something totally different? Suppose that in the building of Canberra we get some new item of which the Treasury has no previous experience. Do you not think that it might unwisely try to beat a man down when the expenditure would be justified?

MR. BROPHY.- No. If it is something new, that is the item that is going to be strictly vetted.

THE CHAIRMAN.- It should be.

MR. BROPHY.- It is.

THE CHAIRMAN.- Would the Treasury be aware of all the possible disadvantages of that? Suppose we wanted a big park with certain new items. Do you think that the Treasury would be inclined to view it from the point of view of its experience of the past?

MR. BROPHY.- Yes, because the Treasury has been expanded in recent years to cope with that sort of thing.

THE CHAIRMAN.- You have there officers who really understand the sort of project that comes before them?

MR. BROPHY.- Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN.- I have heard it said publicly and in Parliament that Treasury control over other departments is too great in that the Treasury not merely sees that expenditure is economic, but also, to a degree, tends to direct the policy of a department. Is there anything in that oft-repeated statement?

MR. BROPHY.- I think that the policy of the Treasury in that respect is absolutely necessary. Then if there is disagreement with the Treasury attitude, it is always left to the minister of the department to take it up with the Treasury.

THE CHAIRMAN.- Perhaps this is a little outside your immediate sphere, but, in effect, has it not become the tendency to look upon the government of the country as being the Treasury and the departments, and not Parliament and the Cabinet?

MR. BROPHY.- No. In any of the discussions that I have had

with departments on estimates, my experience has been that we agree between us as to what should be the appropriation. If we disagree, both sides know that it must go to the minister. There is no suggestion in any of this discussion that we are finalizing it.

THE CHAIRMAN.- There was some reference to strained relations with the Australian National University. I understand that you refused to certify the balance sheet for one year.

MR. BROPHY.- The balance sheet for last year has been deferred.

THE CHAIRMAN.- It is still deferred?

MR. BROPHY.- I do not think there was a previous one.

SENATOR HANNAFORD.- You refused to give your certificate?

MR. BROPHY.- Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN.- It is not our purpose to go into that matter. It was stated also - and the blame was thrown on the Treasury, and, incidentally on the Auditor-General - that there is a rush by departments to commit themselves to works before the financial year closes, and that they give an outline plan that has not been properly considered and commit themselves to something that they later find requires much greater expenditure. Is that true in your experience?

MR. BROPHY.- That is correct, but this suggestion of a rush is rather exaggerated. It takes a long time to get out sketch plans before they can even prepare a preliminary estimate for the purpose of a requisition and submission to the minister for approval. I do not think there is any real rush in the sense that they have to complete the whole task within a week or so; it is a matter of months.

THE CHAIRMAN.- Do you think that, in the planning of Canberra, it would be a good idea to have plans prepared well ahead so that when the time comes the basic plan will be ready, with perhaps the need for only a little readjustment to the existing conditions and prices? Do you think it would be a good thing to plan well in advance?

MR. BROPHY.- I think that that is actually the position.

THE CHAIRMAN.- You think that that is already being done?

MR. BROPHY.- Yes. The one matter on which I can speak from personal experience is the new swimming pool. I am president of the Canberra Swimming Club, and I take a very active interest in swimming. The sketch plans for the swimming pool have been in existence for a matter of years, and not months.

THE CHAIRMAN.- Do you think it would be a good idea to plan now for all the parks and main public buildings that will be necessary within the foreseeable future?

MR. BROPHY.- Technically I am not qualified to say, but from a businesslike point of view I agree.

THE CHAIRMAN.- One witness told us that there was a lack of certainty in preparing programmes for works in Canberra, and I think he blamed it on annual budgeting. Do you think that there is anything in that suggestion?

MR. BROPHY.- There may be a lack of certainty. I cannot express an opinion on that, but I would say that it has nothing to do with budgeting - the actual provision of the amount for appropriation by Parliament.

THE CHAIRMAN.- You would not like to express an opinion on the question whether the planning of Canberra should be left to departments or to a single authority? Do you think that that is outside your sphere.

MR. BROPHY.- I think it is outside my sphere.

THE CHAIRMAN.- Someone made a statement about a sort of uniform Commonwealth building contract as though it was a standard thing used, with certain variations, for most purposes. Is that true?

MR. BROPHY.- I have no knowledge of any uniform building contract.

THE CHAIRMAN.- So far as I can recollect, the suggestion was that there was some sort of a normal Commonwealth building contract in which certain stipulations were always included; that it was rather loosely drawn and therefore master builders would tender for contracts, and then increase their normal prices by as much as 10 per cent; and that that was becoming the practice. Do you know of that?

SENATE CANBERRA COMMITTEE

MR. BROPHY.- I have no knowledge of it.

THE CHAIRMAN.- I distinctly remember that one witness told us that certain clauses were never enforced. I do not know why. I remember that I asked him was it not true that if a contractor failed to deliver by the due date or to keep within the specifications there were certain penalties. The witness told us that that was in the contract, and that it was a sort of common understanding that no one would try to enforce it. Is that so?

MR. BROPHY.- My impression is that the time limit is never enforced, but I cannot express an opinion with any personal knowledge.

THE CHAIRMAN.- Do you think that the time limit should be enforced?

MR. BROPHY.- Many years ago I believed that it should be, but I do not think that it is practicable under present conditions.

THE CHAIRMAN.- Surely it would be better to leave it out. Do you not think that unenforceable laws are always bad?

MR. BROPHY.- I do not agree with you.

THE CHAIRMAN.- It tends to create disrespect for the law when people know that they can break it with impunity.

MR. BROPHY.- There is always some element of fear hanging over them when they know that it is always there.

THE CHAIRMAN.- One of the witnesses - I think it was Mr. Mussen - referred to the possibility of getting advice from your office. Is it part of the function of your office to give advice?

MR. BROPHY.- Most definitely we wish to give advice. It is not part of our function to give advice, but my attitude and the attitude of my officers throughout the Commonwealth has been to advise the men with whom they come in contact. To attempt to advise architects is quite beyond our province.

THE CHAIRMAN.- I do not know whether you would like to comment on this. In our search for ways of developing and governing Canberra we have heard evidence about authorities outside the ordinary departments. From your experience of such authorities, do you think it might be financially inadvisable to constitute an authority to govern and develop Canberra? As an example, have you had much

SENATE CANBERRA COMMITTEE

experience of the Snowy Mountains Hydro-electric Authority?

MR. BROPHY.- Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN.- Do you think that it has succeeded?

SENATE CANBERRA COMMITTEE.

MR. BROPHY. - I do. I could quote another one with which I ^{have been} particularly concerned - Overseas Telecommunications Commission. That has succeeded admirably.

THE CHAIRMAN. - Would you advise us to get definite evidence about the Snowy River Authority and the Overseas Telecommunications Commission?

MR. BROPHY. - I do not know to what use you could put it. Of course, if you want advice on the way not to do things, have a look at Bell Bay.

THE CHAIRMAN. - Another Committee is inquiring into that, and we shall not comment on it.

SENATOR HANNAFORD. - The figures supplied by you have been extremely valuable in refuting suggestions that have been made by certain witnesses. In the programme budgeting of the Department of Works, you referred to the years 1950-51 and 1951-52, where the total programme went up to £71.1 million and £72 million and it was found on reference to the Attorney-General that it was within the Constitution for that year.

MR. BROPHY. - That is correct.

SENATOR HANNAFORD. - You apparently do not agree with that?

MR. BROPHY. - I do agree with the legal opinion.

SENATOR HANNAFORD. - Yes, but you do not altogether agree with such substantial expenditure being incurred - -

MR. BROPHY. - I do not agree with the policy that was being followed at that time. Apparently the Government did not agree with it either, because they dropped it down.

SENATOR HANNAFORD. - Do you think that perhaps an alteration of the Constitution would be justifiable in such a case?

MR. BROPHY. - No, it is not necessary.

THE CHAIRMAN. - You live in Canberra?

MR. BROPHY. - Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN. - And you are interested in a number of things outside your profession. For instance you are interested in sport, particularly hockey and swimming?

SENATE CANBERRA COMMITTEE.

MR. BROPHY. - Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN. - One of the things we have to determine is how far it is fair for the Commonwealth to subsidise the activities of the citizens of Canberra. Do you think there is a special claim that people in country towns or other parts of Australia have not got for assistance for sporting, cultural and other bodies?

MR. BROPHY. - I cannot draw a comparison with other places, but I do say that any expenditure by the Government in respect of sporting, cultural or other bodies with which I am associated is fully justified, because we have been taken away from our homes in the capital cities. Most of us, of course, have been married and established our homes here since, but even so, we seem to be far removed from the main activities of the Commonwealth. We have to build up all of those activities - cultural and otherwise - which are provided in the capital cities of the States and which we have not here.

THE CHAIRMAN. - The proper comparison then should be with the capital cities in the States and not with the country towns?

MR. BROPHY. - Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN. - The unfortunate thing is that the taxpayers all over the Commonwealth have to pay for it, and if they happen to live in a country town, they may say "Why should this body get a subsidy when we do not?"

MR. BROPHY. - I am not inclined to agree with the suggestion that the taxpayers of the Commonwealth have to pay for it. I think that the taxpayer in the Australian Capital Territory provides an equal share with anybody else in the Commonwealth.

THE CHAIRMAN. - Is it possible for us to determine clearly how much of the revenue of the Commonwealth comes from the Capital Territory, and to apportion the amount paid by the citizens here as against citizens in other places?

MR. BROPHY. - The Taxation Commissioner might have a bit of difficulty, but as far as other revenue is concerned it could be easily ascertained.

THE CHAIRMAN. - What kind of revenue do you mean?

SENATE CANBERRA COMMITTEE.

MR. BROPHY. - Rents of houses, for example, and whatever is paid by the people for the many services which are provided here.

THE CHAIRMAN. - Do you not think it desirable that we should be able to get some system of accounts by which you could show quite clearly what was being contributed by the people within this area and what was being contributed by the taxpayers in the States?

MR. BROPHY. - I do not think it would serve any important purpose.

THE CHAIRMAN. - I think it would. One of the difficulties is that many people outside the Capital Territory are not interested in it, and one of the complaints against Parliament is that members are just interested in their States or constituencies and are not giving their attention to this Territory. If we are going to recommend increased expenditure on the Territory, we will have to justify it to the citizens of the States. I represent New South Wales. I will have to face the electors. They may say, "Your Committee recommended that they spend something more on Canberra. You are taking that from us. What about it?" Would it not be desirable for me to be able to say, "As a matter of fact, you are not paying any more, or if you are paying any more it can be justified by the service given to you"? We have heard the complaint that the people here are being spoon-fed and are not looking after their own interests. We want to answer that. Do you not think that a system of accounts such as I have suggested would be valuable for that purpose?

MR. BROPHY. - It may be. I do not know.

THE CHAIRMAN. - Various systems of local or partial local government have been suggested and methods of seeing how much the people here should pay for their bus fares ^{decide} or other things. We cannot/ about that unless we have some idea of how much is incurred by the persons here on account of the plan and demands made on them by the whole Commonwealth.

MR. BROPHY. - It would be very difficult to draw a distinction between those various items.

THE CHAIRMAN. - Yes, but I think it is very important when

we come to the question of local government and local rating. I have not yet got anywhere near making up my mind on that. To give a specific instance, a man in the Senate - a representative of the smallest State - once said to me, "The bus service in Canberra shows a loss of so much each year. Why should the people in my State pay bus fares for the people in Canberra?". I know part of the answer is that the nature of the city is longdrawn out, but that is not the whole answer. I think we should be able to fix a rate which would be just to the citizens of the Northern Territory and Tasmania and also just to the citizens of Canberra. You think that is difficult?

MR. BROPHY. - Extremely difficult, on account of the general layout of the city.

THE CHAIRMAN. - One school will say, "You can never give these people self-government because it is a Commonwealth matter." It is very bad not to give people self-government. If they are not allowed to have self-government they may simply regard themselves as recipients of benefits from a bountiful providence. I think we have to find some way of adjusting the expenditure between the two. I wonder could the Treasury help us with that?

MR. BROPHY. - I do not know whether they could or not.

THE CHAIRMAN. - The buses provide an obvious instance of where that need crops up.

MR. BROPHY. - Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN. - And, I think, also the parks. The parks here - particularly if we have some big ones in the city - are for the benefit of all the people of Australia, particularly for tourists, but the local people will get more benefit from them than anybody else. How can we apportion the shares, and how can we determine the management? It would be very helpful if anybody skilled in accountancy could assist us on those scores.

SENATOR WOOD. - Do you really believe that just because the people here have been removed from other places they should get subsidies for their sporting organisations? Take the case of people in other communities who pay rates on their properties - and more

than those paid by the people of Canberra, incidentally, according to the evidence we have heard. The people in other communities raise the money themselves for all of those activities. Why would the people in Canberra require to be treated on a different basis?

MR. BROPHY. - You are suggesting that the State governments do not subsidise?

SENATOR WOOD. - No, they do not - not sporting and cultural societies.

MR. BROPHY. - I was under a different impression, as far as cultural societies are concerned. Any subsidy to sporting bodies comes from the National Fitness grant. Canberra gets £2,000 per annum, and the States get £72,500.

SENATOR WOOD. - That is the National Fitness movement. I think in Queensland that pertains to a particular national Fitness movement.

MR. BROPHY. - It is all for National Fitness purposes. It just happens to be used by a different method in Canberra from that of the States.

SENATOR WOOD. - I think we in Queensland think of National Fitness as exercises and so on, camps, and that kind of thing.

MR. BROPHY. - You think more of camps, but we here in Canberra think more of the physical exercises - swimming and football for example.

SENATOR HANNAFORD. - You get a grant here?

MR. BROPHY. - The National Fitness committee advises the Minister for Health as to how this £2,000 should be expended, but the £2,000 is not being expended. It averages less than £1,000 a year, which is a very small amount to contribute to the 30,000 people in the Capital Territory.

SENATOR HANNAFORD. - Is that the only instance of a grant towards sporting activities?

MR. BROPHY. - That is the only instance, to my knowledge.

SENATE CANTERRA COMMITTEE.

SENATOR HANNAFORD. - In that case, Canberra sporting bodies are on the same basis as sporting bodies elsewhere.

THE CHAIRMAN. - How the grant should be expended should be determined by the body that spends it. There is no necessity to spend it all in the one way.

SENATOR WOOD. - In the case of a football team, there are a few people exercising and perhaps thousands watching. The true National Fitness idea is for hundreds or thousands to participate in national fitness pursuits.

MR. BROPHY. - Yes, but you must remember that any contribution for national fitness purposes is limited to the 14-18 age group or thereabouts. It is for the youth throughout the Commonwealth. All these adults who play sport are not being subsidised by the Commonwealth or anybody else.

THE CHAIRMAN. - We have to be very careful in making recommendations pertaining to the National capital. I always have in mind not the other capital cities, where they have most of the advantages from governments, but country towns, which I think should be the chief recipients of Government expenditure at the present time.

(Continued on page 1061)

SENATE CANBERRA COMMITTEE.

MR. BROPHY.- I wish to correct the statement that I made earlier in relation to the balance sheet of the Australian National University. Mr. Johnson has showed me our own report for 1952-53, which is the second last report, in which I stated that I had not been able to certify/^{that}the abovementioned balance sheet represents a true and fair view of the Australian National University as at the 31st December, 1952". That is, I refused to certify that particular balance sheet. The balance sheet for the following year which ended the 31st December, 1953, was deferred.

