

(Taken at Yarralumla.)

MONDAY, 9TH APRIL, 1923.

Present:

Mr. GREGORY, Chairman;	
Senator Foll,	Mr. Cook,
Senator Newland,	Mr. Jackson,
Senator Plain,	Mr. Mackay.
Mr. Blakeley,	

John Smith Murdoch, Chief Architect, Department of Works and Railways, recalled and further examined.

106. *To the Chairman.*—There would be no architectural obstacle to re-arranging the plan of the two legislative chambers so that direct access would be given from the floor of the chambers to private gardens at the rear of the Chairs. By bringing forward the east and west flanks of the building so that they projected in front of the main building, an open space 48 feet by 44 feet would be provided at the end of each chamber, or, if the corridors were included, the space would be 70 feet by 45 feet, and the rooms which would be displaced by the gardens would be provided in the forward extension of the plan. Alternatively, the room for the Assistant Clerk of the House of Representatives and the ante-room to the south of the Senate chamber might be converted into corridors, giving access from the chambers by way of the centre gangway to the enclosed gardens already shewn in the plan. That would be a very good arrangement. From the floor of each chamber the lawns and shrubberies could be seen, and at the same time there would be improved lighting and ventilation without the light troubling members' eyes. In order to provide a garden for the exclusive use of members, there is no reason whatever why the garden between the newspaper reading room and the dining room should not be glazed. If swing glass doors were put across the corridor in front of the dining room and at the end of a verandah created along the length of the newspaper reading room facing the garden, an open space 38 feet by 56 feet, or, including verandah corridors, 60 feet by 56 feet, would be provided. To that garden there would be direct access from the newspaper room. As more work is done by the *Hansard* staff in the House of Representatives than in the Senate, the accommodation now proposed for that staff on the Senate side could be transferred to the House of Representatives side. If the telegraph office and post office were combined in the one room on the Representatives side of the central corridor, the room at present provided on the Senate side for a telegraph office would be made available for some other purpose. Press messages will be sent from the press rooms to the telegraph office by pneumatic tubes, and thence transmitted by tubes to the central post and telegraph office, which will be in one of the administrative buildings. Means could be devised by which press messages could go direct to the administrative buildings. One pneumatic tube might be sufficient, but I think it would be desirable to have a duplicate as a protection against breakdown. Attached to the *Hansard* rooms are a number of cubicles for dictation. Each measures 8 ft. 6 in. by 8 feet, and is supplied with through air and natural light. They are situated along a corridor, 10 feet wide, leading from the centre of the building to the dining and billiard rooms. It is probable that the sound from the dictation cubicles will pass through the glass partitions into the rooms of the reporters, but it could be entirely deadened by double glass partitions.

107. *To Mr. Blakeley.*—It would not be practicable to transfer the dictation cubicles from the corridor to the side of the rooms overlooking the gardens, because the reporters' rooms are much larger than the cubicles and would require more air and light. The interven-

tion of the dictating cubicles would interfere with the ventilation and natural lighting of the reporters' rooms.

108. *To Senator Newland.*—The *Hansard* staff will require to use the same corridor as is used by members passing from the debating chambers into the dining room, billiard room, and newspaper room.

109. *To Mr. Blakeley.*—Each of the two press rooms now shown on the plan could be divided into three rooms 10 feet by 9 feet, and the other room corresponding, which is not allotted, would provide four rooms, of the same dimensions, making a total of ten rooms, each 10 feet by 9 feet, immediately behind the press galleries.

110. *To the Chairman.*—If there are to be between 35 and 40 pressmen in regular attendance at Parliament House, with the possibility of the number ultimately increasing to 60, additional accommodation can be provided by adding a second storey on each side central block of Parliament House. The press could be accommodated on the upper floor. That extension would provide an additional 5,300 super feet of floor space on each side, which could be apportioned as may be desired. Such rooms would be thoroughly lighted, and those not allotted to the press could be utilized for the expansion of other parliamentary functions. If the pressmen were placed upon such second floors, there would be no necessity for them to enter the corridors surrounding the chambers on the ground floor. They could have separate access to Parliament House under the connecting verandah between the front building and the two central flanking buildings, ascend a special stairway to the upper floor, and pass over covered verandahs now connecting the central buildings and the side buildings on to the flat roofs surrounding the Senate and House of Representatives, and thence into the press galleries. If more gallery accommodation in the chamber is to be provided, the press rooms now shown on the plan must be sacrificed. I think that the gallery accommodation provided for the public will be sufficient, because in the early stages of Canberra there will not be the same number of people desirous of hearing the debates as there are in Melbourne. The plans provide seating for 105 persons in the House of Representatives galleries and for 80 persons in the Senate gallery. Large galleries, unless fully used, become dusty and unhygienic. But if it be desired to increase the gallery accommodation for the public, the press rooms, now shewn on the plan, could be converted into public galleries and the pressmen accommodated on the upper stories of the two central wings. According to the plan, the press gallery will be 11 feet above the floor of the chamber and will project 6 feet over the walls. A 5-ft. projection might be sufficient, but even 6 feet would not affect the acoustics. All that is required in the press gallery is a passage-way 2 feet wide, and a desk and seat occupying another 2 ft. 10 in. It might be advisable to retain the 6-ft. gallery so that on special occasions, when the accommodation is heavily taxed, standing room behind the seats would be available. The proposal to install double desks for members in the debating chamber is excellent. If that system of seating be adopted for a House of 75 members, a chamber 50 feet by 48 feet would be required; for 100 members, 57 feet by 48 feet; and for 120 members, 63 feet by 48 feet. The House of Representatives chamber as designed is 56 feet by 48 feet, and provides accommodation for 112 members seated on benches similar to those in the present Federal Parliament House. The adoption of the double-desk system will not involve the enlargement of the chamber to any great extent.

111. *To Senator Newland.*—I think the best place for the Senate club-room is on the right of the main entrance vestibule, as shown on the plan. Senators may enter their club-room from the main portico and

viâ the terrace and the loggia. If necessary, independent access from the Senate chamber to the club-room can be contrived.

112. *To the Chairman.*—The proposal to accommodate the Public Works Committee and the Public Accounts Committee on the suggested upper story is excellent. Those Committees would then be able to have bigger and better lighted rooms. I suggest that any extension of the building should be within the area we have appropriated in the draft plan. The south-eastern corner of the building is already set 10 feet into the bank of the hill, and it is impossible to extend the ground area of the plan in that direction. The site is not suitable for a wider area of buildings. The first and most desirable process of extension would be the creation of a lower story under the two central wings on either side of the library and newspaper room. The *Hansard* staff and the other officers at present accommodated on the ground floor in those wings could be extended to the rooms below. There would be more room for the librarian and his staff, and a room could be provided in which the public, by consent of the Speaker or President, could refer to books or documents in the Parliamentary library.

113. *To Mr. Jackson.*—The draft plan does not include a gymnasium for members, because it is thought that such accommodation will be more appropriate in the buildings which must ultimately be erected for the accommodation of senators and members, similar to the club-houses of the United States Parliament. The addition of a story to the wings on either side of the library will not affect the lighting of the library in any way. I think the proposed House will give most comfortable accommodation for an Australian Parliament.

114. *To Mr. Blakeley.*—No dining room has been specially provided for the press, but adjoining the dining room for the officers are three unallotted rooms, 22 x 15 feet, 15 x 11 feet, and 19 x 15 feet respectively, all connected with the services from the kitchen and they could be allotted to the press if the principle of supplying meals to pressmen be approved.

115. *To Mr. Cook.*—If the Committee decides that one room will accommodate both the post-office and the telegraph services, the vacated room would be very suitable for further accommodation for the messengers. This plan is based on the assumption that during the life of this provisional building the House of Representatives may grow to have 112 members, and the Senate 80 members. Party accommodation has been provided for three parties in the House of Representatives and two in the Senate. Subsidiary party accommodation may be provided to any extent by enlarging the building.

116. *To the Chairman.*—The proposed building has been designed in accordance with the view of the Advisory Committee that even after the permanent Parliament House has been erected on Camp Hill, immediately behind the site of the provisional building, the latter will continue to be utilized. The whole architectural scheme has been to keep the provisional building flat, so that the view from the permanent Parliament House will be interfered with as little as possible. If the kitchen and dining room accommodation were extended to two stories, the view from Camp Hill would be detrimentally affected. The ceiling of the dining room is 14 feet high, and the apex of the roof is just equal to the height of the top of the library building. It would not be wise to increase that height. I shall prepare for the Committee an estimate of the cost of a temporary wood and iron building suitable to accommodate Parliament for a period of eight or ten years. Bath room accommodation has been reduced to a minimum, because it is thought that that will be provided in the buildings to be probably erected on each side of Parliament House for the accommodation of senators and members respectively. There is a lavatory for messengers off the central corridor, but, according to the draft plan, the *Hansard* staff will require to use the

members' lavatory off the central corridor. If further lavatory accommodation is required in the two wings on either side of the library, it can be provided in a lower story. I suggest that such lower stories be built; the extra cost will not be very great. Brickwork at Canberra to-day is costing about £35 or £36 per rod. Brickwork in the Perth Post Office at the height at which operations are now proceeding is costing, with allowances, £47 16s. per rod, but there is no comparison between the two prices, because one is work of a very high class, done at a high elevation. For similar cottage buildings, the brickwork would cost practically the same in Perth as in Canberra. The brickwork in the foundations of the hostel, which was carried out by the Department, is of excellent quality and cost about £36 per rod. It is better work than that put into the school building which was erected by contract. The solid earth floors in the hostel building will not involve any additional cost. A certain amount of excavation had to be done, and instead of carting the spoil away we have used it for filling in, so that we may have solid concrete floors topped with 3-inch jarrah, secret nailed. Brick piers, bearers, joists and flooring boards would cost practically as much as the solid floor we are laying.

The witness withdrew.

Thomas Hill, Engineer, Department of Works and Railways, sworn and examined.

117. *To the Chairman.*—In my previous evidence I dealt with the water supply for Canberra. In addition to that, I am responsible for the sewerage, storm-water drainage, paths and streets, hot water, electric lighting, heating, ventilation, and cooking services in connexion with the proposed provisional Parliament House. Our proposal is to heat the chamber and corridors by hot water from a boiler in the basement fitted with pump circulation and wall radiators. The heating will extend to the library, dining rooms and main rooms throughout the building, and proper attention will be paid to the corridors. No provision has been made for electrical heating, but in wiring the building a number of plugs will be installed which can be used for electric radiators if so desired. We do not propose to build fireplaces. The building will be made warm by the hot-water system, and will remain so. Experience of these services shows that they do not often go wrong; the mechanism is simplicity itself, consisting only of a boiler and pipes with a pump to force the circulation. The temperature of the building can be regulated throughout the year to about 62 degrees. The main sewer will pass directly along the streets between the proposed site for the provisional Parliament House and the administrative offices and connexions with Parliament House will be made by means of 9-inch pipes. It is anticipated that the sewer will be laid to within a handy distance by the time the building is erected and ready for connexion. I should say that the sewer would be ready in eighteen months, and if Parliament House is completed as expected, in two and a half years, we will be able to connect it direct with the main sewer. The storm water will be led into the Molonglo River by separate pipes. The estimated cost of the storm-water system is approximately £5,700. Up to the present time no scheme of artificial ventilation has been proposed, and the plan of the building is such that I do not anticipate that a ventilation plant will be required. The chambers are designed with high windows through which will come direct light and air. But in case it may be necessary to install a ventilation plant later we are providing a large boiler chamber. I know the Canberra climate well, and having examined the records of temperature I quite expect that natural ventilation will be sufficient, assuming, of course, that the windows are properly used. If ventilation be found necessary, provision will be made for the introduction of fresh air underneath the seats in the chambers, with separate control at each

seat, so that every member may regulate the ventilation to suit himself. The ventilation plant in Federal House, Melbourne, was installed many years ago by the Department of Works and Railways, but the maintenance of it has never been intrusted to us, and therefore we acknowledge no responsibility for the results. With that plant, the only means of getting the moisture out of the atmosphere on a hot day is the use of cool water or ice. To be made thoroughly efficient that plant requires the addition of some method of cooling. The plant was designed principally as a heating system, and at the time of its installation knowledge of air conditioning had not reached the stage to which it has since developed. At Canberra the air is usually dry and the temperature low. Hot water will be extended to the bath rooms and lavatories of the provisional Parliament House by connexion with the same boiler as supplies steam for cooking purposes in the kitchen. Vacuum cleaning by means of a pipe system is provided for. In the hostel electrically driven cleaners will be used, but for a larger building we prefer the pipe system, by which the building is piped throughout, and the tube on the sweeper is connected direct to a plug in the skirting. The dust is led into the pipes and either washed into the sewer or burnt. Only one boiler will be required in the basement. This system of vacuum cleaning may be seen in operation in the General Post Office, Melbourne, and has an advantage over electrical cleaners in that it is cheaper and does not involve double handling of the dust. In regard to the cooking arrangements, it is proposed to install 1 10 ft. x 4 ft. central range and 1 independent grill; alternatively 1 roasting oven and 1 grill with hot plate extension; 1 pastry oven; 2 carving and serving tables, with hot presses under; 2 5-gallon steam jacketed pans; 2 10-gallon steam jacketed pans; 1 20-gallon steam jacketed pan; 1 45-gallon steam jacketed stock pot; 3 3-chamber steam cookers; 1 dish-washing machine; 1 pot sink. The steam will be supplied from a low-pressure cast-iron boiler located in the basement under the kitchen. It will supply steam and hot water for the lavatories and baths. A separate boiler to be used during only portion of the year will supply the heating. Cool stores will be provided with ice trays and accommodation for ice storage. Anything in the way of a modern kitchen installation in either Sydney or Melbourne is kept constantly under observation by the Department. We have inspected the kitchens at Scott's Hotel, Carlyon's Hotel, and Menzies' Hotel, Melbourne; and the Australia Hotel, the Carlton Hotel, and Usher's Hotel in Sydney. A dish-washing plant is essential; it is clean and labour-saving. All the equipment proposed for the provisional Parliament House will be of the most modern type. The estimates of cost are:—For heating, £5,000; hot-water service, £1,200; vacuum cleaning, £2,500; kitchen equipment, £3,000; total, £11,700. Paths and streets are estimated to cost £2,000. I do not think that the Parliament House grounds should be fenced. Open spaces with curbing at the street channels and gardens at the side would be preferable. The library will be equipped with small book lifts.

118. *To Mr. Jackson.*—The estimate of £3,000 for the kitchen is accounted for principally by equipment, plumbing and fitting. I suppose the boiler, which will also serve the lavatories and bath rooms, will cost about £350, and the plumbing about £1,200. The balance of the expenditure will be for fittings and connexions, including the lavatories and bath rooms. Cutlery and service for the dining room will be a separate item.

119. *To Mr. Blakeley.*—The most modern hot-water service that the Committee can inspect is that installed in the General Post Office and the Commonwealth Offices, Melbourne; whilst the most up-to-date air-conditioning plant is that at the Collingwood automatic telephone exchange, which cost £3,500, including ducts to the machinery and compressed air for

blowing dust from the frames and fine instruments. The plant is electrically driven and only requires regulating, *i.e.*, put into use when required and discontinued when not required. The telephone staff are able to attend to it, and if a similar plant were installed at Parliament House one attendant could look after it. The machinery is simply a system of levers and gauges. In connexion with telephone exchanges, the Postal Department accepts the responsibility for watching the thermometers; and at Parliament House thermometers will be situated in different portions of the building so that the attendants may observe that the atmospheric conditions are the same throughout. One man should be detailed to look after this mechanism under direction and control. This work would not take up more than half-an-hour per day of his time. A man doing other duties, such as attending to the library, could well look after the ventilating plant also. Without proper direction the best ventilating plant will fail; properly directed, an inferior plant may give satisfactory results.

120. *To Senator Newland.*—I do not think the precincts of the chamber will ever require special ventilation; but if artificial ventilation be necessary, a good system for conditioning the air in both chambers could be installed for £4,000. That could be done later, without disfigurement of the walls. The proposals of the Department of Works and Railways in regard to sewerage and water supply have been approved by the Advisory Committee. The mere house connexions are a minor matter.