THE CHAIRMAN.- No decision has been come to?

MR. BROPHY.- That is so.

THE CHAIRMAN.- It contained elements which arose out of that previous one, did it not?

MR. BROPHY.- Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN.- Thank you very much Mr. Brophy. Your evidence has been very valuable.

(The witness withdrew)

(Continued on page 1062)

LATHAM WITHALL, Federal Director of the Associated Chambers of Manufacturers of Australia, Sworn and Examined.

THE CHAIRMAN.- I understand that you have a statement to make, Mr. Withall.

MR. WITHALL.- I have no written statement to make. I have perused with very great interest the reports of the evidence, views and opinions submitted to your committee since it commenced its deliberations and I felt that, in view of the great interest which my organisation holds in the development of the capital city, I should mention one or two subjects to the Committee which would appear could be relevantly touched on by myself as representing the manufacturing industries in an organisational sense at the seat of government. In the first place, we wish to extend our congratulations in respect of the initiative taken by the Senate in establishing a committee of this kind. For quite a long time we have been apprehensive about what seemed to us to be a lack of a clear and well defined policy in relation to the growth, development and expansion of not only the capital city itself but of the Australian Capital Territory as a whole. We hope that this initial step that has been taken by the Senate will be so well received, and prove of such advantage to our community here, that it will be thought desirable to keep a permanent eye on the progress of this city and its surrounding territory. We hope that in due course some body with legislative power of authority will be established. We believe that that might well follow from the recommendations that this committee may deem fit to make when it has concluded its work. Such a legislative authority as I have in my mind has been touched on by other witnesses, notably by Mr. A.T. Shakespeare earlier in the proceedings, and I have read with great interest the transcript of evidence given by Mr. Shakespeare to this committee last February. I and my colleagues find ourselves in agreement in particular with what is set out in the five numbered paragraphs on page 165 when it is said that the Advisory Council

which has been functioning for some time in Canberra and represents the government and the business community is in favour of some unified body of control placing the activities of the present Advisory Council on a more enduring and influential footing. I should like to stress our support of what is contained in those paragraphs. An elected body comprising half governmental nominees and half non-governmental members elected by popular ballot could comprise, we think, a proper body to be charged with the responsibility not only of developing Canberra but of maintaining its development, overlooking all the public services that are rendered to the community, and fostering the development of new business undertakings, and, as time proceeds, of new industries. We think that a body like that should be fortified with funds furnished, in the first instance, by land rentals obtained from the perpetual lease system operating throughout the Australian Capital Territory both inside the capital city area and also in the rural districts. Candidly, we think that the services now being given to the citizens of Canberra compare more than favourably with equivalent services received by citizens in some of our largest capitals, both in relation to water supply, sewerage, electricity and the like, disposal of garbage and all these other mundane and day to day services. We feel that such services are conducted here in a very exemplary manner with little to be complained about at present. In the general development of the Territory and its central city however there is obviously a lot more that can be done and should be done to avoid serious errors of judgment and to ensure something like a smooth working growth. From our point of view as an organisation very interested in decentralisation of industry I might perhaps contribute a few thoughts. Obviously the most desirable of all industries surrounding any community are those that grow up naturally as a result of the impact of demand. They are mostly industries whose products are heavy or difficult to transport, and therefore, from an economic point of view it is better that their products should be produced at a point fairly close to the point of consumption.

SENATE CANBERRA COMMITTEE.

For instance, you find brick yards, timber yards and factories for the production of pottery ware for drainage purposes, and such industries growing up as soon as a community reaches anything like half the size that Canberra has already reached. Going further than that you reach the point where you feel it might be desirable to stimulate and promote the interest of investors and businessmen in looking towards the Federal Capital as a proper place in which to engage in industry. When you do that you are immediately confronted with a number of consequential obstacles to inland development. In the nature of things, of course, the world's industrial plants follow the seaboard or the banks of large river systems or big inland lakes, as in the case of America. It is difficult to establish large industries away from water transport, but none the less, with the development of modern techniques and of what might be called the more aesthetic industries dealing with lighter ^{products} ~~products~~, the question of modern transport does not arise so much. It would seem therefore that Canberra could become as centres like Orange, Albury, Shepparton, Griffiths, Toowoomba, Ballarat, Bendigo, Castlemaine and, no doubt, a score of other centres with populations not very much above the present population of Canberra, ^{to which} industries have come from outside and have attached themselves to those communities.

MR. WITHALL (speaking.) Such industries include knitting mills, woollen mills, plaster mills, food packing and processing plants and footwear industries. Generally speaking, industry has made high value goods wherever the value of production is not unduly burdened by the amount of freight payable on raw materials and in delivering to market centres.

My organisation considers that it would be wise for the Government to set aside areas a few miles out of Canberra for the establishment of industry. Water and power should be made available to these industries on conditions which may be a bit better than those under which the services are available to the private individual because of the huge quantity of water and power that is used by the average secondary industry. Even the subsidisation of the supply of water and power will help to encourage investment in industry, in and around Canberra. In some states, decentralisation is assisted by allowing special freight rates on initial plant and on raw materials which have to be carried inland. As the railway services to Canberra are not in the hands of the Australian Government one assumes that not much can be expected in that form of assistance.

I have not intended to imply that the government should aim to make Canberra a vast industrial centre. However, it is known that diversity of occupation amongst social groups is a tremendous advantage. In Switzerland, there is hardly a village which does not have some engineering plant. As a result, the people do not have to leave their own town in order to get jobs. This maintains home life and a grouping of a self-reliant kind. My organisation considers that Canberra will find it highly desirable to have around it a number of useful manufacturing establishments.

THE CHAIRMAN.- Supposing that the transfer of public service head offices to Canberra, an influx of educational people, and additional building workers, increases the population of Canberra to 60,000; would that population not provide a market sufficient to attract quite a number of small scale manufacturing industries to Canberra?

MR. WITHALL.- I think so. But I think that a great deal of encouragement will have to be given to departments in order to

induce the transfers to take place. There is a natural resistance to movement from one place to another. I think that the industrial areas should be placed at considerable distance away from residential areas. The present light industry areas of Canberra are much too close to the centre of the city.

THE CHAIRMAN.- Which areas are they?

MR. WITHALL.- I think that Lonsdale Street, Braddon, is one, and there is another near the railway station. Manufacturing industries should not be located less than five miles from residential areas.

THE CHAIRMAN.- Do you think that the government needs to do much more than to move the public servants to Canberra and let the educational establishments grow up, in order to attract industry here?

MR. WITHALL.- I think that the Government should provide industrial areas, and, in due course, arrange a liberal supply of electric energy and water. Possibly, it should subsidise those supplies in order to offset, in part, the economic disadvantages of establishing plant so far away from the seaboard.

THE CHAIRMAN.- If the Government subsidised those supplies do you think that it would be reproached with acting against the interests of a state which might want an industry that was established here?

MR. WITHALL.- I have already said that the states subsidised freight rates in order to assist the establishment of manufacturing plants throughout every large inland occupied area. I consider that, in order to offset that assistance to industries outside the Australian Capital Territory, the Government would be justified in subsidising supplies of electricity and water to industry.

SENATE CANBERRA COMMITTEE

THE CHAIRMAN.- We might be attacked from the opposite angle from other States. They might say, "You are doing a positive benefit to New South Wales", which is the adjoining State. Do you think that reproach would have any substance?

MR. WITHALL.- I do not think that point would arise, unless some exceptionally favourable inducement was offered - something much more than I have ever had in mind. But of course that sort of criticism can be raised regarding everything that is done in Canberra. It could be ~~said~~ ^{said} a great deal in respect of the Snowy Mountains scheme, for example.

SENATOR HANNAFORD.- Or defence expenditure?

MR. WITHALL.- Yes. I do not know how you could avoid that.

SENATOR HANNAFORD.- The States are compensated to some degree by their grants.

MR. WITHALL.- Yes, that is the theory - that it is spread around.

THE CHAIRMAN.- Do you think that manufacturers are concerned greatly with the question of land tenure? Do you think that the absence of freehold is a deterrent?

MR. WITHALL.- There was a good deal of latent opposition to the leasing system but I think that has now completely disappeared from a fuller knowledge of the leasing arrangements which are made in Canberra. I remember when some of our own members said to me, "Fancy putting up a building like that on land which is not your own". "Well", I said, "really there is very little difference between a freehold that can be resumed anyhow and a perpetual lease. Any Government has the power to resume land. After all, what is there much different about it so far as security of tenure is concerned?"

THE CHAIRMAN.- And all that they would demand would be that leases should be renewable and that, if a lease was not renewed, there should be some compensation?

MR. WITHALL.- Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN.- The Government should not take the building?

MR. WITHALL.- That is so. Those provisions are in our leases now. That is, there is provision for compensation if a lease

is not renewed or is withdrawn for any reason at all. Compensation is payable in respect of improvements. You cannot get any more than that even with freehold.

THE CHAIRMAN.- What is the term of your lease?

MR. WITHALL.- Ninety-nine years, with the right of renewal.

SENATOR HANNAFORD.- If it is resumed, provision has been made for valuation of the improvements and compensation?

MR. WITHALL.- Yes. Even if part of it is resumed, the lease goes on to say that compensation must be given. If the Government wants your back garden, it has to compensate for the loss of that piece of land.

SENATOR HANNAFORD.- To all intents and purposes, except for the rental you pay for the land that your building occupies, it is the equivalent of freehold?

MR. WITHALL.- Yes, and in a sense better because there is no capital outlay required. The rentals are very low indeed. They are subject to revision at periods of time, but there is no reason to assume that they will ever be more than a reasonable rate of interest on the capital value of the land.

THE CHAIRMAN.- You mentioned some industries that you thought could come here and would be attracted by the market and so forth. Would you mention one or two others?

MR. WITHALL.- Yes. I would think knitted apparel, men's and women's clothing, lingerie, hosiery, light engineering industries of all kinds, gloves, biscuits, other food products.

SENATOR RYAN. Flour milling?

MR. WITHALL.- Flour milling of course, the whole range of building materials, builders hardware - relatively high-value products or alternatively goods of a kind that are already here, like bricks, because of the freight on cement and those things.

THE CHAIRMAN.- We have heard complaints about the quality of bricks made here. Do you think they are justified?

MR. WITHALL.- Well, our experience was that under test the local bricks were not good enough for facing purposes. We used local bricks, what are called "commons", for internal divisional walls.

Our outside bricks we carted from Punchbowl at very considerable expense. That is not to say that we may not have been unduly critical. We just did not want to be bothered about cracked and broken bricks in our lifetime, so we thought we would make a proper job of it. We were in for a lot of money anyhow. Why spoil the ship for a ha'porth of tar? We thought we would have a building that would look as good in fifty years as when it was first erected.

THE CHAIRMAN.- Could they not make good bricks here with the right process?

MR. WITHALL.- We think they could. I do not know what their trouble is. At the present time, I would say that, for ordinary purposes, for inside work, the Canberra bricks are admirable. For outside work there is room for difference of opinion.

THE CHAIRMAN.- You made some brief mention earlier of government for the city. Would you like to give any definite opinion as to whether there should be any change in the system of administration?

MR. WITHALL.- Well, it seems to us living here that the present position is a very confused one. There seem to be so many different authorities pursuing their own views and objectives, and it is quite evident that the Advisory Council, while doing very valuable work, has little or no executive authority. On the other hand there must be a lot of people like myself who feel that they would not like to go back to an authoritative commission, the sort of authority which is justifiable at an early stage of affairs but which could be resented as being totally undemocratic at a later stage of affairs. Therefore, it seems to me and others that it would be a good idea if you could build upon the present Advisory Council and establish a Legislative Council with executive powers - powers to make rules and regulations, and even laws for the Australian Capital Territory. We operate now under a very mixed grill. When in doubt you look up the New South Wales law. When there is a local statute, you use the local statute. Nobody quite knows which would stand up best if attacked in the courts. My organization is registered as a limited company under the statutes of the A.C.T. That is all leading up to the point that I think the time has come when thought might be

given to the establishment of a body such as I have suggested. The growing pains should be pretty well finished now in Canberra. It has been quite a long time in growing and the time has come when it has made good. It is here forever, and we all wish to see a national capital worthy of Australia in every sense of the term with a Legislative Council or some other suitably described authority. We know that its membership would have to include nominated Government representation. Unlike other centres where property is mostly owned by private individuals, the whole of this property is, in its freshhold sense, owned by the Government, and the Government therefore rightly should exercise a very pronounced influence on the legislation and the policies which determine the way in which its property is to be dealt with. That is why it would seem that any tribunal or body such as I have in mind would necessarily be half composed by Government nominees. Possibly, for a start, the Chairman could be nominated by the Government from the body of nominees and representatives elected by popular ballot. I think such a scheme as that would be very well received in Australia generally, as well as in Canberra itself by the people of Canberra. Such a body as that, too, would have to bring about development. It could move here and there so as to encourage development of all kinds - aesthetic, industrial, social, and all those other activities that go to make up community life.

SENATOR WOOD.- I take it, Mr. Withall, that you have in mind that industry, as required by the growing community, should be allowed to filter in in order to supply the needs of the people and that, if necessary, the Government should go out of its way to encourage industry?

MR. WITHALL.- That is a summary of my views.

THE CHAIRMAN.- You have enumerated means of encouragement that you recommend.

MR. WITHALL. Yes. I know that basically you must have a lot of water and a lot of electrical energy to produce goods.

SENATOR WOOD.- Do you think that the building up of the city in that way would give the people of Canberra a wider outlook

with more varied interests?

MR. WITHALL.- Yes. I feel that between here and Tharwa, over the rises towards the plains, there are several areas that would make most admirable industrial areas.

SENATOR WOOD.- You have suggested putting industry out a few miles from the residential areas. Have you thought of the problem of staff getting to and from work?

MR. WITHALL.- Well, with motor transportation I do not think that matters much. You would have road transportation. The railway line runs along there. I have in mind that you would have some employees coming out from Queanbeyan. You could perhaps have a branch line running off for a mile or so to the north of the present line as it goes close to the Tharwa road. You would have goods from Sydney, Melbourne, Albury and Goulburn transported close to that industrial area on the present railway system.

(Continued on page 1070)

SENATOR WOOD. - We talk about light and heavy industry. Do you not think it would be better to talk about noxious and non-noxious industry?

MR. WITHALL. - You do not get many noxious industries nowadays, thank goodness. The disposal of waste and so on has become so scientific that you are hardly conscious of a noxious industry.

THE CHAIRMAN. - You are conscious of them in Sydney going from the airport to the city.

MR. WITHALL. - That is where the tanneries are. It is the drying of the skins. In a few years the modern chemist will eliminate all that. You know the Great Western road from London. The factories have moved along the Western Road from London, and it has become one of the most picturesque and attractive drives out of London. The factories have gardens and modern architecture, and there is no question of anything noisome or noxious about them.

SENATOR WOOD. - You are probably very interested in the question of a shopping centre in Canberra. Do you not think there is a lack of any central shopping place here?

MR. WITHALL. - The place was designed to provide that lack. By fragmenting it into this design for a capital city, it precluded all possibility of a main street, which was such a stand-by in all country towns in the past. As there is no main street, if you want to serve the community here and over there, you have to build three or four shops, not one. Therefore you do not get the emporium class of shop. That was done deliberately in the design with a good deal of forethought. Presumably they thought that other things would more than compensate for that disability.