121. *To Senator Newland.*—In connexion with the sanitary arrangements the most up-to-date silent flushers will be installed. We are well satisfied with the results achieved by the air-conditioning plant at Collingwood telephone exchange. We have tested it through a season with hourly readings, and the results have been so satisfactory that we are taking action straightway to install similar plants in 30 other exchanges.

122. *To the Chairman.*—At the Collingwood exchange moisture is taken from the atmosphere in winter by means of radiators, and in summer by means of an ammonia compressor. With the reduction of temperature the atmosphere drops its superabundant moisture. As I have already said, we do not think that artificial ventilation will be required, but if it should be our proposals will be to introduce fresh air under the seats rather than to draw off the vitiated air at the floor level. I do not approve of the latter method. I submit to the Committee the following comparative statement of prices of bricks and coal at Canberra, Queanbeyan, and various capital cities:—

Canberra.—Bricks—At kiln, £4 per 1,000; delivered in city area, £4 15s. per 1,000. Coal—Delivered at Canberra brickworks, £2 5s. per ton.

Perth.—Bricks—At kiln, 1st class, £3 6s. per 1,000; at kiln, 2nd class, £3 4s. per 1,000; delivered at Perth, 1st class, £4 5s. per 1,000; delivered at Perth, 2nd class, £4 3s. per 1,000. Coal—At the mine, £1 per ton; delivered at Perth, £1 12s. per ton.

Adelaide.—Bricks—At the kiln, £3 18s. per 1,000; delivered at Adelaide, £4 15s. per 1,000. Coal—Delivered at Adelaide, £2 9s. per ton.

Sydney.—Bricks—At the kiln, State Brick Works, £2 13s. per 1,000; Metropolitan Brick Co., £3 12s. per 1,000. Delivered G.P.O., State Brick Works, £3 19s. per 1,000; Metropolitan Brick Co., £4 14s. per 1,000. Coal—Delivered Sydney, large coal, £1 16s. 2d. per ton; small coal, £1 12s. 3d. per ton.

Melbourne.—Bricks—At the kiln, £3 per 1,000; delivered G.P.O., £3 17s. per 1,000. Coal—Delivered, large, £2 2s. per ton; small, £1 18s. per ton.

Queanbeyan.—Bricks—1st class, £6 per 1,000; 2nd class, £5 per 1,000, at the kiln.

123. *To Mr. Jackson.*—The brickworks were operating full time until lately. We cannot produce bricks below £4 per 1,000, which covers all charges, including amortization, based on the production of

5,000,000 bricks per annum for twenty years. There is plenty of shale in the vicinity, and the kiln will always be there. Wood would be a more costly fuel than coal, and would not produce the same quality of brick. We hope to produce roofing tiles at £14 per £1,000. We have made them satisfactorily by hand, and the mechanical plant has now been started. The machine tiles are not quite satisfactory yet, but in time they will be quite as good as the bricks. The use of oil fuel in a brick kiln is not practicable; it does not give the same length of flame as one gets from coal. I anticipate that we shall use our own tiles for Parliament House and the administrative offices. We aim at turning out 15,000 tiles per week shortly. The present price of tiles in Sydney is £17 10s. per 1,000, which, with freight and allowance for breakages, would represent about £22 at rail-head. We anticipate being able to make flooring tiles also; in fact, all kinds of pottery that is made from brown clays for building purposes, including ventilators and special sewerage fittings. But we do not contemplate doing glazed work. The ventilators already produced at Canberra are better than those we are getting from Sydney. The experience we have had with tenders shows that for a hollow wall brick construction is cheaper than concrete; with a solid wall concrete might prove the less costly, but that is not practicable. For a building of the type of Parliament House, brick work is best, but for a building like the power-house concrete is superior. The nearest stone for foundation work of which I know is the granite at Tharwa, about 16 miles away. We have exposed there a quarry of very good granite. Beyond that, I know of no suitable stone in the Territory. Of course, we get limestone at Fairy Meadows. Trachyte would be too costly to work. The trachyte quarries are about 130 miles away. If columns were required at the entrance to Parliament House it would be necessary to go to Tharwa for granite, or to Fairy Meadows for limestone.

(Taken at Yarralumla.)

WEDNESDAY, 11TH APRIL, 1923.

Present:

Mr. GREGORY, Chairman;

Senator Foll,	Mr. Cook,
Senator Newland,	Mr. Jackson,
Senator Plain,	Mr. Mackay.

John Thomas Hill Goodwin, Surveyor-General and Director of Lands, sworn and examined.

124. *To the Chairman.*—I occupy the position of Officer administering the Territory for seat of Government, and I am also a member of the Federal Capital Advisory Committee. The idea which governed the Committee in selecting the sites for the hostels, administrative offices, and temporary Parliament House was that the buildings erected thereon would not be in the way when the monumental buildings were erected. To the north of the site proposed for the temporary Parliament House is a high knoll which commands a good view of the surrounding country, but according to Mr. Griffin's scheme that elevation must be eventually lowered. For that reason it would not be a suitable place on which to place the provisional Parliament House. If the provisional Parliament House were placed on that site it would quite upset the scheme for the ultimate development of the official triangle. In most capital cities the House of Parliament is the most monumental building. A suggestion has been made that as Kurrajong Hill is the dominating natural feature of the landscape, it is the most appropriate site for the permanent Parliament House. At the present time, certain records are being taken in order to ascertain whether the wind pressure is greater there than on

Camp Hill, the site proposed by Mr. Griffin, for Parliament House. I understand that in placing the Capitol upon Kurrajong Hill Mr. Griffin intended the erection there of a highly monumental building as a crowning architectural feature. If I were responsible for the designing of the Federal Capital I would place the monumental Parliament House on Kurrajong Hill, because there it would be the dominating architectural feature, and would be visible from all directions. A Parliament House on Camp Hill will be seen only from the east and the north, and not at all from the south. To the west there will be practically no settlement.

The witness withdrew.

(Taken at Sydney.)

THURSDAY, 12TH APRIL, 1923.

Present:

Mr. GREGORY, Chairman;

Senator Foll	Mr. Cook
Senator Newland	Mr. Jackson
Senator Plain	Mr. Mackay.
Mr. Blakeley	

Ernest Macartney de Burgh, M. Inst. C.E., Chief Engineer for Water Supply and Sewerage, New South Wales, sworn and examined.

125. *To the Chairman.*—I am a member of the Federal Capital Advisory Committee. As the number of workmen increases at Canberra, it may become necessary to establish camps for them as we do on some of the large State public works. Some of the old internment camp buildings are available for the men, and the officials in charge are renting cottages. I see no necessity for pressing on with the building of cottages in order to deal with the class of men employed upon construction work. Provision might be made in permanent cottages so far as they may be required for men who remain there, but I cannot imagine that a large proportion of the workers employed in building the Federal Capital will permanently settle there. I admit that the accommodation at present provided is not sufficient to induce good tradesmen to go there with their wives and families. The provision of cottages that could be let at a low rental would be advantageous within reasonable limits. I would not like to commit myself to a large building programme for the accommodation of a construction staff, which might exceed the requirements of the public after the immediate construction work was complete. Up to 100 cottages, which could be made available at low rentals, might be provided. It would be very desirable to build cottages cheaper than those already erected if it could be done, but the inability to put in hand a large number of cottages at one time has militated against economy in construction. The cost of some of the cottages now being erected exceeds £1,200, and the rental will be very high. We should endeavour to provide accommodation at a cheaper rate. If an officer stationed in Sydney or Melbourne is transferred for public purposes to Canberra, and the transfer is adverse to him in respect of the rental for which he can obtain accommodation for himself and family, he should receive an allowance. That is the practice in the Public Service of the State. For instance, if we send an officer on to one of our big works in an isolated place where there are no buildings, we provide him with accommodation free of charge. Again, if an officer is sent into a country town under conditions that put him at a disadvantage, it is the responsibility of his Department to make good his loss. It is the business of the Government to construct cottages at Canberra as cheaply as possible, consistent with efficiency, and if an officer suffers any disability through residing there it should be

rectified by the Department to which he belongs. I would be in favour of the construction of cheap cottages at Canberra, provided that the architects can construct them of such a design that they will not be a blemish on the city. The Advisory Committee recommended that an architectural competition should be held for the design and lay-out of a group of residences for the higher officers on the administrative side of the city. A similar competition might well be held with regard to workmen's cottages. If wooden houses can be built with economy, I would favour their construction. The Advisory Committee fixed the area of the building blocks on Ainslie-avenue. The then Prime Minister, Mr. Hughes, took exception to the small area provided, but the Committee took the view that if the areas allotted to individual cottages were too large, they would be neglected, and that it would be better to keep the areas relatively small, and maintain a pleasing appearance in the pathways and front gardens, and perhaps in a central garden or park under the control of the municipal authorities. I think that policy is sound. I have given full consideration to the water supply in relation to the fire risk, and the sizes of the pipes from the main reservoir to the city were adopted on my recommendation. In regard to the allocation of hydrants, it is my practice to take the advice of the fire fighting chiefs who are also the best judges as to whether plugs or hydrants should be installed in the streets. There is no doubt that the water mains will be completed before Parliament House is ready for occupation, and I see no reason why the sewers also should not be ready for connexion to the buildings in three years' time. I have not made any final recommendation in regard to the treatment of sewage. When the sewerage scheme for the Capital was under consideration, and the site for the treatment works was recommended, I pointed out that it would be advisable to defer the final decision as to the method of treatment until the last possible moment in order to avail ourselves of the latest observations of methods of treatment at present in vogue, or anything new that might develop in the meantime. Colonel Longley, of the Rockefeller Institute, who makes a special study of this matter, has been on a visit to Australia. The institute has a fund for sending scientific investigators to different parts of the world to investigate special problems. Colonel Longley has discussed this matter with us very fully, and we anticipate installing a treatment plant at Western Creek. The whole of the treatment works need not be constructed at once; the nucleus can be provided and added to as the population of the city increases. We have been considering the installation of the first units, and we will finalize our plan before the driving of the sewer is completed. Colonel Longley has been in touch with me in regard to sewerage matters in this State. He has also visited Queensland and Canberra, and we have been very pleased to have the opportunity of consulting a man who specializes on this subject. Colonel Longley is entirely in accordance with my views in regard to the removal of the sewage from the city to Western Creek, and treatment there to the extent necessary to protect the rivers from pollution by the effluent. We are now engaged in bringing the details up to what we consider the most modern standard. In a legislative capital the most prominent building, in my opinion, should be the House of Parliament, and therefore Kurradjong Hill suggests itself to me as a suitable site for Parliament House. I am strongly opposed to the erection of a permanent building of any kind, the purpose of which is not very thoroughly defined. In my opinion the monumental Parliament House should occupy the site allocated in Mr. Griffin's plan to the Capitol. If the provisional Parliament House is placed on the site recommended by the Advisory Committee, it will not interfere with the subsequent placing of the monumental Parliament House on Kurradjong Hill. The Committee did consider

various sites for Parliament House, and we came to the conclusion that that building should not be placed away from the main axis, and cause development about it which would not be symmetrical with the design. I approve of the construction of a provisional Parliament House with a life of, say, fifty years. The financial loss involved in erecting a temporary Parliament House for, say, ten years, would not be warranted, and I am afraid that if that policy were adopted, Parliament would remain in those premises indefinitely. As to the purpose for which the provisional Parliament House will be used when the monumental structure is erected, one cannot with advantage endeavour to form opinions on matters so remote. This provisional building should be regarded as intended for parliamentary purposes only. I have in mind a provisional building dignified and plain, but replete with conveniences for the Legislature, leaving the erection of a great monumental structure until occasion and circumstances warrant.

126. *To Senator Plain.*—I should say that at Canberra iron houses would be cheaper than wooden ones, but if a plebiscite of a large number of people were taken there would be a majority in favour of wooden houses; that is partly due to association. I personally prefer the iron painted white, with red tiled roofs. I do not say that the erection of 100 additional cottages for workmen will meet all requirements during the construction stage, but we would be fully justified in building that number. The Advisory Committee has laid down a certain building programme up to the date the Federal Parliament will meet at Canberra, say, three years after the commencement of the provisional Parliament House. To what extent the capital will develop subsequently is entirely problematical. My own view is that once Parliament meets there the whole circumstances will alter in regard to the opportunities given to private enterprise, and the general programme of construction. The Advisory Committee recommended the erection of a number of dwellings, and if there are many workmen in excess of that accommodation, they can be housed in temporary structures. We cannot build cottages at once in readiness for a big army of workmen. So far our construction has been limited to brick work. We called for tenders for the erection of concrete houses as an alternative, but the response was not satisfactory. I personally would be quite prepared to consider the erection of wooden houses in order to bring the accommodation within reasonable measure of requirements.

127. *To Mr. Cook.*—Tenders for the driving of the sewer tunnels were invited, and the Department of Works and Railways decided to carry out the work departmentally on the estimate made by Mr. Hill, in accordance with the lines laid down on plans recommended by the Advisory Committee. The construction either by contract or day labour is a matter for the Department of Works and Railways. More hard rock has been encountered in the tunnels than was anticipated. If the Advisory Committee were given authority to construct a large number of cottages, we could, if we thought it desirable, call for competitive designs for these cottages, have designs prepared by the Department, or adopt both courses, with a view to getting the most economical design and most effective grouping, and then we could invite tenders for the construction in such numbers as would probably tend to cheapen the cost. I see no objection to the use of wood; the important considerations are the grouping and design of the buildings. The construction of the Federal Capital should be expedited in every possible way if the work is to be done economically.

128. *To Senator Foll.*—I do not consider that single wall construction would be suitable at Canberra on account of the cold winter. For wooden houses I would use the weatherboard on the outside walls and fibro-cement linings inside. Canberra is probably colder than Stanthorpe (Queensland) where, I understand,

single-walled wooden houses are found satisfactory if surrounded by a verandah. Of course timber will shrink if it is green, but weatherboard with a good rebate will allow for shrinking. We are using single wall construction in the temporary accommodation for workmen, but not in permanent buildings.

129. *To Senator Newland.*—It is the function of the Advisory Committee to make recommendations to the Minister for Works and Railways. We have no executive powers. The Minister approves or rejects our proposals, and instructs his departmental officers accordingly. Plans for proposed buildings at Canberra are submitted to the Advisory Committee. In fact, the plans for the provisional Parliament House have been prepared after consultation with members of the Committee. Should the Committee see anything objectionable or inadvisable in the plans submitted by the Department, it would be a matter for discussion with Colonel Owen, and amendment, if necessary, would follow. The suggested site of the provisional Parliament House will require some levelling, but it will not be a serious matter. The rear of the building will be let 10 feet or 12 feet deeper into the hill side, but I am sure that the architects will allow clearance enough to avoid damp, and insure good lighting and ventilation. I do not approve of the knoll to the north of the suggested site as a site for the provisional Parliament House. That building is not to be altogether temporary, and, therefore, it should be axial to the main design. We should conform to Mr. Griffin's lay-out as much as possible. There will be in this block plantations and gardens, and road making, notably planting, to which I attach the greatest importance, with a view to the ultimate development of the scheme, and they will group satisfactorily around the provisional parliamentary building if it is located, as has been proposed, slightly to the north of Camp Hill. A provisional Parliament House on the knoll would not interfere with the ultimate construction of a monumental building on the higher ground towards Kurrajong Hill. The proposal made by the Advisory Committee some time ago that a conference hall should be erected at Canberra to be subsequently embodied in the provisional Parliament House was in response to a sudden demand from the Government for the treatment of the problem in that way. That idea has lapsed. We have discussed very frequently the construction of workmen's cottages at such a price as would permit of cheap rentals being charged. Economy in construction depends to a large extent on the authorization of a fairly extensive programme. In regard to the better class of houses for single officials, we have already recommended that an architectural competition be instituted, but with them as with cheaper cottages, you must have authority to build a large number. So long as we are limited to the construction of two or three houses here and there, we can only utilize the material we have got, and consequently the buildings cost more. If we are given authority to proceed with our programme, as set out in our reports, and sufficient funds are allotted to enable us to go ahead definitely, I think we can get better results. Our suggested competition for design and lay-out of a block of buildings applied to a more expensive type of house to be rented by officials drawing £800, £1,000, or more per annum. In respect of cottages for the workmen, there would be no need to enforce a particular lay-out. We cannot get the cost of construction down to an economical limit if we are not given a programme which will enable us to handle work competently in bulk. I see no objection to wooden houses being interspersed amongst brick buildings, provided the design is satisfactory. The fire risk to the block would not be increased.