SENATOR HANNAFORD. - Do you think that they do?

MR. WITHALL. - I do not think that they do. I am old-fashioned, and I like the old-fashioned main street where you can get a ticket to travel around the world, or go to the bank or to the grocer. Apparently those who designed the city and those who approved the design had other ideas and were willing to sacrifice a lot of that in the objective of developing a garden city. In spite of that,

we see that evolution is taking a hand and the force of circumstances is coming into operation. Two main shopping centres, one on the north and one on the south, are growing up. This problem will partly solve itself. If you have a community of 50,000 or 60,000 people, half to the north of the river and half to the south of the river, you will have two fine shopping centres.

SENATOR HANNAFORD. - We have had certain evidence given to us in connection with the food supplies of Canberra. I do not know whether your knowledge takes you far afield of manufacturing industry, but do you agree that in some respects Canberra is not well placed in respect of the supply of vegetables, fruit and other necessary items of diet that a city requires?

MR. WITHALL. - Yes.

SENATOR HANNAFORD. - Do you suggest that the land resources of the Australian Capital Territory could be developed much more effectively to provide those requirements?

MR. WITHALL. - Yes. There must be some fine valleys and river flats close to Canberra where a great deal of market gardening could be undertaken. I do not know whether you have the type of people about now that are keen on market gardening. It appears that about Sydney a great number of New Australians have gone in for that work, and also about Goulburn and other centres. We have seen little or no evidence of them at work here, although there are quite a few at Narrabundah and about Queanbeyan. Some encouragement might be given.

SENATOR HANNAFORD. - I was coming to that point.

MR. WITHALL. - There are some wonderful flats along the Murrumbidgee River between the Cotter Dam and, say, Tharwa - some remarkably fine areas of meadow land that would make ideal sites for market gardens. On the manufacturing side, we are intensely interested. A lot of our members prepare and produce canned and dried foodstuffs. Our membership comprises practically everything in which factory operations are involved. Those who produce dried fruits and wine are members, as are flour-millers and manufacturers of butter and cheese. A big proportion are engaged in the manufacture, preparation and

processing of raw materials and food products of all kinds. Of course, in the irrigation areas you get quantities of vegetable and fruit products large enough to justify a cannery. I do not think that that is what you have in mind.

SENATOR HANNAFORD. - No. I am thinking mainly of the local consumption of fresh foods, such as milk, butter and the like. Do you think that prices for those commodities in Canberra are unduly high?

MR. WITHALL. - I would not like to comment upon that. I do not buy fruit and vegetables. That is a responsibility that is shared with another member of my family. I do not know. All I know is that they are very difficult to grow oneself.

THE CHAIRMAN. - I met one gentleman who said that he would always grow his own vegetables because he could grow much better vegetables than he could buy.

SENATOR HANNAFORD. - There is no reason why it should not be done.

MR. WITHALL. - Some parts of Canberra have very good soil. Under Red Hill where I live there is little top soil and the ground is very stony. It is difficult to grow anything except roses and the like.

SENATOR RYAN. - The very fact that you have established the headquarters of the Associated Chambers of Manufactures in Canberra indicates that you have faith in the future development of Canberra. You told the Committee about the lighter types of industry that you propose to establish in Canberra. Has the Chamber any definite idea regarding the establishment of heavier industries?

MR. WITHALL. - Our organisation does not try to influence its members in that matter. We are there to give service, opinion, advice and ideas. We collaborate with governments. We direct attention to the facilities and forms of encouragement that governments, State and municipal, offer, with the idea of attracting investments and establishing manufacturing branch factories or new factories in inland areas. But we cannot draw up a list. We cannot

SENATE CANBERRA COMMITTEE.

nominate any commodity. We can only say that, in the nature of things, this or that sort of commodity might be economically produced and have a fair local demand, and that the burden of freight should not make it an uncommercial product so far as we can see at the moment. That is all we can do. A manufacturer of electro-plated ware might want to come here, and we would give him every possible facility and advice, But we would not say, "We want you to come here." We would not presume to do that. It would not be our province as a service organisation to do that.

SENATOR RYAN. - If some business interest proposed to establish a motor-body building industry in Canberra your Chamber would give all possible assistance?

MR. WITHALL. - We would give it all possible advice and help. We are busy all the year round in servicing our members' requirements under that heading as well as all other headings, and that would be our policy here. My office is wholly an Australian office, as you understand. It comprises as its membership all the State Chambers of Manufactures. Ours is the Federal body, and we have had transferred to us certain functions of a national character in the same manner as State governments transfer^{red} to the Federal Government questions and policies of a national type.

SENATOR RYAN. - Are the present rail communications satisfactory for the freighting of goods to and from Canberra in the opinion of your Chamber?

MR. WITHALL. - They are not, but I think you would find that if the traffic were there the New South Wales Commissioner for Railways would improve facilities. You cannot run a train half empty, any more than you can operate a ship half empty. You have to make it a business-like proposition and I think the New South Wales Commissioner for Railways would approach it most sympathetically when the time arises. To show that apparently there was no hostility from the New South Wales administration in connection with the development of Canberra, when we had to cart bricks from Sydney they exempted us completely from the payment of road transport tax. That indicates that they were definitely co-operative and not restrictive, even to the point of making

SENATE CANBERRA. COMMITTEE.

concessions in response to our request that they consider lifting the road transport tax in connection with the transportation of bricks for building at Canberra. I mention that in passing to show that there is reasonable ground to expect co-operation from the authorities in respect of the commercial side of Canberra.

SENATOR RYAN. - You expect that rail communications would improve?

MR. WITHALL. - I think that they would.

SENATOR RYAN. - That would depend upon the business offering?

MR. WITHALL. - They want business, and like everyone else, they want to make their enterprise pay. I feel sure that if freight traffic for the transport of goods and raw materials to and from industries at Canberra were offering, the trucks and the engines would be provided.

SENATOR BENN. - I suppose that it is some advantage to your organisation to establish your head office in Canberra?

MR. WITHALL. - We felt an inescapable obligation to do so. More and more as the years go by legislation affects industry. I do not mean necessarily more direct legislation such as taxation or tariffs, but the administration particularly of wartime or postwar controls, in respect of which the departments are continually involved in negotiations with industry. We found that the time had arrived when we should have our own centre here instead of sending representatives to Canberra continually. That being so, we had to consider whether it should be a branch centre or a headquarters. It was decided that we should make it our headquarters. As in political life Canberra has become a political headquarters so, in industrial life, Canberra has become our industrial headquarters - our organisational headquarters - and we have never regretted taking that step.

SENATE CANBERRA COMMITTEE.

SENATOR BENN.- Have you any views with regard to the establishment of the head offices of all government departments in Canberra?

MR. WITHALL.- Naturally, having made that step ourselves, we have been disappointed at the reluctance of some of the government departments to act similarly. We know that it is the old question of vested interests - people's roots being in the city and State they were brought up in, and there is a tacit, but definite, opposition to coming to Canberra. It is a big change in many people's lives. We feel that the government should encourage and assist them to make that change. If the government does not do that, Canberra will never become fully a capital city and gain that respect which is due to it. It will not do that until it becomes 100 per cent the seat of government and national administration.

SENATOR BENN.- Would you say that the High Court of Australia should be here?

MR. WITHALL.- We think the High Court of Australia, the Commonwealth Arbitration Court, the Tariff Board and the government departments should be here.

SENATOR BENN.- Including the Commonwealth Bank?

MR. WITHALL.- And the division of National Development of the Commonwealth Bank. We believe that all those bodies and authorities should be based on Canberra. Canberra should be their headquarters, even if they have branch offices elsewhere. The administrative and executive heads should be residents of Canberra.

SENATOR BENN.- Have you heard that it is proposed by the Commonwealth government to build a Commonwealth Arbitration Court in Melbourne?

MR. WITHALL.- I had not heard that.

SENATOR BENN.- You did not hear that the plans are being prepared for a Commonwealth Arbitration Court in Melbourne?

MR. WITHALL.- No, I had not heard that. Has that been published?

SENATOR BENN.- Would you like to have direct evidence on

it?

MR. WITHALL.- I would, because I drew the conclusion from the Minister's statement headed "Operation Administration" that that involved the transfer to Canberra of the Arbitration Court. Possibly I read too much into it.

SENATOR BENN.- Later this week we will call evidence on that point, and the evidence will be submitted to you.

MR. WITHALL.- Thank you very much. We feel that the Commonwealth Arbitration Court, dealing as it does with the wages and conditions for workers in industry throughout Australia should only be in one place, and that is at the central and administrative headquarters.

SENATOR BENN.- It should function in the National Capital?

MR. WITHALL.- Definitely.

(The witness withdraw)

SHIRLEY ENID WARDE,

Sworn and Examined.

THE CHAIRMAN.- What is your occupation?

MRS. WARDE.- I am a public servant. I work in the Commonwealth National Library. I table a statement which is in the following terms :-

We, the undersigned, have been asked by our fellow riders to place before yourself and the Members of the Senate Committee on the Development of Canberra the question of the provision within the plan for the City's development of adequate facilities for the various branches of equestration. This submission arises from a meeting of the most regular and serious riders specially convened for its preparation and may be regarded as representing the views of the majority of such riders who have discussed this question informally over a long period.

We feel that we should make it quite clear that no official request for consideration of our views and needs has yet been made by us to the Department of the Interior, although we

understand that several such approaches have been made in the past, with indifferent or negative results. Several of us, however, have had informal discussions with Departmental officers in recent months. Nothing in what follows, therefore, should be construed as a reflection on the Department in any way. We hope to approach it soon officially and feel certain of a sympathetic hearing and of its co-operation in such of the matters raised as are practicable. We appreciate your Committee's invitation to persons interested in the development of our City to forward their ideas, and submit ours in the spirit which prompted the setting up of the Committee and has guided its deliberations.

We are aware that the number of persons pursuing this form of recreation is, and will remain small in proportion to the numbers engaging in other forms of recreation, and that this is doubtless one reason why no positive plans exist, so far as we know, for facilities for its development. We feel that our numerical smallness should not of itself preclude our needs from development planning and that the very moderateness of our immediate needs could well be expected to encourage consideration.

Because a horse's pace is limited and because the time available to most of us is limited to weekends, we do not manage to get very far afield, with the result that we can claim a very detailed knowledge of Canberra and its environs. We know where all macadam roads end, where the storm-water channels are, where new suburbs extend from one week to another, and where and when rubbish is dumped (in alarming and disgusting array) on roads and stockroutes. The relatively slow pace at which we perform travel and the beauty of our City and surroundings encourage us to observe carefully and think (and sometimes criticise) a great deal. Unconsciously we have become lay town planners. We wish to place before you the question of facilities for equitation in relation to the planning of the City, and our views on the small but very pleasing way in which such facilities could add to the beauty, attractiveness and importance in the minds of Australians of the National Capital.

Aims and means of achieving them, for practical purposes, should be divided into immediate and ultimate, the former leading to the latter by the best possible method. For your consideration we would divide ours accordingly and, by way of background, provide a picture of the equitation situation as it exists at present.

Present Equitation Situation.

Riding activity in Canberra is at present centred around the Llewellyn Riding School at Acton. It is the focal point both for persons using horses from the School and those owning their own. The interest of the group centred there is serious and regular. Weekly lessons in dressage and jumping are conducted for a growing group of young riders, using both hired and privately owned horses, and regular hacking and other excursions are arranged on weekends and during school holidays. Adults and children compete annually, and with success, in equitation events of all kinds in the A.C.T. and district shows. Unfortunately, Canberra riders still have to go as visitors to Hall and Queanbeyan and further afield for competition, but look forward to the day, eventually, when the National Capital can attract such competitors in return to its own equitation centre. The entry for the first time of an Australian team in the Olympic Equestrian events to be conducted in Stockholm, and the arrival in our midst of a man who has trained horses to the extremely rigorous standards demanded overseas in International contests of this kind, has given a tremendous fillip to local equestrians. Olympic and other jumping is practised regularly every weekend in the very cramped enclosure between the Stables and the Golf Links, and the first Canberra Olympic Jumps entry competed in the Queanbeyan Show which has just concluded.

IMMEDIATE NEEDS AND ULTIMATE AIMS AND VIEWS.

Immediate needs may be reduced to two:

- (1) The definition of a riding network within the City proper and leading to suitable exists from the City, and
- (2) The allocation (temporarily, if need be) of a small area of land where dressage can be practised, and regulation jumps erected at internationally approved distances.

SENATE CANBERRA COMMITTEE.

Re (1): With the rapid post-war expansion of the built-up area and the accompanying extension of roads, hacking parties find it increasingly difficult to get out of the City without half to three-quarters of an hour's roadwork (and in some directions longer) during which we are a hazard to motorists and they to us. In this respect it should be remembered that a large proportion of the riders are children and young people who, through excitement or thoughtlessness, are likely to cause road accidents. Also, horses are not machines, but highly strung animals prone to take fright easily. The provision of bridle tracks, adequately labelled, would provide safe and well defined routes for "afternoon" riders desiring short and easy rides, exits for hacking parties going further afield and exercise tracks for persons getting horses into condition for district equestrian events. (Other aspects are covered in the section which follows, on "Equitation facilities and the future development of Canberra".)

The Hon. P. Hasluck, M.P., who is a regular rider and with whom we have frequently discussed our ideas, has already submitted to the Department maps on which he has marked routes which we frequent and the "hazards" encountered. We feel we should not burden your Committee with detail which can well be worked out with Departmental officers when the time arrives. We are, however, working on concrete proposals for the definition of the rough tracks which already exist and which could, in our opinion, be maintained to temporary standards with little expense, and developed properly in the future.

Re (2): We badly need the use of a small piece of land near to the School and to transport, and expect to take up this matter with the Department of the Interior shortly. To improve on the competitive dressage and jumping standard already attained, we need at least 10 to 20 acres, (apart from the need for agistment paddocks). The area in use for this purpose at the moment is not only inadequate but dangerous, owing to the large number of trees.

EQUITATION FACILITIES AND THE FUTURE DEVELOPMENT OF CANBERRA.

(1) Bridle Tracks and a Future Riding Network.

Bridle-tracks well defined, labelled and maintained could be a

SENATE CULTURE COMMITTEE.

means of beautifying the City area, Circuits could take in Parliament House, Capitol Hill, St. John's Church, the Australian and American War Memorials and would provide an unrivalled way of seeing the main buildings and places of interest. When the ribbon of water and basin systems are begun, tracks could be extended either through or along the fringe of the projected passive recreation areas. Riding parties unobtrusively enliven the scene. Such famous city rides as Rotten Row in London and the Prater Ride in Vienna are definite civic attractions, and the Canberra of the future could well develop an Australian version of these. It would be one way of helping to preserve the pastoral atmosphere of the City, which many people are convinced is worth preserving. Washington also has a riding circuit, and Australian examples are the tan tracks around the Botanical Gardens and Government House in Melbourne, also the track through the Green Belt in Adelaide.

(2) Equitation Centre.