130. *To Mr. Mackay.*—The Advisory Committee was constituted on the 22nd January, 1921, and its *personnel* has remained unchanged. The leasehold

principle in respect of Federal Territory lands was laid down in the Seat of Government Act. I am opposed to private individuals being granted building leases yet. The construction of the capital is not far enough advanced, and the public mind is not sufficiently assured that Parliament will transfer to Canberra within a short period to enable a proper value to be obtained from the leasing of the land. I cannot conceive of any man taking a lease to build at Canberra in the absence of absolute certainty that the Parliament will sit there within a definite time. The mere approval by Parliament of the erection of the legislative building will not be sufficient; money must be appropriated for the purpose. I do not think that immediate leasing with reappraisalment in five years would meet the situation. I would almost say that the lands cannot be properly dealt with until Parliament actually meets there. The present loss of 25 per cent. of rental value on the houses already erected is not serious in connexion with the building of a new city. I do not think the loss to the taxpayer will be very large when the construction programme is proceeded with vigorously. I do not approve of immediate leasing and early reappraisalment. At the request of the Government the Advisory Committee have outlined a scheme—a sort of *Crédit Foncier* system—by which financial assistance may be given to officials to erect homes at Canberra. I am not setting aside the unanimous report of the Committee, but I, as a member of the public, would not pay for a lease at Canberra, and erect a house at my own cost, until I was definitely assured of the date on which Parliament would meet there.

131. *To Mr. Blakeley.*—I think that the Government should proceed at once with the erection of up to 100 cottages for workmen. The Committee should have the authorization and be allowed to use their own business judgment as to the number of cottages to be erected at a time. If the construction of a large number of cottages at the one time were approved, there might be a reduction in cost by the use of different materials and the letting of larger contracts. It may be possible to improve the design also. The administrative buildings, which are to be of wood and iron, are definitely characterized as temporary structures, but the brick cottages already built are permanent. That is the reason for an apparent anomaly. The housing of Parliament, even though it be not in a monumental building, warrants the construction of an edifice superior to the administrative offices. I should not be opposed to the use of almost any material for workmen's cottages, provided that the line, colour, and roofing were right. Projecting eaves are justifiable; they are an important adjunct to the roof of an Australian cottage. I think enclosed verandahs were adopted with the idea of getting the bathroom one side, and the sanitary accommodation on the opposite side. Before those cottages were built, the Committee examined an enormous number of plans of soldiers' cottages erected in different States. Competitive designs for an economical cottage might very well be sought, but hitherto the authorizations have hardly been sufficiently large to warrant the adoption of that course.

132. *To Mr. Jackson.*—It might be possible for the Administration to fix the annual value of a few hundred building blocks, but if, after the Government have encouraged the public servant to take up a block of land and build on the *Crédit Foncier* system, the establishment of the Federal Capital is delayed, he will then have no use for his house. As a servant of the Government, he will have some redress; but if the ordinary public are encouraged to do that, they will have no redress. I think the proper course is for the Government to build the cottages; the Government must take the responsibility of providing accommodation for their officers. It should be possible to get sufficient workmen to build the provisional Parliament House, the hostel, the administrative offices, and a number of cottages, in

three years. Our programme leaves a large proportion of the building to private enterprise if it will come in. No doubt the carrying on of a great deal of work at Canberra will harden the prices of material and labour. I am satisfied that Parliament House, the hostels, and administrative offices can be built in three years from the date of authorization. Extremely pleasing bungalows of timber can be built quickly. In the architectural competition which we suggested, the range of material was left very wide.

133. *To the Chairman.*—A railway across the river would be of great advantage during the construction period, but I do not think it is absolutely essential. The Committee did recommend the extension of the railway.

134. *To Mr. Cook.*—There is an old saying that a man should not pay more in rent than he earns in one day, but my experience is that to-day he cannot get accommodation for 50 per cent. above that rate.

(Taken at Sydney.)

FRIDAY, 13TH APRIL, 1923.

Present:

Mr. GREGORY, Chairman;	
Senator Foll	Mr. Cook
Senator Newland	Mr. Jackson
Senator Plain	Mr. Mackay.
Mr. Blakeley	

William Stewart Mowle, Clerk of the Legislative Assembly, New South Wales, sworn and examined.

135. *To the Chairman.*—I am in the fortieth year of my service as a parliamentary officer. I have inspected the plans of the proposed provisional Parliament House, at Canberra, and for the information of the Committee, I produce plans of the State Parliament House, Sydney. I think it will be a very great advantage if you provide that strangers be accommodated near the front of the building, so that there will be no need for them to go into the corridors reserved for members, or near the party rooms. I therefore indorse the proposal to provide a number of small rooms near the main entrance in which members can interview strangers. Our experience in New South Wales has shown that it is a mistake to crowd offices and rooms about the chambers. It is desirable that there should be direct access of natural light and ventilation, and that the chambers should open on to garden spaces or verandahs. I notice that the plan shows on three sides of the chambers rooms for Ministers and officers; they hem in the chamber, and thus interfere with direct ventilation. Those rooms could with advantage be moved outwards. It would be an improvement if the frontage of each wing were brought forward, and the area now occupied by rooms at the back of the chamber converted into a private garden, to which members could have direct access from the corridor at the back of the chambers. We find in the State Parliament that members take advantage of the tennis court and bowling green as breathing spaces rather than for recreation purposes. I dare say that the provision of congenial surroundings would have an influence in tempering the acerbity of debate. Certainly when members are obliged to sit for long hours, and sometimes all night, in a stuffy atmosphere their tempers are inclined to become ruffled. I have had no experience of the rostrum, but I have heard it suggested that seating in the form of a crescent with the Speaker much nearer to the centre of the chamber would be an advantage. In the Legislative Assembly, however, the acoustic properties are good, and I do not think that any advantage is lost by the present system of benches grouped in horse-shoe shape. It is probable that a member speaking from a rostrum

would receive a better hearing than when speaking from the floor, and that system might tend to improve the standard of debate, but I do not care to express an opinion as to how members would regard the innovation. The Standing Orders of the Legislative Assembly contemplate that when a member is called to speak on a second reading, or on a motion, he shall leave his seat, and speak at the end of the table; that rather supports the suggestion that the rostrum would be of advantage. In regard to the method of seating, in the Legislative Assembly there are a few writing desks, but, unfortunately, our benches are so placed as to prevent the free movement of members to and from their seats. I can conceive of no objection to the placing of desks on the back benches, but if they were on the front, they would detract from the appearance of a deliberative Chamber, and give it rather the appearance of a stock exchange. I admit the disadvantage of a member not being able to leave his seat on the back benches without disturbing other members. It would be an improvement if the benches were wider apart. I understand that the *Hansard* staff in the State Parliament prefer to be in a low gallery rather than at the table, because I have heard it said that, at the table, they hear too much. The *Hansard* gallery in the Legislative Assembly has been lowered recently, and the reporters are now able to hear the debates fairly well, but the hearing would have been better if the gallery had been lowered another 2 feet. If that were done, it would not be more than 2 feet above the heads of members on the back benches. Such a gallery should not project into the chamber more than is necessary. The present gallery could also be lowered with advantage, probably to 9 feet above the floor of the chamber. If the seating of members is to be in tiers an 8-inch rise and a 10-inch step would be sufficient. As many as twenty pressmen sometimes attend the Legislative Assembly, and quite recently there has been an insistent clamour for more accommodation, which we are trying to meet. At the present time there are two large transcribing rooms, which are at the exclusive disposal of the *Sydney Morning Herald* and the *Daily Telegraph* respectively, and there are two smaller rooms for the *Sun* and the *Evening News*. Next session a new room will be available, which has yet to be allocated. There is a common dining-room for the pressmen, and they are allowed to obtain refreshments until 10 p.m. They have not a separate entrance to the House, but after a quite recent experience in New South Wales, I strongly recommend that provision should be made for the pressmen to enter their rooms and galleries without coming into the main corridors. It would be a very great advantage to give the pressmen an exclusive block of buildings from which there would be direct access to the gallery. If they wished to interview a member, they could ask for an appointment with him, instead of wandering into the corridors in search of him. In the State Parliament House, Ministers, members, and the pressmen are too much mixed up. For the last thirty years the pressmen who attend Parliament House regularly have formed a press gallery committee. They elect their own chairman, and secretary, and the chairman almost exclusively deals with the Serjeant-at-Arms. That arrangement has worked excellently. The gallery committee allocates the seating, but, in the event of any dispute, there is a right of appeal to the Speaker. It is very necessary that the members should have a common room close to the chamber, and I suggest that, in the Parliament House at Canberra, ample provision be made as close as possible to the chamber for keeping votes and proceedings, and copies of the debates, recent statutes, and handbooks, and all books of reference likely to be required at short notice. A special room for papers close to the chamber and shelves in the surrounding corridors would answer very well. If the