Provision should be made for a permanent, centrally situated Riding School and Livery Stables, and ultimately for two or three other Schools and stables or Clubs on the outskirts of the City. The question of agistment is important in connection with the cost of hiring or maintaining a horse and would, of course, need to be considered. Canberra already needs an area of ten or twenty acres for training horses and riders, and where informal gymkhanas can be held. It is hoped, with the anticipated formation of an Equitation Club in the near future, to encourage the Department to adopt a more positive policy of development as regards the provision of such a centre.

The Molonglo Polocrosse Club has been in existence for some years, using land near Duntroon, and the Canberra of the future may well be expected to need a permanent ground and facilities for both Polo and Polocrosse.

Conclusion. Canberra riders, Sir, represented for immediate purposes by the undersigned, are of the opinion that temporary facilities are not only inadequate but threatened by the immediate

SENATE CANBERRA COMMITTEE.

expansion of the City area. To the best of our knowledge, no permanent facilities have been planned. We feel that a more positive policy of development of equitation facilities should begin now while it is still possible to make provision for them without undue disruption of plans already in hand. We feel that positive planning now would ensure the ultimate provision of a suitably located centre and of facilities of a standard fitting to the National Capital. We should be happy to offer any assistance we may be able to give to the Department in the definition of tracks and exists, and in any matters relating to equitation development.

We feel, Sir, that riding is an activity in which Australians naturally excel, that it is one of the more graceful forms of recreation, that Canberra, with its nationally important buildings in beautiful surroundings, offers great scope for the development of an Australian type of Rotten Row, which would greatly enhance the beauty and ultimate "spirit" of the City. Attractive equitation facilities could be a source of civic pride and a valuable tourist attraction, and could play a small but worthy part in the development of the most beautiful possible National Capital for which we all hope.

We appreciate your invitation to groups such as ours to bring forward our ideas and hope they commend themselves.

The statement is signed by A. Morland, B.K. Emmerly, B.J. Crease, S.F. Grzybowski, S.E. Warde, and M. McPake.

(Continued on page 1083)

SENATOR BENN.- We have been told that there is almost no statuary in Canberra, no monuments worth talking about. Have you observed that?

MRS. WARDE- Yes, I have.

SENATOR BENN.- Your club is solely interested in horse riding?

MRS. WARDE- Yes.

SENATOR BENN.- It wants bridle tracks and so on?

MRS. WARDE- Yes.

SENATOR BENN.- Would you approve of some statuary or monuments, about stirrup height, of Corrigan, Lewis, Sir Gordon Richards and Darby Munro, to inspire the members of your club?

MRS. WARDE- I do not know that we would be particularly interested in that sort of statuary, but we are interested in this question of the provision of tracks, either within the city area or, better still, tracks leading off a main circuit which would take in the main places of interest, to areas further out. At the moment, so far as we know and so far as we have been able to find out from a department elsewhere, there are actually no plans made for equitation development here.

SENATOR HANNAFORD.- I understand there is a track going out to the west of Canberra, circling Black Mountain, which is a picturesque ride. Is that the type of thing you have in mind when you suggest that tracks should be provided?

MRS. WARDE- No. As you say, there are some tracks already in existence. For instance, there is a rough track across the front part of Parliament House, which is a valuable way of getting across town.

SENATOR HANNAFORD.- There are no obstructions in and around the city that prevent that sort of thing, even now?

MRS. WARDE- No, but we think some development should be made of those later on into proper tracks.

SENATOR HANNAFORD.- Tan tracks?

MRS. WARDE- They could be, yes. That would be a very good

SENATE CANBERRA COMMITTEE.

thing, I think. Then, of course, there is the other question of a permanent centre somewhere within the inner part of Canberra, not too far from transport and so forth.

SENATOR HANNAFORD.- At the present time, the riding school is at Acton?

MRS. WARDE- Yes.

SENATOR HANNAFORD.- Would that be a suitable locality?

MRS. WARDE- I think it would be very suitable.

SENATOR RYAN.- Is riding a popular sport in Canberra?

MRS. WARDE- Its popularity is growing rapidly. I have been here since about 1945, and it has grown tremendously since then.

(The witness withdrew)

(At 4.40 p.m. the Committee adjourned until 10 a.m. on Tuesday, the 15th March, 1955).

Pl. 7

Minutes

A

Senate Select Committee on
the Development of Canberra

Pages 1085-1320

<u>Page.</u>	<u>Name</u>
1085-1134	Dr. K. Langer
1135-1143	L. F. Fitzhardinge
1144-1170	Mrs J. Horgan, Mrs L. Fignore
1170-1173	R. Robson
1174-1192	H. J. Meyer
1193-1230	M. Fitzell
1231-1254	F. J. Skewright, A. J. Macdonald
1255-1278	F. J. Watters, D. C. Smith, J. B. Kennedy
1279-1295	Dr. W. E. H. Stanner
1296-1320	F. J. Skewright, A. J. Macdonald (recalled)

SUPPLEMENTARY SUBMISSION ON THE PLACING OF THE
PROPOSED PARLIAMENT HOUSE

After having given my evidence in respect to the placing of Parliament House, I took the opportunity on the morning of my departure from Canberra, to walk up Capitol Hill. I measured the in grades the appearance of the Australian and American War Memorials in order to get the reciprocal height and bulk of the proposed Parliament House which would be required at the end of the axis.

I come to the conclusion that a tall, wide and impressive building is needed to fulfill the function of a focal point at the end of the long vista. The idea to have Parliament House include a complete self-contained hotel for the Members, with recreation facilities and necessary shops, would easily fit into such a scheme.

(Sgd) Karl Langer,

(K. Langer F.R.A.I.A., F.A.P.I.)

KARL LANGER, F.R.A.I.A., F.A.P.I., ARCHITECT & TOWN PLANNER.

231 Adelaide St., Brisbane.

21st March, 1955.

R. Bullock, Esq.,
Secretary,
Senate Select Committee for the
Development of Canberra,
Senate Department,
CANBERRA, A.C.T.

Dear Sir,

I wonder whether it will be possible to include into the evidence these two items which I talked about on the occasion of our going round with the Committee.

1. When I said that the industry should not be increased beyond its natural growth, I meant that if industry starts properly, it has a snowballing effect, and the size of a city increases irrespective of the hinterland or the capacity of the region; and if this capacity is not very strong this accumulative growth can have ill effects.

2. Parliament House, apart from the sections serving the parliamentary procedure etc., should have a fully equipped first class hotel for the members as part of the building. There should also be recreation facilities, restaurant etc. included. This would meet the unique conditions of our Parliament and eliminate the walking from the hotels to Parliament.

Such a ten or twelve story structure would also have the necessary height and bulk to form an effective focal point at the end of the 2-3/8 mile axis.

Note: I have redrawn and prepared the plans for the different comparative layouts ready to be attached to the map of Canberra. However, I haven't received the plans yet. Whenever I receive them I will attach these comparative layouts and send one copy to you.

I would like to use the occasion of this letter to thank you for the hospitality and kindness extended to me during my enjoyable stay in Canberra.

I am,

Yours sincerely,

Karl Langer.

Committee Members

For your information.

(R. E. Bullock)
28/3/55.

SENATE SELECT COMMITTEE ON THE PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT.
OF CANBERRA.

MINUTES OF EVIDENCE.

(Taken at Canberra)

TUESDAY, 15th March, 1955.

PRESENT:

The Chairman	(Senator McCallum)
Senator Benn	Senator Ryan
Senator Hannaford	Senator Wood

DOCTOR KARL LANGER, Consultant Town Planner and Architect, Brisbane, sworn and examined:-

THE CHAIRMAN.- Would you care to make a statement on Canberra generally?

DR. LANGER.- Yes. I have seen Canberra before. I have attended a conference here, and have had the opportunity to walk round Canberra and to talk to people. I have had some interesting discussions with them. When I was here, officials were giving evidence about Canberra at the Town Planning Conference, and I was fortunate to hear accounts of the history, and so on, of the place.

At that time, I discovered that there are certain problems associated with Canberra. They ^{were} quite obvious to me. I refer to the zoning problem, the housing problem, which is important, the regional problem, ^a the traffic problem in the making, the aesthetic problem and a problem of symbols. ^{the two last ones are} That is the most important problem of the lot. Canberra is the symbol for the whole nation, and as such, has to live up to it.

It would help to make the point if I am permitted to give a short history of the background of the plan of Canberra. Briefly, there are two different types of plan. One is the geometrical type, and the other is the type in which the planner takes his lead from Nature.

SENATE CANBERRA COMMITTEE

Those two types of planning are fundamental types.

In the first, the planning is to put the geometrical plan in the form of a gridiron, or star system, as has been done here, on to the land; and in the second form, the planner looks round, and takes his lead from Nature. If there is a hill, the planner makes use of it. For example, in Athens, they use the hill, and put the whole civic centre on top of it. A similar plan has been adopted for Prague, and so on. Those cities have a definite advantage, and are called ~~"Cities Beautiful"~~ because the lead has been taken from Nature. Burley Griffin did not take his lead from Nature. He rather superimposed the geometrical plan onto an undulating landscape, unique in the history of planning.

~~There are a number of plans developed.~~ The Greeks, when they built cities for themselves, built them to an irregular plan, but when they built cities for other conquered nations, they used the geometric pattern - the gridiron pattern. The Romans did the same thing. When they built for themselves, they built irregularly; when they built for the conquered nations they used the gridiron.

Later, the Germans, when they were fortifying their eastern borders against invading tribes, such as Mongolians, fortified them with gridiron plans and ~~star~~ ^{circular} plans, but never used that system in their own cities. Later again, in the time of the Renaissance, Science was developing, and people believed in science. We still do. If somebody claims that something is scientific, people think that it must be good. At the time of which I am speaking, Science was ~~only~~ ^{mainly} geometry and people in those days thought that if a plan looked like a geometrical pattern, it must be good. At that time, the star system developed. There are ~~three plans~~ ^{reasons for the} ~~plans~~ ^{most} developed of the star system. First, the geometrical pattern, because it is scientific, secondly, it suited the Absolute Monarch at the time to have a symbol of his power in this form. His castle was in the centre, and streets radiated from the castle. Thirdly, at this time, people got socially minded, and the cannon had to be introduced to keep them down, to put it bluntly. Those three elements formed the foundation for the

SENATE CANBERRA COMMITTEE

star system.

From the time of the Renaissance, we have had cities in the form of a star system; but today, comparatively few have been built. I start with the first of them, which is Paris. I have plans here for you to see. There is the Arc De Triomphe, which is built in the centre of a star system, with a radiation of ~~elder streets~~ ^{travelling avenues}. It is a magnificent layout. Further down is the Trocadero, and there is a huge axis where there is the Eiffel Tower, and from there is ~~a huge field~~ ^{the chess field}, and ~~the academy for war~~ ^{the Academy at the end of the axis}. All that is in Paris. On the plan which I have here, there is the famous Boulevard ~~the~~ ^{square} Champs Elysees. From there, you go to the centre, ~~which is the~~ ^{following on to} Place De La Concorde, and, ~~into~~ ^{the} Louvre, an enormous ~~construction~~ ^{complex of buildings}. I mention this on purpose because of its relation to the plan for Canberra.

The next map is the plan for Versailles. The King did not feel safe any more in Paris, so he moved out of the city, and created his own city. Versailles consists of a centre with a castle, streets radiating from this, and a huge axis in the middle - one of the biggest structures in this Grand Manner. Canberra ^{too} is a city built in the Grand Manner. The third example is Washington. Let me say at the outset that Washington was so placed by a fluke or a coincidence. When the first meeting was held at Philadelphia, the city was surrounded by a regiment which had not been paid and they did not safeguard it. That was a slur on Philadelphia, and it was not chosen to be the capital. The Frenchman Lefont surveyed Washington and did the plan in half a year. It consists of an enormous structure, the capitol, which is ~~some~~ ²⁷⁵ 500 feet high, and there is also the famous Washington monument which is about 550 feet high.

New Delhi is the next one built in the Grand Manner. The capital city consists of a backbone - the Governor's house, the Parliament, and two houses for honorary members. This is considered to be one of the very biggest schemes ever devised on a similar line to Canberra. Moscow ^{too has} ~~by~~ a similar plan, ^{has been} ~~it~~ transformed

SENATE CANBERRA COMMITTEE

into the star system, ^{city} Hitler intended to change it. ^{plan into an axial city with} ~~Hessew was~~
 a huge dome in the centre. This is approximately the history of the
 Canberra. "great manner" plan, of which Canberra is an example.

I should like to mention that the geometrical art ^{city} of planning
 and the like are typical of constructions in Latin countries like France.
 It is no coincidence that a French General was called in to plan
 Washington. He planned it on the straight line. Typical
 for English and other Nordic countries is the irregular plan.

SENATE CANBERRA COMMITTEE

DR. LANGER (Continuing) You have university cities such as Oxford and Cambridge and the lawyers' quarters in Lincoln's Inn and such places where you have an irregular layout. That is typical for the English. It is significant ^{that} that when the English architect Wren tried, after the Fire of London, to make a plan for London and ~~laid it out~~ on the lines of boulevards in a star system like Paris the English would have nothing to do with it. So much for national characteristics.

It has been suggested that Delhi is very much like Canberra except that it is incredibly bigger. I dare say it is not quite so. I have drawn up a plan of New Delhi on the same scale as this map on the wall and when I superimpose the plan of New Delhi on this map of Canberra you can see their relative sizes. The distance from City Hill to Capitol Hill in Canberra is exactly the length of New Delhi which is considered the vastest layout ever designed anywhere.

THE CHAIRMAN.- And Canberra is the same size?

DR. LANGER.- Exactly, from Capitol Hill to City Hill. I shall go further. If you go to Paris as a tourist you see the Arc de Triomphe, the Eiffel Tower, the Trocadero, ~~the~~ Champs Elysees on one side and then you can go down the other side and you have the ^{and the} Louvre. The whole lot, drawn on the same scale as this map of Canberra on the wall, fits easily in the space between City Hill and Capitol Hill. That is everything that matters in Paris. When this transparent map of Paris is superimposed on the map of Canberra the first court of the Louvre lies on top of City Hill, Canberra, and the Trocadero lies over Queens-Square on the Canberra map. On top of that, the distance between those star systems in Paris is less than half the distance in Canberra. Yet everybody talks of the vastness and grandeur of Paris, its huge avenues and enormous vistas. Canberra's layout is bigger than that of Paris.

I have drawn a scale map of Versailles which shows that it covers only the distance from the War Memorial in Canberra to the beginning of the lake on the other side. That area is the same as the area in Versailles which contains all that matters of that city, such

SENATE CANBERRA COMMITTEE

as the Trianon Palace which was built for Marie Antoinette. All that matters in Versailles covers only half the distance between Capitol Hill and the Australian War Memorial.

The Capitol Building in Washington is approximately ~~300~~ ⁵⁵⁰ ~~275~~ feet high, and the Washington Memorial is ~~500~~ feet high standing at either end of Pennsylvania Avenue in Washington but the distance between them is ^{over} just half the distance from the existing Parliament House in Canberra to the border of the proposed lake. In fact it is ~~about~~ two-thirds of the distance. Yet that is known as the "enormous mile" in Washington and is considered one of the biggest and finest developments anywhere.

SENATOR HANNAFORD.- In other words, it is only two-thirds of the length that the Canberra Mall will be?

DR. LANGER.- Yes. The point is, are we now going to furnish this huge vista and axis with appropriate furniture? You can compare it with a huge mansion in which, everybody would agree, it would be ^{radical} necessary to put kitchen furniture, ~~but only in the proper place.~~ Certainly if we have in Canberra such a huge system with enormous vistas we must put something there worthy of it. If you have an axis you are compelled to put something at the beginning and end of it, otherwise it will be like a long story with no point.

SENATOR WOOD.- You mean that at both ends of the central avenue we should have big features?

DR. LANGER.- Yes. This Canberra ^{plan} ~~is~~ ^{designed} in what would be called the grand manner. We have the layout of Canberra and we have to use it and furnish it appropriately. If we have single residences on either side of the central avenue, and domestic gardens, and at the end of it a two-storey building, or no building at all, the layout will be defeated. You have to put something there to carry it. It is easy to tear such a thing to pieces, and I should like humbly to suggest a solution. I want to suggest one or two star systems and one vista only, or a maximum of two, should be selected and properly designed, furnished and developed. That has to be done in the form of a carefully designed plan in which height is carefully considered. The longer the development is the higher must be the buildings overall.

SENATE CANBERRA COMMITTEE

As the length of ~~Pennsylvania Avenue~~ ^{the Mall} in Washington is only two-thirds of the ~~distance~~ from this existing Parliament House to the Australian War Memorial, and yet is one of the biggest axes known, you can imagine how big our features will have to be in Canberra. At one end of that enormous mile in Washington you have the vast dome of the Capitol and at the other you have the Washington Memorial 550 feet high. The American War Memorial in Canberra is only 250 feet high, so that will give you an idea of the dimensions of the Washington Memorial.

THE CHAIRMAN.- What is the height of the Capitol?

DR. LANGER.- ~~I think it is 100~~ ²⁷⁵ feet. It is an enormous mass of building. All the other schemes I have mentioned are built on flat ground, but in Canberra Griffin has superimposed a geometrical pattern on undulating land which makes it very hard to see the circumferential features. However it is impossible not to realize the axis feature of the plan.

I believe that it is not much good to talk about things only. An actual scheme should be devised ~~somehow~~ and shown to the people and if that scheme shows vision and is artistic I am convinced the people will adopt a different attitude towards Canberra. They will not despise it or be negative towards it, but will support it and be proud of it and without such a scheme I do not see how that result can be achieved. First, there must be a scheme. Second, it must be brought to the public and their support for it must be won. I have had many experiences with colleges for the development of which there is usually a lack of money. I was always meeting the complaint of lack of money until I got a hint from somebody and drew up a whole scheme. Then the money began to roll in. People were willing to subscribe because they could see something on which they could hang their ideas. It is of no use to talk about things without showing what can be done. ^{Similarly} I suggest therefore ~~a~~ ~~similar~~ drawing up of a definite scheme.

SENATE CANBERRA COMMITTEE.

DR. LANGER. - May I refer now to the green areas. It is the trend nowadays amongst town planners to have what is called "organic" planning, which means bringing nature into the city in the form of strips from outside and having not single parks, so called, as show pieces where a few or a great many rare specimens of trees and flowers are displayed, but a whole system of green areas in the form of wedges. In former times people talked about green belts and city parks, but that has been given up entirely. Here in Canberra, there is a golden opportunity for organic planning. I would suggest that you select one area which will be developed as a governmental area on a grand scale. In this area the green area would be developed together with the buildings on a certain scale. It must be a ^{work} piece of art which may be formal or otherwise. For the rest, planned nature should be brought in, and nature should be intensified and humanised; but it should be nature as such and not some rare specimens of trees and flowers brought in just for people to look at, like places in England where people go during the hot summer months and spend a few weeks parading up and down among the flower beds. That is not the idea any more of landscaping. Sweden, Switzerland and South America have gone in for the new type of landscaping and gardening.

I should not like to comment on the number of houses that are needed here, but I would like to mention, in general, that a garden city can be afforded by only a few nations. That is a matter of living standards. There are two trends at present which would affect the layout of Canberra as a garden city. One is that the cost of building is going up constantly. The second is that the type of building changes. In former times, the shell of the house was approximately 70 percent of the value, and the fittings - electric light, windows, doors, cupboards - accounted for 30 percent. That has changed to approximately 50-50, and in better class homes the carcass or shell costs only 40 percent and the fittings cost 60 percent. That means that it is harder and harder to get a house.

SENATOR WOOD. - Harder to afford a house?

SENATE CANBERRA COMMITTEE.

DR. LANGER. - Yes. On the other hand, you have a tendency to spend from your total income less and less for a home. As people spend more on leisure, entertainment, cars, wirelasses, gadgets and so on, ^{they} spend less and less on houses. These two curves, in many cases, have met, and people cannot afford a home any more. That is a very regrettable thing. There will be a number of people - and this number will grow - who will ^{have to} live in flats. We see this ~~very~~ highly intensified in Sweden and the United States, where more and more people are living in flats. The higher the living standard, the more people spend on things other than housing. Therefore, they cannot afford to own a home any more. This will affect the whole layout of Canberra. The density in certain areas will be higher, regrettable as that will be.

I would like to have the residential area separated from the governmental area, if possible, and to have the residential area developed on modern residential lines. "Modern" is perhaps a misnomer, but I would like to indicate what I mean by ^a good residential area. First of all, the whole area has to be surveyed as to the local climate - where is the wind blowing from, where is a good residential site, and so on. Such an area should be selected. It would be wrong to do away with all the streets we have. I would never suggest that. My suggestions are made in the event of the city growing beyond the existing limits. Then try to design houses for the best aspect possible, and have all the roads facing the same aspect, which is the best. Then use the ^{improved} Redburn layout, which means a layout whereby, from a feeder road, loops go into a centre green strip from both sides, so that it is like having vehicular roads on one side and pedestrian walks to a central green strip from the other side. That means that from every house the children can go to the central green strip, where they have the school, and the women can go shopping to the central portion of the green strip. This has been developed at ^a Redburn in America.

SENATOR WOOD. - Is that the cul-de-sac type of thing?

DR. LANGER. - Yes, but nowadays they are making it in the ^{conf} form of roads. I used it just recently for the new section of Mt Isa.

SENATE CAMERERA COMMITTEE.

It is very economical. It saves 40 percent on streets, services and so on. It is absolutely safe for children to live in. Instead of treating the residential areas in exactly the same way as the centre of Canberra, with the star system and the long vistas, have something different for the additional residential areas - a true residential development contrasting with the enormous vistas which we have in the central section of Canberra. I can see no reason why the residential area should be laid out in the same way as the area around Parliament and other important buildings. After all, there should be a differentiation between the residential section and the governmental section.

As to zoning, which was mentioned to me as a problem, I am not very familiar with the scheme, but I may say that one has to be careful, in zoning, not to create areas near to the governmental section or the residential section which in war time can be treated as legitimate targets. For instance, most industries can be converted into war factories. Let me give a small example. When the Americans were approaching Vienna, they bombed the city for two weeks, and bombed a certain block particularly. The people marvelled that they should bomb like clock-work every day an area in which there were 5-storey residences. Then it was found out that in one cellar they produced warheads.

SENATOR WOOD. - The Americans apparently knew that.

DR. LANGER. - Yes, they knew it. The people did not know about it, but the Americans did.

SENATOR WOOD. - I take it that a lot of civilians were killed?

DR. LANGER. - 15,000 people were killed on account of that *similar targets* and *and*
Petrol should not be permitted to be stored in the centre in any circumstances, because it is a potential target. The Power House, if possible, should be removed. As it is at present it is dangerously close to the governmental section and to the Parliament. Then, the Military College is an essential facility of the military forces and therefore a legitimate target and should be treated as such in a city.

SENATE CANBERRA COMMITTEE.

SENATOR HANNAFORD. - Would you say that Parliament House would be a legitimate target?

DR. LANGER. - No, it is not. There should be no uniformed soldiers in the town. To have a separate zone for noise in residential areas, zone for 35 decibels only. Noise is counted in decibels. If you ^{allow for} ~~count~~ the whole area of Canberra, zone for 35 decibels in the residential areas, 50 decibels in light industrial areas, and so on. That would be a very good thing if it were introduced everywhere. I would further suggest a zoning of height for the whole area which matters in Canberra. That should be part of the scheme for the central design of Canberra. Further, I would suggest a zone for ~~the~~ clay-pits, quarries, sand-pits and so on, because they mak a mess of any city. That should be done as soon as possible.

SENATOR WOOD. - So as not to have them popping up everywhere?

DR. LANGER. - Yes. As to traffic, at present the traffic problem is practically non-existent. I know there is congestion at the Commonwealth Bridge and that there are dangerous crossings, but compared with other cities the traffic is negligible. However, if the city grows, we do not know how big it will be, and it is hard to plan for any size. Let us say one plans for 100,000 people, there is a possibility that it will grow into a city of 200,000. I would suggest that the separation of the governmental and residential sections will prove in the long run also beneficial from the point of view of traffic, because you will never have a traffic problem then in the governmental section. The residential section may grow to any size - let us say to half a million - but it would not matter to the governmental section if the two sections are separate. That means arterial roads serving the residential and business sections but not going through the governmental sections.

SENATOR HANNAFORD. - They should by-pass it?

DR. LANGER. - Yes. The main ^{problem} ~~thing~~ is not so much the road system as the parking. The need for parking space is enormous. We reckon that if you have an area for a building of 20 acres, 60 acres

SENATE CANBERRA COMMITTEE.

are necessary for parking.

SENATOR WOOD. - That is, if the building sits on 20 acres, you need 60 acres for parking?

DR. LANGER. - Yes. A sports ground needs three to five times the area of the ground, including the necessary buildings, for parking. That is over-looked in most town plans. When you look at the areas required nowadays for parking, you will see that that is the biggest need. That has to be done.

(Continued on page 1096)

SENATE CAMBERRA COMMITTEE.

THE CHAIRMAN.- This city was planned on the geometrical idea.

DR. LANGER.- Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN.- You think that plan can be adapted to the natural surroundings?

DR. LANGER.- Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN.- You say that there is no necessity to alter the main lines of Griffin's governmental plan?

DR. LANGER.- No .

THE CHAIRMAN.- You want us to develop mainly from where the permanent Parliament House will be up to the Australian War Memorial on both sides?

DR. LANGER.- That is the area from Capital Hill to City Hill.

THE CHAIRMAN.- Either City Hill or the Australian War Memorial?

DR. LANGER.- Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN.- You would need those two axes because you want a vista looking through to the War Memorial and you want a line of buildings going through the city?

DR. LANGER.- Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN.- You spoke of symbols in the older cities that were planned under military autocracies. It does not follow that because that was the original idea of having these stars and fine things we need depart from it.

DR. LANGER.- No.

THE CHAIRMAN.- After all, Paris is now the capital of a democracy; yet the old symbols remain and the plan is as Napoleon III left it.

DR. LANGER.- I agree.

THE CHAIRMAN.- The symbols will be dictated by our own social and political conditions. I imagine that the only sort of military symbol that our people would want is the Australian War Memorial. They like it, but I do not think public opinion would

SENATE CANBERRA COMMITTEE.

tolerate the introduction of something just as a symbol of military might. I think we can disregard that idea. Personally, I should like to see something such as the Arc de Triomphe. Can you think of anything similar to it that we could have?

DR. LANGER.- We have modern symbols nowadays, such as the library and the opera.

THE CHAIRMAN.- The library and the opera house should have prominent positions and be fine buildings, quite apart from their functions.

DR. LANGER.- Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN.- Is an arch so expensive nowadays that people would think it a waste of money?

DR. LANGER.- I think so.

THE CHAIRMAN.- They look very fine all the same.

DR. LANGER.- They do.

THE CHAIRMAN.- Some witnesses who have given evidence before this committee do not like New Delhi and cities of that type which are planned and executed on a grand scale. One criticism given to us is that New Delhi is a dead city. What do you think of that suggestion?

DR. LANGER.- The conception has been used in Washington, and Washington is not a dead city. It depends on the people who are there and who populate the place.

THE CHAIRMAN.- No one would call Paris a dead city.

DR. LANGER.- No.

THE CHAIRMAN.- It is full of animation, life and vitality. You have mentioned the Englishman's attitude and the Latin attitude towards cities. It may be mere accident, but it is a fact that the critics of this grand plan that we have happen to be people who have come from England to live in Australia. Their criticism may just be a reflection of the Englishman's natural prejudice.

DR. LANGER.- Yes. The English nation, like the Nordic nations, has been brought up for centuries in timbered country

SENATE ~~CONFERENCE~~ COMMITTEE.

where they erected timber houses which were scattered about the place so that in the case of fire there would be no danger that the fire would destroy the whole place. ^{People in} Latin countries, from 500 years back, have lived in small, tight cities built out of stone and clay, and they have in them the spirit of town planning.

THE CHAIRMAN.- It went back really to the Roman Empire.

DR. LANGER.- Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN.- That empire did not leave on England such a definite mark as it left on the Continent. Would you say that, given our climate and the fact that we are the heirs of the whole European tradition, we should not be greatly perturbed by that criticism of the city planned on a grand scale?

DR. LANGER.- No, except that it should not be too big.

THE CHAIRMAN.- You think that there will have to be such a modification of Griffin's plan as to eliminate some of his outmoded circles, as one witness called them, and that a different plan will have to be adopted?

DR. LANGER.- Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN.- Do you not think it would be better if London had been replanned on Wren's lines?

DR. LANGER.- No.

THE CHAIRMAN.- Why?

DR. LANGER.- It would have lost its personality. A city, like a face, must have personality.

THE CHAIRMAN.- Yet some of the most magnificent things in London are Wren's churches, not only the big cathedrals, but also the little churches.

DR. LANGER.- Yes. He was a good architect.

THE CHAIRMAN.- He was a good architect, but he was not a good town planner. You suggest that we could have here a city, not bigger, ^{than} but with its governmental part as grand as that of either Washington or Paris?

DR. LANGER.- Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN.- Would you say that at present most of the

buildings in Canberra are mediocre or possibly even worse?

I refer to the public buildings. For the moment I leave domestic architecture out of it.

DR. LANGER.- Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN.- Can you name any one building that you consider has some really distinctive features and great merit?

DR. LANGER.- I have not looked about so much.

THE CHAIRMAN.- You have seen the Institute of Anatomy?

DR. LANGER.- Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN.- Do you like it?

DR. LANGER.- Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN.- It has some distinction and some style?

DR. LANGER.- Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN.- Have you noticed University House?

DR. LANGER.- Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN.- Tell us what you think of it? Perhaps you will be criticising the work of another architect.

DR. LANGER.- Professor Lewis is a friend of mine.

THE CHAIRMAN.- Perhaps you would rather not say anything about it.

DR. LANGER.- It is good architecture.

THE CHAIRMAN.- I think it has some wonderful features internally, but I am disappointed with its exterior. Internally, the hall is a triumph. I like it very much. But every time I travel past the building I notice that it seems to trail off towards the road. At present some new additions are being made which look like a series of lean-tos or attachments.

SENATOR HANNAFORD.- Does that not bear out Dr. Langer's observation that the carcass is receiving more attention than the interior?

DR. LANGER.- In addition, it was a German trend after World War I and now after World War II to demonstrate an absolute restriction of expenditure and show rather a poor exterior on purpose, and to elevate that to a virtue.

THE CHAIRMAN.- University House was not a cheap building,

SENATE CANBERRA COMMITTEE.

I can assure you.