shelving were not more than 7 feet high, which is about the maximum height that the average man can conveniently reach, you would require at least three 30-foot lengths in order to accommodate the recent votes and proceedings, parliamentary debates, and statutes for the last twenty years, so that they would be handy for reference during debates. It is desirable that the clerk should have two rooms, one close to the chamber. I have a room adjacent to the chamber to which all papers laid upon the table are sent, and there the press has access to them. That room is handy also when members or Ministers desire to consult me. Under our system the Clerk leaves the chamber with the Speaker when the House goes into Committee, and, having a room adjacent to the chamber, he has an opportunity of knowing what is happening in Committee. There is no necessity to have the rooms of other officers close to the chamber; they can be accommodated in more remote quarters without disadvantage. It is necessary that the *Hansard* staff should be close to their work, which is in the chambers. I think that the accommodation shown on the plan in a wing on the Senate side would satisfactorily meet *Hansard* requirements. The Library is rightly situated centrally so as to be easily accessible to members of both chambers. I would strongly urge the provision of a basement for records. We have no private dining-rooms, and in that respect our accommodation is very deficient. If a Minister or member wishes to entertain a friend, he is obliged to ask for the loan of a room from somebody, and he has to pay a small additional amount for extra service. There is a separate room for the press but not for the official staff. The minimum charge for lunch is 1s. 6d., and for dinner 1s. 9d. There is no actual loss on the provision of food. The Government supply the waiting staff (who also assist in the cleaning of the establishment), the cook, and assistants, fuel and lighting. The purchasing of the food until the last few years was done by a Committee, but latterly the Committee has taken very little interest in the matter; the catering is now controlled practically by the President of the Legislative Council and the House Secretary. The dining-room makes a slight loss during recess, but during the session that is recovered, and there is always a small credit balance. At present there are three distinct party rooms for the Ministerial party, Opposition, and Progressive party respectively, but the Speaker has been asked to provide a suite of rooms for a number of members who have constituted themselves a separate party. Under the system of proportional representation there is a tendency for members to form into a number of parties, and that problem will have to be met. The rooms of the Standing Committees need not be close to the chamber. The Parliamentary Standing Committee on Public Works in the State Parliament has a board room and a suite of four offices in a detached building, and that accommodation is under the control of the Chairman.

136. *To Senator Foll.*—It would be an advantage if the present Legislative Assembly chamber could be made, say, 10 feet wider and 20 feet or 30 feet longer. It would be advisable to allow at Canberra a generous margin over present requirements, in order to allow for future developments. The strangers' gallery accommodation in the State House is inadequate. When the Assembly is discussing matters which the public regard as interesting, numbers of people have to be turned away.

137. *To Mr. Cook.*—It is not desirable that strangers should have access to parts of the House that are intended for the exclusive use of members, and for that reason any accommodation for interviewing strangers should be near the main entrance. The draft plan before the Committee seems to provide adequate accommodation—at all events, while the membership of the Federal Parliament remains at the present number. Generally speaking, I am very favorably impressed with

the completeness of the plan. A Parliament House could hardly be made of any cheaper material than brick.

138. *To Senator Newland.*—I admit that it would be convenient to a member to have a desk at his seat in which he could keep his papers; my sole objection to that arrangement is that it interferes with the appearance of what is intended to be a deliberative chamber. I admit that utility is of more importance to members than appearance. There is, of course, a desirability in the present system of seating by which members have to pass each other in going to and from their seats. In the Legislative Assembly it is the general practice of members to speak from the end of the Table, where there is always a clear space to accommodate their notes and reference books. From that system to the rostrum is not a far cry. It has been suggested that a member speaking from the rostrum would be less subject to interruption than when he speaks from his seat, and I notice that a member speaking from the end of the Table can make a better impression on the House than if he speaks from a back bench. There has been no complaint from the *Hansard* staff of inability to hear well since the gallery was lowered. The *Hansard* reporters have not been accommodated on the floor of the House in recent years. Prior to 1914, questions were answered orally, but now questions upon notice are answered by laying the information on the table. The questions without notice are reported by the *Hansard* staff from their own gallery.

139. *To Mr. Blakeley.*—Semi-circular seating would probably be an advantage acoustically. I take it that the Speaker would sit very close to the points of the crescent. In the Legislative Assembly the only difficulty experienced in hearing is when members speak conversationally; a member addressing the House in the ordinary way can be heard quite well. We have tried many methods of ventilating the chamber, and the system now in use is certainly the best we have had. Natural air is driven by a large fan into a long room under the chamber, whence it sweeps through small holes into the chamber through a grating under the seats and table. At one time members did complain of draughts and colds, but that is overcome by closing the air chamber, which has about the same floor area as the main chamber, and is 7 feet 6 inches high. It is kept empty in order that the air in it may be sweet. In winter time the air is warmed by means of a boiler, and it is the duty of the electrician attached to the House to take records every twenty minutes in order to maintain the atmosphere in the chamber at a uniform temperature. The retiring accommodation for messengers is very bad; they have only one common room and one small retiring room. I have asked many times that the accommodation be improved. The *Hansard* staff employ three permanent female typists, and when both Houses are sitting extra casual typists are engaged. The Legislative Assembly has a permanent staff of three typists, who are entirely at the disposal of members as amanuenses. They do correspondence and clerical work, but not secretarial work. The accommodation for these ladies is fairly good. They are in an old cottage at the back of the House, and each has a well-furnished room, and there is a common room and lavatory. The *Hansard* typists have poor accommodation, the transcription rooms being very small. They have separate lavatory accommodation, but no dining-room. It is desirable that the staff should have a dining room. The press dining-room is used only as such, and not as a club room, although pressmen are not prevented from sitting and smoking there. The furniture is rather severe, but the press writing rooms are provided with some easy chairs, and there is access to a fairly good balcony. I think that the press should be provided with a dining-room at the Parliament House in Canberra, and, having regard to what will be the conditions in that city in its early stages, they should have something in the nature of a club room.

140. *To Mr. Jackson.*—The actual cost per meal supplied in the parliamentary dining-room is 1s. 6d. The minimum charge of 1s. 9d. for dinner at 6 p.m. would pay for two courses; three courses would cost about 2s. or 2s. 3d. There has not been a great demand for separate rooms for individual members, but a few have suggested that it would be desirable for each member to have an exclusive room, even if it were only a cubicle. A fairly large room is occupied by the Progressive party, and it has to accommodate ten to twelve members. I do not think they find any inconvenience in sharing a room that is properly furnished. The large room for Ministerial supporters contains about 30 members. The convenience depends largely upon the furnishing.

141. *To the Chairman.*—I understand that the Government architect considers that the system of ventilation in use at the State Parliament House is up to date. Notwithstanding that the temperature is humid during certain months of the year, there is no apparatus for taking the moisture out of the atmosphere. At times the humidity in the Assembly chamber has been very troublesome, and because of the climate there is a general desire on the part of members to terminate the session before the end of November if possible. The late Mr. Brookfield, who, as an ex-miner, spoke with some authority, said that it was not necessary to drive fresh air into the chamber, and that if the foul air were drawn off good air would automatically take its place.