SENATOR WOOD.- I suppose that Dr. Langer means that had it been more elaborate outside it would have been even more costly.

DR. LANGER.- Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN.- No one could want anything better inside. Do you say that we should first get a definite idea of the type of buildings - there will be various buildings on Capital Hill and City Hill - that are to be constructed?

DR. LANGER.- Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN.- Do you suggest that some one should prepare a definite plan specifying that one building shall be in one position and another in another situation?

DR. LANGER.- It should be illustrated, as far as possible, with perspectives, models and photographs so that it can be easily read by the public.

THE CHAIRMAN.- Do you say that that is now an urgent task?

DR. LANGER.- Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN.- Do you say that when the plan has been prepared we should get to work immediately on one very good building that will serve as a standard?

DR. LANGER.- Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN.- Do you think it is imperative that we should at once impress the people with the notion that we have been satisfied in the past with a low standard and that we now intend to lift it immediately?

DR. LANGER.- Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN.- The question of the use of Capital Hill comes up constantly. It is the most prominent natural feature behind this existing Parliament House, and something will have to go there. Senator Vincent, who is not present today, raised the question whether Capital Hill would be suitable for a permanent Parliament House. Do you think that it would be suitable for the purpose?

SENATE CAMBERLAND COMMITTEE.

DR. LANGER.- Yes, from the point of view of aesthetics, if the building is to be very tall. If it is not to be very tall, it would not look very much ~~up to~~ ^{from} the open space, the lake and so on up to the War Memorial. It might be a mistake. From the point of view of convenience, I could not say so.

SENATOR WOOD.- You do not agree that it would be a convenient site?

DR. LANGER.- I could not say so. If there is to be a huge Parliament House, part of which is to provide quarters for the Senators to live in, and so on, it would be very difficult.

THE CHAIRMAN.- The alternative is to put it where Griffin suggested - on Camp Hill behind Capital Hill. Do you think that that site would be suitable?

DR. LANGER.- Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN.- If the permanent Parliament/^{House}were situated on Camp Hill, would it overlook the top of this building?

DR. LANGER.- If it were tall, yes. If the permanent building were not very tall, you would lose the view of the lake.

THE CHAIRMAN.- Although on the lowest level of that building you might be able to see over this building, a good deal of the view immediately in front would be hidden?

DR. LANGER.- Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN.- One would probably see only the central basin or the lake?

DR. LANGER.- Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN.- By the term "star system" you mean the system of circles?

DR. LANGER.- Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN.- Some one has called the circles with lines radiating out from the centre spiders' webs. Do you think that we should keep that type of plan for the governmental area?

DR. LANGER.- Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN.- But not for the suburbs, because, to some extent, they are already built upon?

DR. LANGER.- Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN.- Where the plan has not been implemented it would be legitimate to alter the suburbs?

DR. LANGER.- Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN.- You spoke of the need for flats and tall buildings. I think that all of us feel that the Australian tradition of the single-storey house - a cottage and a garden - is a good one. It is very persistent in this country. Do you think that we should have one or perhaps more areas of flats and persist with the cottage-garden idea in the greater part of the suburbs?

DR. LANGER.- Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN.- You spoke of the modern town planning trend of having the country coming into the city - having green fingers coming right in. You stated that the idea of the old-fashioned park had gone out. Nevertheless, I feel that Australians like parks, especially big parks, for reasons other than the appearance of them.

THE CHAIRMAN.- Do you think that, in addition to these green fingers, we need big park areas?

DR. LANGER.- Yes, on the basis of ten acres per one thousand people.

THE CHAIRMAN.- That is the desired standard?

DR. LANGER.- Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN.- In Canberra we have far more green area than that but some of it will be lost later. Do you think we should lay down at this time certain areas for parks, green fingers and so on which are to be kept for those purposes and nothing else?

DR. LANGER.- Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN.- An encroachment on such areas should be prevented?

DR. LANGER.- Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN.- Then there is the whole question of defence. We shall have to get a defence witness later. Do you not think it advisable, from the standpoint of defence, to keep industries which are not absolutely necessary to satisfy the needs of the people, right out of the city?

DR. LANGER.- Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN.- You would deprecate any attempt to make this a great industrial city?

DR. LANGER.- Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN.- The question of the military college is very important and we shall have to consider it. Do you think that a mistake was made in putting it so close to the city?

DR. LANGER.- Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN.- That does not mean that we shall have to take it away because when something is established you have to look at it from a different point of view. Would you definitely recommend that it should be moved further away?

DR. LANGER.- Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN.- We shall have to consider that against the evidence of other witnesses. With regard to flats, how high would

you allow them to go?

DR. LANGER.- Flats without lifts are the most economical and should be not higher than three storeys, if that consideration is taken into account. If a flat is higher than three storeys, you must have lifts, and then flats of six to eight storeys are found to be the most economical. With a master plan, it may be necessary to have some indication of height. If that is not necessary, I would place them where they are most convenient, and from an economic point of view, and only in a suitable neighbourhood. If it is necessary to have a few tall buildings, then have some flat buildings.

THE CHAIRMAN.- Could they be of a height where they could overshadow government buildings?

DR. LANGER.- Definitely.

THE CHAIRMAN.- Would there be any harm in that?

DR. LANGER.- It would be wrong. If somebody builds tall flats on one side of the huge axis, it throws the whole axis out. If one builds a ten storey flat on one side of the axis, there must be another one to accompany it. If not, the plan in the Grand Manner is affected. You must build in the Grand Manner to preserve symmetry.

THE CHAIRMAN.- The original intention was to build in the Grand Manner, and one must adhere to it. Did you see the site of the new eight storey flats?

DR. LANGER.- Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN.- Do you think it is suitable for such buildings?

DR. LANGER.- If another one is built on the other side.

THE CHAIRMAN.- How would it affect other permanent things as landmarks? The War Memorial and the steeple of St. Johns Church are two prominent things. Is it too close to them?

DR. LANGER.- No, because I consider that a magnificent and tall building will be built one day on the city hill.

THE CHAIRMAN.- We have to consider it in relation to that?

DR. LANGER.- Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN.- There are two axes, one going to the city hill and the other to the War Memorial. Is not the prominence of the War Memorial an important feature?

DR. LANGER.- Yes, but it is somewhat too weak as a focal point.

THE CHAIRMAN.- Because it is overshadowed by the hill?

DR. LANGER.- The hill is a good feature behind, and therefore the War Memorial should never endeavour to compete in height with it, because Nature is far stronger. The War Memorial, too, is too deep, it should be more spreading *subways*.

THE CHAIRMAN.- The War Memorial looks different from different points. When you are under it, the huge pylons overshadow you. It looks finer when you are close than when you are at a distance.

SENATOR WOOD.- It is really meant to make an appearance in the distance?

DR. LANGER.- *It ought to.* The second point is the colour of it. It blends too much into the background, and is not sufficiently obvious.

THE CHAIRMAN.- You have raised an important point with regard to building material. St. Andrew's Church at times is almost lost, because it is built of yellow sandstone. Can you give us any general advice about building materials?

DR. LANGER.- I suggest that a government building should be built of, say, stone, and not be just a painted structure.

THE CHAIRMAN.- A curious thing about Parliament House is that it is a painted structure, yet it stands out very prominently. It more or less shoves every other building into the background, particularly when viewed from the air. I do not think it is worthy of a Parliament House and I do not like the whitewashing paint, but I must confess it is of pleasant appearance to me from many angles.

DR. LANGER.- Yes it is.....

THE CHAIRMAN.- Would you say that, as a general idea, we should keep Canberra as a governmental and educational city, and encourage only such other occupations as serve the needs of the fairly big population we shall bring here. Is that a fairly sound principle?

DR. LANGER. - Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN.- Thank you. I have asked you most of the things that I want emphasised.

SENATOR RYAN.- I have no questions. The Chairman has covered my questions about reservations for public parks.

SENATOR HANNAFORD.- I am interested in the statement with regard to the green fingers. It is an accepted town planning principle which is very popular?

DR. LANGER.- Yes.

SR. HANNAFORD.- It could hardly be adopted in our housing areas which have already been built up?

DR. LANGER.- No, you cannot do much there.

SENATOR HANNAFORD.- It is only applicable to any area to be laid out in future?

DR. LANGER.- That is correct.

SENATOR HANNAFORD.- That principle could hardly be embodied now in regard to the central administration area at this stage of development.

DR. LANGER.- No, I suggest that there should be a laying out for the central section.

SENATOR HANNAFORD.- Parliament House is a provisional building. The site for the permanent building is immediately behind it. Do you think that this building should be scrapped, or could it be embodied in the plan, provided the building behind it is sufficiently high?

DR. LANGER.- From the aesthetic point of view, I would say it should be scrapped, but I do not think that it ever will be and therefore any realistic planner should include it in the scheme.

SENATOR HANNAFORD.- You do not think that this building could be remodelled on its present site to provide an adequate national parliament in the future?

DR. LANGER.- It would not be as good as if it were on the high ground, but it is in a pleasant situation. The Capitol in Washington has been added to and re-built. The addition of the iron dome has nearly doubled the original height. Both wings of the

senate were added later. It is an impressive building, but it was not at the beginning.

SENATOR HANNAFORD.- And you think that the same thing could happen with this building?

DR. LANGER.- Yes.

SENATOR HANNAFORD.- You agree with the site, even though it is not so good as the other one?

DR. LANGER. - Yes.

SENATOR HANNAFORD.- There is another matter on which I should like your opinion and that is regarding the outlook to the War Memorial. There will be one of the basins of the lake system which will be leading down. Would you prefer to see the buildings on the basis of a triangle or square mall.

DR. LANGER.- The square mall system.

SENATOR HANNAFORD.- I wanted to know that. I thought it was laid out originally on the basis of a government triangle. You prefer the effect of a square mall.

DR. LANGER.- Yes.

SENATOR HANNAFORD.- Very good. What do you think of the lakes idea?

DR. LANGER.- I think it would bring Canberra into line with Perth where you have the wide Swan River.

SENATOR HANNAFORD.- You think that is very fine.

DR. LANGER.- Yes. The city of Prague has a tiny river basin, which has been damned and now there is a wide expanse of water in the city.

SENATOR HANNAFORD.- You like the idea of having a lake system?

DR. LANGER.- Yes.

SENATOR HANNAFORD.- You know the proposal for three basins. You are in agreement with the Griffin plan in that regard?

DR. LANGER.- Yes, that was one of the finest features of Griffin's plan.

SENATOR HANNAFORD.- What do you think of the idea of abandoning the West Lake and having a ribbon of water?

CANBERRA SENATE COMMITTEE.

DR. LANGER.- I would leave that question to the landscape architect and let him decide what he could do with the area. I understand that it gets flooded from time to time. It has to be studied.

SENATOR HANNAFORD.- It has an engineering problem as well?

DR. LANGER.- Yes, it should not be too shallow, otherwise algae and certain planktons will develop in it and form a swamp.

SENATOR HANNAFORD.- I should like to know whether you have any hard and fast opinions on the type of buildings for homes. Do you prefer one particular type made of bricks or stone compared with timber?

DR. LANGER.- Brick homes generally are somewhat dearer than timber homes. You can ^{make} structures which are more in accordance with modern lines in timber. You can have wider openings, but both types of home can be made equally liveable. Far more important is the layout and aspect. There is nothing worse than to have a number of types ~~with~~ ^{having} the wrong aspect. That is the biggest crime which can be committed.

SENATOR HANNAFORD.- You think there has been faulty siting in Canberra? Is that evident to you?

DR. LANGER.- Yes, the circular layout makes it clear that at least half the buildings face the wrong aspect.

SENATOR HANNAFORD.- That is a detrimental aspect of the circular layout?

DR. LANGER.- Yes.

SENATOR HANNAFORD.- Would you say, on the information that you have given us, that, generally speaking, although the Griffin plan may not be 100 per cent, in your opinion it is at least a plan that can be quite well adapted as a plan for the capital city?

DR. LANGER.- Yes.

SENATOR HANNAFORD.- Do you believe that the Griffin plan could be adapted for neighbourhood planning?

DR. LANGER.- Yes. But I do not believe in that to the extent that through neighbourhood planning we would get more neighbourliness. However, we can plan for more economic and handy units in the form of neighbourhoods, and I believe in that.

SENATOR HANNAFORD.- What is your general opinion of the shopping areas in Canberra?

DR. LANGER.- I have visited them and have seen shopping areas which were constructed partly by private interests and partly by the Department of Works. They are more orderly than a in other cities and have parking areas, but I think there is still room for improvement.

SENATOR HANNAFORD.- Do you think that the parking areas are adequate?

DR. LANGER.- No. In future more people will have cars. We reckon on a saturation point in the future of one car to every 2.3 people and if ^{new types of} Volkswagen ^{like} and Fiat cars are ^{available} in the future ~~more available to the public~~ practically everybody will have a car and then we shall have a calamity in relation to parking.

SENATOR HANNAFORD.- Would you say that Civic Centre is deficient in parking space?

DR. LANGER.- Yes.

SENATOR HANNAFORD.- Could you recommend where parking provisions should be made adjacent to the city area?

DR. LANGER.- I have a feeling there is sufficient space for it but I could not say where it should be.

SENATOR HANNAFORD.- Would you recommend that immediate consideration be given to this urgent problem of parking?

SENATE CANBERRA COMMITTEE

DR. LANGER.- Yes. I would also suggest a well equipped terminal for buses with modern conveniences ^{where} people coming in from outer areas by bus, perhaps on their way to see doctors or dentists, would be able to ^{shave and} ~~sh~~ have a shower and generally remove the stains of travel.

SENATOR HANNAFORD.- Is there no provision for that sort of thing at present? You realise that Civic Centre is not a terminal?

DR. LANGER.- Yes.

SENATOR HANNAFORD.- Reverting to the type of buildings in our shopping areas, do you like the architecture of them?

DR. LANGER.- Not particularly. I like to have arcades and I like them to look orderly but I do not like the present architecture.

SENATOR HANNAFORD.- Would you agree that it would be more desirable to have, instead of the present two-storey buildings at Civic Centre, a multi-storey type of building?

(Continued on page 1111)

SENATE CANBERRA COMMITTEE

DR. LANGER.- For shopping, no, because shopping is mainly done on the ground floor. It may be necessary to have office blocks, and they would be better in tall buildings, but it has to be considered that on this City Hill will one day stand the Town Hall. Everything has to be planned with an eye on this Town Hall, which will be not only a Town Hall but also the terminal end and focal point of that long axis. Everything should be planned with an eye on that.

SENATOR HANNAFORD.- You appreciate that there is a big area of ground there. Do you think that such a large area would be necessary for the purpose of civic buildings?

DR. LANGER.- The Town Hall itself, in the future, will need an area equal to this area for parking space alone, so that if that building, plus parking space, went there, it would just fill it.

SENATOR HANNAFORD.- I am a supporter of the skyline type of building. As an example, I refer to Adelaide. It may be a poor example, but at least it is an example of the centre of the city being visible from practically any vantage point. The administrative centre in Canberra, with Parliament House as the focal point, does not show very much in the way of skyline buildings, and even the new administrative building is not very noticeable. Would you be in favour of that type of impressive building which provides a certain amount of skyline aspect?

DR. LANGER.- Yes, definitely. There is a rule that if you have a certain distance you must have a building of a certain height in order to make it impressive. The minimum we can discern properly is approximately one degree. The further you go, the higher the building should be. Only a tall building can be a terminal point. If you have a great natural feature, like Mount Ainslie with the War Memorial at the bottom the mountain itself is the focal point and should only be underlined at the bottom.

SENATOR WOOD.- It could have been more accentuated by having a long War Memorial.

DR. LANGER.- It could be accentuated by having wings on each side.

THE CHAIRMAN.- Do you know who designed the War Memorial?

SENATE CANBERRA COMMITTEE

DR. LANGER.- I knew it, but I have forgotten.

SENATOR HANNAFORD.- You mentioned that the Royal Military College would almost certainly be a target in the event of war. You are familiar, I take it, with the fact that the Burley Griffin plan extends right round and even encompasses the area set aside for the Royal Military College. I believe you said something to the effect that it would be desirable to have it elsewhere?

DR. LANGER.- Yes.

SENATOR HANNAFORD.- Do you not think that from a sentimental or a national point of view it is desirable to have it adjacent to Canberra?

DR. LANGER.- Yes. It can have an area whereby it is still protected. If there is an elevation between the residential area and the Military College, and the Military College gets bombed, the bombs would not affect the residential area. I do not say the College should be moved, but you could put it the other way round and say "Remove the residential area".

SENATOR HANNAFORD.- Would you approve of a modification of the plan to prevent the expansion of the city around Mount Pleasant and adjacent to the aerodrome?

DR. LANGER.- Yes, definitely.

THE CHAIRMAN.- We are very interested in this, because we have had contradictory evidence.

DR. LANGER.- One good bomb on the Duntroon area would cost hundreds of ^{civilian} lives.

SENATOR HANNAFORD.- Do you think that the roads system of Canberra could be improved by certain modifications of the plan?

DR. LANGER.- Yes.

SENATOR HANNAFORD.- Mr. Gibson, whom you have met, has outlined to this Committee certain modifications he has made in regard to the main roads and the entrances to the residential areas that have been a great improvement on the old plan.

DR. LANGER.- He intends to make out of this present road system, with the many crossings, what we call arterial roads, which have, in the ideal fashion, crossings only every quarter of a mile.

SENATE CAMBODIA COMMITTEE

That would be a blessing if it could be done - and I think it could be done easily.

SENATOR HANNAFORD.- Do you think he is on the right lines in that regard?

DR. LANGER.- Yes, definitely, except that he has to be careful not to bring the residential arterial road through the governmental section, because that would block up that section.

SENATOR HANNAFORD.- You know the Commonwealth Avenue and the bridge that carries the main traffic between the city and the southern areas?

DR. LANGER.- Yes.

SENATOR HANNAFORD.- Would you recommend a bridge of much greater dimensions than the one that is there at the present time?

DR. LANGER.- Yes, definitely.

SENATOR HANNAFORD.- Would you agree that other bridges are necessary?

DR. LANGER.- Yes.

SENATOR HANNAFORD.- At King's Avenue, for instance?

DR. LANGER.- Yes.

SENATOR HANNAFORD.- And the one at Acton?

DR. LANGER.- Yes. The bridge between the Capitol Hill axis and the City Hill axis should be built not only with an eye to the necessary width but also as a part of the axis. Therefore, it should be wide.

SENATOR WOOD.- What was the purpose of countries which captured other places building the conquered areas in geometrical design? Was it because they treated the conquered peoples as inferior, or did they regard it as a simple system by which they could hold those places in the event of revolution by the conquered peoples?

DR. LANGER.- In the very beginning there were two different types of architecture. There was the square type and the irregular type. It can be said that the square or rectangular type was used by nomadic desertic tribes. They had squares, ^{with seats} and they fought in a square fashion. The Islamic people still ^{use} ~~found~~ in that very same

SENATE CANBERRA COMMITTEE

fashion, and their churches or mosques are blocks. When they went to other places they had to form a camp within a very short time, and it may have been necessary for them to leave in a short time. The easiest ^{simplest way of laying out a camp} ~~layout~~ was for a man to stand in the centre, put down a lance and say "That is the north, that is the south, that is the east, that is the west", and make a square. It could be done in a few hours. The Romans took ^{in their} ~~that~~ ^{own} ~~for~~ ^{custom} when they were fighting, but they did not want to do it for themselves because they loved nature. They consulted their priests about whether there was water or not. They liked hills, forests and springs, and they included them in their living quarters. Therefore, they looked down on the barbarians who lived in squares. They thought ~~it~~ was only fit for conquered people ~~a layout such as that~~. That was so until the time of the Renaissance, when the pattern was lifted.

SENATOR WOOD.- The Romans did not like the geometrical design for themselves, but it was good enough for the conquered peoples?

DR. LANGER.- Yes.

SENATOR WOOD.- From your evidence, I take it that you consider that the planning of Canberra, particularly as it affects the governmental buildings, is far too spacious?

DR. LANGER.- Yes.

SENATOR WOOD.- There is too much room round them?

DR. LANGER.- Yes.

SENATOR WOOD.- I take it when you speak about the axis you mean the central avenue which is sometimes called the "Mall"?

DR. LANGER.- Yes.

SENATOR WOOD.- Apparently ~~there~~ ~~is~~ ~~more~~ than one backbone in the Canberra plan.

DR. LANGER.- Yes, there are several.

SENATOR WOOD.- You think one would be plenty?

DR. LANGER.- Yes.

SENATOR WOOD.- And any one of them that is laid out on the map there is bigger than that of any other city in the world?

SENATE CANBERRA COMMITTEE

DR. LANGER.- That is correct.

SENATOR WOOD.- Would it be correct to say that one of those backbones would be as big as Paris, Washington and New Delhi combined?

DR. LANGER.- No - *Canberra axis; Yes.* ~~the group of the existing ones.~~

SENATOR WOOD.- The whole lot of the main avenues now allowed for governmental buildings would be as big as Paris, Washington and New Delhi combined?

DR. LANGER.- Yes.

SENATOR WOOD.- Therefore, basing it on the assumption that Canberra would grow to 100,000 people, there would be no hope of ever using all that area?

DR. LANGER. No.

SENATOR WOOD.- Would there be any hope of using it if the population rose to half a million?

DR. LANGER.- No.

SENATOR WOOD.- What would be the population of Paris?

DR. LANGER.- I could not guess.

SENATOR WOOD.- Do you know the population of Washington?

THE CHAIRMAN.- I think it is about 750,000.

SENATOR WOOD.- What would be the population of the United States of America - 140,000,000?

DR. LANGER.- I think 160,000,000.

SENATOR WOOD.- And the population of India is 400,000,000 or 500,000,000?

DR. LANGER.- Yes.

SENATOR WOOD.- Therefore, it seems that the area of Canberra is far too vast?

DR. LANGER.- Yes.

SENATOR WOOD.- In that case, there will always be a very big vacuum of vacant land in the middle of Canberra?

DR. LANGER.- Yes.

SENATOR WOOD.- Do you not think that that makes for an uneconomic city, from the point of view of transportation, people getting to work, and so on?

SENATE CANBERRA COMMITTEE

DR. LANGER.- Yes, definitely.

SENATOR WOOD.- You feel that the right idea is to have a good wide avenue with all governmental buildings on both sides of that avenue, making a strong central feature?

DR. LANGER.- Yes.

SENATOR WOOD.- With a strong focal point, such as Parliament House or something else?

DR. LANGER.- Yes.

SENATOR WOOD.- In that case, the area would need re-planning. What do you think that the surplus land that apparently has been provided by Burley Griffin could be used for? Could it be used for building the residential area in closer to the city and making a more compact city?

DR. LANGER.- Yes, partly that and partly parks.

SENATOR WOOD.- Do you think that the residential area should be brought in closer?

DR. LANGER.- Yes.

(Continued on page 1117.)

SENATE CANBERRA COMMITTEE.

SENATOR WOOD. - Do you not think that it would be more advantageous for the population of Canberra to be closer to the centre of the city?

DR. LANGER. - Definitely.

SENATOR WOOD. - You are staying at Hotel Kurragong. I do not know whether you have looked at the surrounding area. Do you think that it would be an advantage if that area were utilised as a residential district?

DR. LANGER. - I think it would be.

SENATOR WOOD. - One of the difficulties in Canberra is the shopping centres. It has been stated by one witness that visitors to Canberra can see no shopping centre in the sense that almost all Australian people think of a strong shopping centre. Do you think that it would be an advantage to have one main shopping centre supplemented by neighbourhood shopping centres?

DR. LANGER. - Yes, definitely.

SENATOR WOOD. - Do you think that it would strengthen the city's structure?

DR. LANGER. - It definitely would do so.

SENATOR WOOD. - I do not know whether you know the shopping centres. There are what is called City, Kingston, Manuka, which is near Kingston, and, I think, one or two very small groups of shops elsewhere. It looks as if City, until now, has not been the strong shopping centre.

DR. LANGER. - No.

SENATOR WOOD. - I do not know what is the principle in relation to the layout of the shopping centres, but the other day a business man complained that businesses have not sufficient area of land at the rear of their premises for their activities, and that at Kingston, which is a shopping centre that almost surrounds a complete block, his firm was not allowed to add a second storey to its building because it might spoil the area. Can you see any objection to the shopping centre rising more than one storey?

DR. LANGER. - No, There would not be any objection.

SENATE CALLEBINA COMMITTEE.

SENATOR WOOD. - Particularly if a building of more than one storey were on the corner of a shopping block, do you not think that it would enhance the appearance by giving point to the shopping line?

DR. LANGER. - Definitely.

SENATOR WOOD. - One of the complaints about the space available at the rear of premises was that there was not sufficient room for semi-trailer vehicles to turn round. Keeping in mind the scheme that you prepared for Mackay, do you think that it would be an advantage to have shopping blocks such as the one at Civic Centre with a central road through the block wide enough for traffic and the parking of cars belonging to the employees and the people of the business area?

DR. LANGER. - I would suggest a layout similar to the modern American shopping centres, in which there is a central area for pedestrians only, nicely landscaped, where the children can be kept within an enclosure while the mothers shop, and with a huge parking area surrounding the whole shopping centre and also feeding in the necessary supplies. These modern shopping centres in the United States of America are very good. If you took an example from that, it would be a very good thing.

SENATOR WOOD. - Do you think that instead of parking blocks, which you provided in Mackay, which was a built-up city, it would be better to have parking centres around the shopping blocks?

DR. LANGER. - Yes, and there should be parks taken up by walks and enclosures for children to play.

SENATOR WOOD. - Do you mean that the children would be outside the block or in the centre of the block?

DR. LANGER. - The children would be in the centre.

SENATOR HANNAFORD. - Will you draw us a rough sketch?

The witness having drawn a sketch plan,

DR. LANGER. - The parkland is in the centre so that the people shopping can walk to each shop in the shortest possible distance.

THE CHAIRMAN. - I think that one of the difficulties is that Austrialians in general have definite tastes. They want long brightly-lit streets that they can walk up and down. The impression of Canberra

SENATE CANBERRA COMMITTEE.

on the ordinary man - and it is he who has sent us here - is that the shopping centres are very small and that they are not brightly lit at night. Whatever one may think about Pitt Street in Sydney from a planning point of view, at night it exhibits a string of neon lights and shop windows glittering with colour, and that is what the people like. We shall have to allow for that taste.

DR. LANGER. - The plan that I have sketched is for a suburban shopping centre, not for a city proper.

SENATOR HANNAFORD. - It would be suitable for the development of Canberra?

DR. LANGER. - Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN. - There are no city shopping areas in Canberra. Women especially and young people like to walk up and down the street looking at the shop windows. There must be a city shopping centre somewhere in Canberra. Would there be any objection to its development along a fairly long street?

DR. LANGER. - No.

THE CHAIRMAN. - The neon signs make a shopping centre at night.

DR. LANGER. - They are beautiful.

THE CHAIRMAN. - In a sense, shopping continues even when the shops are shut, because the windows are brightly lit and the public may see the goods attractively displayed. In Sydney, and even in Brisbane, one sees people streaming up and down the city streets looking at the shops at night.

DR. LANGER. - Yes.

SENATOR WOOD. - How would the people have access to the shops in the plan that you have sketched?

DR. LANGER. - From the back.

SENATOR WOOD. - You suggest a square of shops with an island garden centre?

DR. LANGER. - Yes.

SENATOR WOOD. - The access would be from the rear of the shops?

SENATE CANBERRA COMMITTEE.

DR. LANGER. - That is correct.

SENATOR WOOD. - Do you think that the layout of Canberra is difficult and complex for people who visit the city and do not live here for any length of time to find their way about in it?

DR. LANGER. - It is definitely a complex plan. I find my way about only with a map in my hand.

SENATOR WOOD. - Do you think that any city, and particularly a national capital, should be so designed as to allow visitors, to whom it belongs in a national sense, to find their way about easily?

DR. LANGER. - Definitely.

SENATOR WOOD. - Your indication - and we have had a similar indication from others - is that it should be re-planned by some planner or group of planners? Do you think that it should be overhauled?

DR. LANGER. - Overhauled, not with the idea of scrapping everything, but with goodwill to leave as much as possible, by a strong personality.

SENATOR WOOD. - Do you think that if the circular road system were overhauled now some of the consequences that have developed from it could be eliminated?

DR. LANGER. - Easily.

SENATOR WOOD. - You do not think that Canberra has developed to such a degree that it is impossible to rectify the error?

DR. LANGER. - No. I think that it can be rectified.

SENATOR WOOD. - In Canberra there are residential areas scattered in all directions at some distance apart, with a big vacuum in the centre. Do you think that the residential areas are too far apart and that they need something to co-ordinate them?

DR. LANGER. - I think that they are somewhat too far apart. If this would be an ordinary city in which a big business and industrial and semi-industrial section would be or could be developed, I would say that it is a very wise thing to leave that space; but that is not intended here, and I think that the suburbs are too far apart.

SENATE CANBERRA COMMITTEE.

SENATOR WOOD. - Do you think that in Canberra it would be best to design the governmental section carefully and then the strong central business section, and from that allow the natural development of residential and other areas from the centre?

DR. LANGER. - Yes.

SENATOR WOOD. - Re-orientate the development program?

DR. LANGER. - Yes.

SENATOR WOOD. - Looking at the plan of Canberra, I cannot find any indication that it has a ring road - a circular road - about the city. Thinking of the future of Canberra, do you think that it would be an advantage to have a ring road?

DR. LANGER. - At present the advantage would not be very great, but in the future a ring road would definitely be needed.

SENATOR WOOD. - Do you think that it should be planned now?

DR. LANGER. - Yes.

SENATOR WOOD. - The purpose of a ring road, of course, is to take traffic off the main arteries and prevent congestion?

DR. LANGER. - Yes.

SENATOR WOOD. - It is an accepted principle of town planning that there should be at least one ring road.

DR. LANGER. - Yes.

SENATOR WOOD. - Sometimes there are an inner and outer ring road.

DR. LANGER. - That is correct. Under no circumstances should this ring road cut the governmental section in two.

SENATOR WOOD. - Your idea is that all arterial roads running through the governmental area should be as free as possible from feeding in traffic from the residential and business areas?

DR. LANGER. - Yes.

SENATOR WOOD. - Have you looked at the residential areas? There has been a lot of discussion about the monotony of the architecture and the construction of the residences in Canberra. Do you consider that there is scope for much more variety and for designing of a different type in Canberra?

DR. LANGER. - Definitely.