The witness withdrew.

Percy Thomas Owen, Director-General of Works, Department of Works and Railways, recalled and further examined.

142. *To the Chairman.*—One of the basic instructions given by the Government to the Advisory Committee, of which I am a member, was that Mr. Griffin's plan of the lay-out of the city was to be adhered to. There is no doubt that in that plan there is one essential line for the governmental group, viz., from Kurrajong Hill or Camp Hill to Mt. Ainslie. The selection of that line with Mt. Ainslie as the closing vista was very wise, for Mt. Ainslie is one of the most important natural features in the whole of the Capital area. We had to remember that a certain site had been allocated by Mr. Griffin for Parliament House; therefore, the provisional Parliament House should not be placed there. We had also to have regard to the development of the administrative group, aiming to keep it as close as possible to the provisional Parliament House, as well as to the site of the permanent building, because it was thought that the evolution of the parliamentary and administrative group would be gradual. Therefore, to locate the temporary or provisional buildings on any other than the main axial line would be a mistake. In regard to the main axial line, there are two considerations—prospect and aspect. The line which is directed to Ainslie goes from the Capitol on Kurrajong Hill to Prospect Parkway. A full plan of the town shows that the designer intends that there shall be an aspect from the civic centre down Prospect Parkway past Parliament House to the Capitol, showing a centrally situated and balanced scheme for the governmental group. In my opinion, that aspect from the civic centre is very important. On the other hand, the prospect from Parliament House, with developmental gardens and ornamentations in the foreground, Prospect Parkway beyond, and Ainslie in the background, is equally important. We came to the conclusion that if the provisional Parliament House is to be there for many years, advantage should be taken of both prospect and aspect. Therefore, it is patent that the provisional Parliament House must be located on that main axis. The question then arose as to where we could put it without interfering with the permanent Parliament House to be erected later, but located in favorable relation to the

future administrative offices. We looked at a site close to the ornamental waters, and we decided that it was unsuitable for Parliament House, for two reasons—the great dip of the ground from the south-east, and elevation to the north-west, and the fact that if a provisional building were placed there it would be essential to remove it as soon as the permanent structure was built. Another objection to that site was that the Government offices should be in the first instance established as close as possible to the site for the permanent Parliament House. Therefore, we resolved that the best site was at the foot of Camp Hill; that is not the ideal site, which must eminently be that one which is to be reserved for the permanent House. That structure will take several years to build, and when it is occupied the provisional Parliament House can still be put to some suitable use without closing the vista towards Prospect Parkway and Mt. Ainslie. The disadvantage of that site is that it has not the altitude which the site for the permanent building has. The Advisory Committee considered, also, a high mound or knoll to the north of the proposed provisional site, having a natural height of 1,889 feet. To do anything with that knoll, we should have to take 10 feet off the top, bringing the altitude down to 1,879 feet. There is no doubt that if we had not to work to a great scheme of development for this governmental group that knoll would be a fine commanding site, with a panoramic view in all directions, and a pleasing prospect over the ornamental waters. On the other hand, on the site chosen, the floor level of Parliament House will be 1,887 feet, so that on either place the buildings would be on practically the same level. In other words, viewed from a distance, there would not be very much difference in the aspect of the two, so far as height is concerned; but if the provisional Parliament House is located on the main axis, the aspect will always be symmetrical and architectural, and the building will have as its background Kurrajong, with Ainslie culminating the prospect to the north. So long as Mr. Griffin's plan exists, Parliament House on an eminence dislocated from the general scheme and axis would for all time look accidental and make-shift, no matter how the surrounding grounds might be treated. The administrative offices must be developed in conjunction with the parliamentary buildings, and, in addition, the Advisory Committee have always thought that there will be residential club houses for members of the Senate and House of Representatives respectively, and they will have to be put in juxtaposition to the provisional, as well as the permanent, Parliament House. If they were in juxtaposition to a building set away from the main site, they would be out of position for the permanent house. Apart from the displacement and lopsidedness which would obtain from the start, a building so situated would, during fifty years' growth, send down such a tap-root that it would be very difficult to shift it. Another objection to the knoll near the ornamental waters is that, according to Mr. Griffin's general section, that elevation must eventually disappear. Even without that being accomplished, the prospect from the site of the permanent Parliament House to Ainslie will be attained. Garden development will follow, and probably the gardens will be very beautiful. Everything done in that regard for a provisional Parliament House on the site suggested by the Advisory Committee will be a contribution towards what will be required for the permanent Parliament House. We are working as far as we can on Mr. Griffin's lines, and, assuming that the most important line of the whole group is the one appertaining to the governmental group, we thought it would be very unwise to depart from it. Moreover, the site off the main axis is exposed. Camp Hill will be less exposed, because the wind will be broken by the range of hills running from Capitol Hill towards Black Mountain. There is one blemish in the proposed provisional site, and that is the

topography to the south-east. The land slopes away to the north-west, and there is quite a fine prospect from the legislative part of the House, and from the centre to the south-west there will be an arc of vision of 125 degrees. On the south-eastern side the contours do not recede so quickly as on the north-western side, but the mound which stands in the way of the same view on the south-eastern side is only a small spur. The excavation involved in removing that spur in order to give the same slope to the south-east as to the north-east would amount to 52,000 cubic yards, and at 2s. 6d. per yard would cost £6,500. It would not be a very big job with an excavating shovel. We have not included that cost in the estimate for provisional Parliament House, because it is work which need not necessarily be done in readiness for the first sitting of the House. The material consists of loose boulders and a certain amount of alluvial. There is an average excavation of 4 feet, and a maximum of 7 feet. Assuming that Mr. Griffin's plan is to be carried out, that spur must eventually be removed, and the earth put somewhere else. There is land near by on which we could put it straightway and improve the general levels. A third site suggested was Kurrajong Hill, on which Mr. Griffin has placed the Capitol. The Advisory Committee has had under consideration that site, and is now obtaining records of wind velocity during winter. I must admit that I have never fully realized what Mr. Griffin intended the Capitol to be, except that it should contain the archives, and that when Australia is a great nation many things associated with its history and government will be placed there. Beyond doubt Kurrajong is the dominating site in the city, and as such should be occupied by Parliament House; but I quite appreciate the difficulties in the way of placing the building there. I was a member of the Committee which selected the site, and the Committee which drew up the conditions of the competition for the lay-out of the city. We spent many days at Canberra in considering what would be the most suitable site for Parliament House. Kurrajong Hill was considered, but the objection raised amongst us then was its altitude, and the difficulty of associating it closely with the administrative offices. As there is a difference in altitude of over 100 feet in a distance of half-a-mile between the best site for administrative offices and Kurrajong Hill, that site obviously presents some disadvantages. On the other hand, we studied the aspect of Camp Hill from many points for miles around, and we found that from the direction of Ginninderra, Duntroon, and Queanbeyan, Camp Hill stood out prominently, and was, in fact, a much more prominent elevation than it seemed when viewed at close range. It is true that Mr. Griffin's city plan makes all the avenues focus on the Capitol centre—and he apparently had in mind a highly ornamental and monumental building to form a focussing point for the avenues, and be utilized to house archives of national interest, and possibly a hall of statuary, a picture gallery, and certain functions associated with the government. I would certainly recommend the reservation of Kurrajong Hill for some purpose of the sort. Nothing should be placed upon it but some national and monumental structure. The Selection Committee was further influenced by the fact that Camp Hill is better protected than Kurrajong from the south-westerly winds. I have lived at Canberra off and on for a considerable time in different seasons, and, bearing in mind that Parliament will probably be in session during the winter months, and that some of its members will come from sub-tropical parts of Australia, we considered it important to give protection from the wind that will blow off the snow-clad mountains in winter. Notwithstanding what our chief architect says, protection from those bleak winds cannot be given by any method of designing the building. Members may be made comfortable inside, but they have to reach the building while cold winds are blowing strongly, and nothing we could do