SENATOR WOOD. - You would not say that the standard of architecture here is such that it cannot be improved upon?

DR. LANGER. - There are a few very nice examples. I was thinking of houses built by Sid Ancher and others. But the majority are bad and unpleasant to look at.

SENATOR WOOD. - Regarding the Lakes scheme, there were planned originally an east lake, a west lake and three smaller lakes in the centre, all to be connected.

DR. LANGER. - Yes.

SENATOR WOOD. - Over a period of time the east lake has been abandoned, and most people seem to think that it is impossible to have it restored to the plan. If I remember rightly the west lake has recently been eliminated. There has been a lot of controversy in Canberra about its elimination, and the suggestion is that the three small lakes with a ribbon of water would be sufficient. What is your view about it? Will you keep in mind the value of a lake to, say, Ballarat. Do you think that the west lake and the other lakes are needed to get as wide an expanse of water as possible?

DR. LANGER. - Personally, I should like to see as much lake as possible. I think it also would be economic to make lakes instead of anything else and to have them bordered on either side by big expanses of playgrounds, parks, and so on, to make use of the lakes for the people.

SENATOR WOOD. - So that the people could use them for boating and other recreations?

DR. LANGER. - Yes.

SENATOR WOOD. - Do you think that from the point of view of the people living in this inland city of Canberra a lake would make it much more attractive?

DR. LANGER. - I think it would.

SENATOR WOOD. - It would compensate, to a degree, for the loss of the seaside?

DR. LANGER. - Definitely.

SENATE CANBERRA COMMITTEE.

SENATOR WOOD. - At the present time the Australian National University overlooks what would have been the west lake, where there are a temporary race-course and a golf-links. As you can understand, in a place such as Canberra, there is a tendency to retain things that are supposed to be temporary. Do you think that it is right for the students of the University to overlook a race-course?

DR. LANGER. - Definitely not.

(Continued on page 1124)

SENATE CANBERRA COMMITTEE.

SENATOR HANNAFORD.- Why not?

DR. LANGER.- I have definite ideas. The students are supposed to listen to their lectures.

SENATOR HANNAFORD.- Is not horse racing supposed to be the sport of kings?

SENATOR WOOD.- What about the æsthetic consideration?

THE CHAIRMAN.- As to that, I pass Randwick Race Course twice a day when I am at home. I must confess that I do not like horse racing but I know that if the Randwick Race Course went, it would be broken up for building purposes. It is always green...

SENATOR WOOD.- You would not retain the race course if you could put something better there?

THE CHAIRMAN.- The two cases are not identical. I was trying to get the strongest grounds.

SENATOR WOOD.- From your earlier reply I understand that you think that Canberra should be continued as a governmental city in the main, with only those industries associated with the living of the people, and not a city emphasising too strongly the industrial point of view.

DR. LANGER.- Yes. The main purpose of Canberra is to be a governmental city, and industry should be kept by itself.

SENATOR WOOD.- You would not prevent industries from coming out here?

DR. LANGER.- No.

SENATOR WOOD.- Would not some industries widen the scope for the people by association?

DR. LANGER.- Definitely.

SENATOR WOOD.- It would give them a truer national view.

DR. LANGER.- Yes; but certain industrial zones will have to be provided so that industries which wish to establish themselves here will be able to get the land.

SENATOR WOOD.- You think that industry should be placed sufficiently far away from governmental and residential areas, keeping in mind the possibility of bombing.

SENATOR COUNCIL COMMITTEE.

DR. LANGER.- Yes.

SENATOR WOOD.- And also from the point of view of living.

DR. LANGER.- Living, noise and smells, and traffic ~~to~~ ^{from} ~~the~~ industry. Traffic, which is created by industry, makes a noise, and if ~~vehicles~~ ^{trucks} race through a residential area, they might kill a number of people. It would be better if the residential areas were segregated.

SENATOR WOOD.- You mention noise in residential areas, and you have suggested that five acre blocks should be designed with streets that are not "through" streets. Your idea is to prevent traffic running through those blocks at night when people are sleeping?

DR. LANGER.- Yes.

SENATOR WOOD.- That would be of advantage in a residential area?

DR. LANGER.- Yes, and for the sake of bringing up children.

SENATOR WOOD.- I realise that my next question requires a lot of thought, but what is your view on the placing of Parliament House on a hill. Would the aesthetic side be paramount, or would the placing of the building on a low level such as now be of advantage because of the ease with which people could go to and from it.

DR. LANGER.- ^{Hooker} ~~If I am~~ a citizen, I would like to see the Parliament as high up and as imposing as possible, but if I ~~am~~ ^{was} a parliamentarian, I would like it to be as convenient as possible.

SENATOR WOOD.- It has been suggested that an 8-storey flat is suitable. You think that another 8-storey flat should be built on the other side if one is to be built?

DR. LANGER.- Yes.

SENATOR WOOD.- Do you think that flat areas should be set out rather than have flats springing up about the residential areas?

DR. LANGER.- Yes, areas for flats, and if 8-storey or 10-storey flats are to be built I suggest that the occupants should

SENATE CANBERRA COMMITTEE.

have certain areas alongside where the children can play. The public should not be forced to provide the necessary recreation areas from their own pockets for the people from the flats who get the benefit of them.

THE CHAIRMAN.- When you speak of "the other side", will you indicate on the map the place you mean? The flats are going up to the east of Civic Centre. Where do you want the other block to be?

DR. LANGER.- The other side of the axis running through to Civic Centre.

SENATOR HANNAFORD.- You must have symmetry.

DR. LANGER.- Yes.

SENATOR WOOD.- You have said that each flat should be surrounded by sufficient parklands for the people, and for children, presumably to keep the children off the roads.

DR. LANGER.- Yes.

SENATOR WOOD.- You say that the proposed block of flats should be balanced by another building. Senator Hannaford has been hammering a good point about Adelaide. Do you think that a flat area should be set aside.

DR. LANGER.- Yes, a whole row on either side....

SENATOR WOOD.- Or even have them grouped in a block?

DR. LANGER.- Yes.

SENATOR WOOD.- Do you think it would give emphasis to Civic?

DR. LANGER.- Yes.

SENATOR WOOD.- It would bring about a higher density for Canberra?

DR. LANGER.- Yes.

SENATOR WOOD.- You do not see anything wrong in building flats, in view of the traditional feeling of the Australian people for unit homes?

DR. LANGER.- Some people do not want gardens. I refer to some aged people, and to some childless couples. Some people

SENATE CANBERRA COMMITTEE.

are not suited for gardening work. Instead of forcing neglected gardens on the general public, why not allow ^{outside} people to live in flats?

SENATOR WOOD.- Do you think that Australian people are becoming more flat minded in recent years than they were previously?

DR. LANGER.- I do not think so, although they are being forced into it. A man cannot afford to spend any more than three or four times his yearly income on the purchase of a house. No one on the basic wage can afford to buy a home.

THE CHAIRMAN.- What is the basic wage today?

SENATOR HANNAFORD.- It is about £11.11.0 in South Australia.

THE CHAIRMAN.- The cost of a moderate house in Sydney is about £3,600.

DR. LANGER.- It is beyond the means of the ordinary working man, which is a sad thing.

THE CHAIRMAN.- It is one of our main problems.

SENATOR WOOD.- In regard to the replanning of Canberra, the present plan is said to have been designed for the horse and buggy days and therefore needs some revision for traffic reasons.

DR. LANGER.- The Canberra plan has been designed ^{based on a design meant} for the display of huge horse drawn carriages - six or eight horses - in the grand manner. That was the design with the wide avenues. In former times, a man of esteem and wealth could display his importance or wealth only by the number of servants he had and the number of horses ^{to} in his carriage.

SENATOR WOOD.- It is the impression created. The replanning of Canberra would be a serious matter because it is the capital of the nation. What is the best way to re-plan or overhaul it. Is it better to have one capable man to draw the plan, or a group of planners.

DR. LANGER.- Let one capable man have a go, and then scrutinise his work, and tear it to pieces, or throw it away, and invite another capable man to have a go. But let one man do the thing, and then let it grow into teamwork.

SENATE CANBERRA COMMITTEE.

THE CHAIRMAN.- Who should pick the man? That is our main problem. The Minister for the Interior could pick him now.

SENATOR WOOD.- In regard to the cultural side of Canberra, a witness yesterday for the Art Club advocated the building of an art gallery. Keeping in mind Canberra is still growing and that many years may pass before it reaches the ultimate, what is the best way to handle the development of art? Is it to build an art gallery now or build a proper auditorium for the city, and use the large foyer of it for the display of art works until sufficient need arises for an art gallery.

DR. LANGER.- I think that a big art gallery at the present time would be premature and that a display of ^{objects} ~~the beauties~~ of art in a public building which is visited by the people would be better. The trend now is away from the erection of galleries, which are nothing else than burial places of ~~pieces~~ of art which should be a part of the people's ^{lives} and should be among the people. There should be a living gallery. You could make people interested in art by arranging for lectures to be given. The exhibits should be changed constantly so as to make it live. Various rooms should be set aside for the display of art, and that can best be done in any building which is used by the people. The town hall would be the best place for that. The idea of having a huge gallery where a number of pictures are on display permanently is disappearing rapidly. Then again, great ^{works} ~~pieces~~ of art are not available any more, or if they are available, they are so expensive that we cannot afford them.

SENATOR WOOD.- Do you think that the printer's art has developed to such an extent that reproductions of masterpieces would be of sufficient standard to warrant their exhibition in an art display?

DR. LANGER.- Definitely.

SENATOR HANNAFORD.- This is becoming well known now.

DR. LANGER.- The ^{prints} ~~works~~ cannot be distinguished from the originals if you stand back a couple of steps.

SENATOR WOOD.- Do you think that they would be good enough to educate the people and interest them?

SENATE CANBERRA COMMITTEE

DR. LANGER.- Definitely.

SENATOR WOOD.- And they would be much cheaper than the originals.

DR. LANGER.- Oh yes.

SENATOR HANNAFORD.- That is a very good point.

DR. LANGER.- A selected number from ^{say of} the old Roman, Italian ^{and so forth by the artists} and Dutch Masters should be on exhibition, and ~~should~~ ^{be changed} every two weeks or three weeks. During that time, descriptions of the works should be given by a lecturer. The people would be interested, and they would obtain the knowledge of the history of art.

CANBERRA SENATE COMMITTEE.

SENATOR WOOD.- It would be possible to obtain reproductions where it would not be possible to have the original because it has been purchased by somebody else, and in the case of damage they could be replaced easily?

DR. LANGER.- Yes. Such exhibitions could be sent round other cities which might not be able to afford to buy even prints. Everybody would benefit from them.

SENATOR WOOD.- While certain prints were being exhibited here, other prints could be sent to other cities and towns?

DR. LANGER.- Yes. Art could be made to live in that way.

SENATOR WOOD.- Do you consider that having the works shown in buildings used by the people would be a way of bringing art to the people instead of them having to seek it?

DR. LANGER.- Yes.

SENATOR HANNAFORD.- You agree that it would be all important for the exhibition of prints to have a suitable building? There have been many instances of exhibitions badly displayed in inadequate buildings with inadequate lighting?

DR. LANGER.- In the beginning it would probably not be possible, but it would be possible later on. For instance, part of the buildings which form the Mall in Washington is the big National Gallery.

SENATOR WOOD.- In the meantime you think that art can be displayed in an auditorium or town hall?

DR. LANGER.- Yes.

SENATOR WOOD.- You say the trend is away from the art gallery?

DR. LANGER.- Yes. It is thought that television will in time make art galleries superfluous. For instance, you can take a walk through the Louvre while sitting comfortably at home and see all the pictures at close quarters. You can similarly see the pictures in the Washington gallery which is today one of the finest galleries on earth.

SENATOR WOOD.- You are yourself an artist?

DR. LANGER.- Somewhat of an artist.

SENATOR WOOD.- Your wife is the art critic of the Brisbane Courier-Mail?

DR. LANGER.- Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN.- You have gone into these questions very thoroughly?

DR. LANGER.- Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN.- Do you know your wife's views on this matter?

DR. LANGER.- They are practically the same as mine.

SENATOR WOOD.- I suppose it is right to say that at this late stage it is useless our trying to compete with the great art galleries of the world in the securing of pictures and that therefore the alternative is your suggestion about prints?

DR. LANGER.- Yes.

SENATOR WOOD.- Are you keen on the use of statuary and sculpture in a city like Canberra?

DR. LANGER.- Sculpture on buildings, yes, and monuments for important people who do something of importance for the nation. They need not depict human beings.

SENATOR WOOD.- Would you prefer symbolic sculpture rather than human figures? Do you think it would be more attractive?

DR. LANGER.- Yes, or a big obelisk which would help the lay out.

SENATOR HANNAFORD.- Such as the Nelson Column in London?

DR. LANGER.- Yes.

SENATOR WOOD.- It would need to be at the end of The Mall?

DR. LANGER.- Yes.

SENATOR WOOD.- Are there any worthwhile Australian sculptors at the moment who could be commissioned to execute such sculpture?

DR. LANGER.- Yes, there is one in Brisbane.

SENATOR WOOD.- The Royal Military College authorities desire to keep a piece of land at Mount Pleasant on which the Department of the Interior wishes to establish a residential area. The Military College wishes to use it for manoeuvres. Do you think it is better, in view of what you have said about bombing targets, that until anything further is done about Duntroon that that area

be retained by the College so that residences can be kept away from Duntroon?

DR. LANGER.- Definitely.

SENATOR WOOD.- Your purpose in coming here to give evidence arose from a desire to help to make the national capital a truly national capital?

DR. LANGER.- Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN.- Do you think, once we have got the plan straightened out, and in order that there should be a sort of permanent guardianship over it, that there should be a permanent town planner always here, or do you think we should call in somebody from time to time?

DR. LANGER.- A man of great stature would not be content to be permanent anywhere. A man who is set aside to sit here all his life may not be impressive.

THE CHAIRMAN.- Would you call in someone from time to time?

DR. LANGER.- Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN.- Do you think there should be a Consultative Council like the Fine Arts Commission of Washington?

DR. LANGER.- Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN.- Would you suggest that such a council be composed of architects and an engineer?

DR. LANGER.- Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN.- And a connoisseur of the fine arts who is an artist of great stature?

DR. LANGER.- Yes. I would be careful with the artist however, to ensure that he is not one who belongs to a certain school because he would want only a certain style. I am thinking of men like John Moore in Sydney.

THE CHAIRMAN.- I think that government is related to town planning. Have you any opinions about the government of this city? You need not answer if you do not feel disposed to.

DR. LANGER.- I would sooner leave that to somebody else.

CANBERRA SENATE COMMITTEE.

SENATOR WOOD.- Do you think the type of men we should bring in to overhaul the plan should be a consultant town planner who would be engaged for the occasion in a consultative capacity?

DR. LANGER.- Yes, but in such a way that if he is not satisfactory there need be no strife.

SENATOR WOOD.- If his plan is successful he would be the man to help carry it to completion?

DR. LANGER.- Yes.

SENATOR WOOD.- Do you think it would take a town planner long to overhaul the Canberra plan?

DR. LANGER.- No. The whole survey and the drawing up of the plan of Washington was done in half a year.

SENATOR WOOD.- In what time do you reckon you could overhaul this plan?

DR. LANGER. In half a year.

THE COMMITTEE ADJOURNED.