would protect them during their approach to the site on Kurrajong Hill. I think the designer was constrained to use Capitol Hill as the focussing point for his avenues because of its altitude and eminence, and to select Camp Hill as the site for Parliament House by the same considerations as influenced the Selection Committee—its lower altitude, prominence, and convenience. Camp Hill presents more advantages as a Parliament House *per se* than does Kurrajong Hill, notwithstanding the fine panoramic view which the latter affords. I am opposed to placing Parliament House on the knoll near the monumental waters, for the reason that we should be developing off the main axis, and creating a disturbing element, which might be very beautiful, but would be out of harmony with the ultimate plan. The whole idea of Parliament House being focussed by the important prospect and aspect I have described, and the development of administrative offices and club houses for members, would be jeopardized. In fact, there would be no architectural motive for placing Parliament House on that knoll except that it is high. The provisional site which we have recommended is eminently suitable. We have put down some shafts on the ground, and I apprehend no difficulty in regard to the foundations. My estimate of the amount of earth to be excavated at about 2s. per cubic yard showed a cost of £2,000 or £3,000. That amount is comparatively small, and may be taken as part of the foundation work of the building. The cutting where the back portion of the building will sit into the hill will be battered, and probably pitched. On the top we shall place a hedge, and so treat the surroundings that the back of the building will have a presentable appearance. If, during the life of this building, more accommodation is required for members and the staff, it can be provided. I concur in the views put before this Committee by the chief architect as to the various ways in which expansion of the building can be provided for. I refer particularly to the placing of a floor below the quarters shown on the plan for the *Hansard* and Library staffs, which would get full window lighting from the garden, and, alternatively, the adding of a story above those two wings. Further accommodation could be provided in the form of wings at the south-eastern and south-western corners of the building. If this Parliament should recommend that the provisional Parliament House be placed on Camp Hill, I do not think that the administrative offices should be brought closer. As sites for those offices we selected portion of Mr. Griffin's lay-out, which will not be occupied by permanent buildings for many years to come. However, I do not offer any emphatic opinion on this question. A flanking building close to Camp Hill might be used for temporary administrative offices. If the provisional Parliament House is to be placed on Camp Hill, I would like the Committee to again consult the officers of my Department in regard to the site of the administrative offices. So far, we have considered the matter as one scheme, to ultimately develop on that main axis. The only immediate railway proposal the Advisory Committee makes is to replace at a higher level that portion of the railway over the Molonglo which was swept away by flood. We considered it inadvisable to put in another bridge at low level. We propose that the railway from Queanbeyan to the civic centre shall be completed before Parliament opens there. We were asked by the Minister to give an estimate of what expenditure would be required before Parliament could sit at Canberra, and in our last estimate we included the replacement of the railway over the Molonglo. We expect to get good value from the light narrow-gauge line we are laying. To attempt the construction of all the buildings required by the Government and the civilian population during the next three years without a contractor's trainway would be suicidal. We will possibly put in first spurs from the 3-ft. 6-in. line to the principal buildings in

course of erection. We may put in a spur or siding for a group of cottages, so that truck-loads of bricks can be run in and there handled by a crane and lodged on the site of each cottage. This transport by road would probably cost 1s. 6d. to 2s. per ton per mile with empty returns, and we shall do it very much cheaper by railway transport. Even after allowing for the capital cost of the line, we can show economy. It was bought for another Commonwealth Department, and was transferred to us cheaply.

143. *To Mr. Cook.*—The Advisory Committee did not include in its estimate of the cost of removing Parliament the linking up of Canberra with Yass. We were asked to estimate the minimum outlay for which Canberra could be prepared for the meeting of Parliament. We came to the conclusion that Parliament could commence its sittings without the Yass railway, but with an improved approach *viâ* Queanbeyan and Goulburn. There is an agreement between the State Government and the Commonwealth in regard to the construction of the Yass railway, but the carrying out of that agreement would entail considerable outlay by the Commonwealth in the construction of the railway from Canberra to the boundary of the Federal territory. Members from southern States may be at some disadvantage at the commencement, but with a properly organized railway service *viâ* Goulburn there should be no difficulty in their getting from their homes to Canberra. We assume that the Yass connexion will be made soon after Parliament meets at Canberra. In order to place the provisional Parliament House on Camp Hill, I think it would be necessary to cut off the cap of the hill. The drawings would have to be revised, because around the extremities of the building we could very easily put two stories on account of the slope of the hill. The cost of building there would be about the same as on the site we have suggested; there would be savings in some directions and additional expenditure in others. So far as the general layout of the building is concerned, it is immaterial which site is selected.

144. *To Mr. Mackay.*—There will be a railway station at Eastlake, and another at the civic centre, each distant about 2 miles from Parliament House. When the departmental plan was drawn up, we thought that the distance from the closest stations to Parliament House as proposed by Mr. Griffin was excessive, and we proposed to bring the railway closer in; but I think that the development of the road motor vehicle, which gives a very flexible service, superior in many ways to tram or train, will cater for every one. In a city of 6,000 people there will be quite a number of motor vehicles. The population will be concentrated in two areas—3,000 at the civic centre, settled fairly close together, and another 3,000 on the residential sites to the south. Motor buses will probably ply to a regular time-table. There is no reason why the roads should not be treated with asphaltum at a reasonable cost, but in any case there will always be a good road surface between the railway stations and Parliament House. In regard to the site of Parliament House, I am now as desirous of adhering to Mr. Griffin's plan as he would be, because once we depart from its essential features we might as well cast it to the winds. Make one deviation for the sake of a better view or expediency, and the plan is destroyed in respect of the most important part of the city—the governmental group. The ultimate removal of the knoll near the monumental waters is essential if we are to get the view which Mr. Griffin aims at—from Prospect Pathway a horizontal line stretching from each side of the axis to Kurrajong. The removal of that knoll may cost a lot of money, but it must be done some day. However, it is only fair to Mr. Griffin to say that that part of the scheme may not be completed for very many years. I believe that before Parliament has been at Canberra many years the whole of that area towards the monumental waters will be developed into beautiful

gardens and pathways, with a culminating vista on Mount Ainslie. That knoll is out of harmony with the general conception of the governmental group.

145. *To Mr. Blakeley.*—The disability of approaching Canberra *viâ* Goulburn will require adjustment within the first decade, but the Advisory Committee thinks that it will be possible for Parliament to carry on with an improved railway service. To serve the number of people that will be at Canberra at its inception, the capital cost of the connexion with Yass would not be warranted. I firmly believe that in the course of a few years, when proper landing grounds have been provided, members living in the southern States will not be dependent upon trains; they will fly. It is only a matter of time when flying will present no greater danger than motoring does to-day, and an aeroplane will go from Canberra to Adelaide in five hours. Air transport to Tasmania may be a little more difficult, unless we can get a suitable type of amphibion. At present, the inherent risk of crossing such a wide sheet of water by aeroplane is too great. We have not yet got as far as considering the furnishing of the hostels, administrative offices, and Parliament House, but I think it will be reasonable to require that, as far as possible, the whole of the material shall be manufactured in Australia. The furniture, crockery, and plate for Parliament House should be discussed with the Works Department by some parliamentary committee, and the decision be sent to us as a requisition.

146. *To Mr. Cook.*—From Canberra to the Federal boundary, towards Yass, is a distance of 10 miles, and railway construction would cost, approximately, £10,000 per mile. The replacing of the bridge over the Molonglo and the approaches would cost probably £60,000 or £70,000. The Advisory Committee have advised the Government that the railway bridge connecting the Capitol centre with the civic centre should be replaced. It must be built within a few years, and if it be built at once all we shall lose is the interest between now and the date beyond which its construction could not longer be delayed. We consider that the increment to the value of land in the civic centre will be such as to warrant the construction of the railway at once. It will not be completed in less than two years. I would not recommend the extension of the railway to the boundary of the territory as a work to be done by the time Parliament meets at Canberra, but it should follow within a decade of that date.

(Taken at Sydney.)

MONDAY, 16TH APRIL, 1923.

Present:

Mr. GREGORY, Chairman;

Senator Foll	Mr. Cook
Senator Newland	Mr. Jackson
Senator Plain	Mr. Mackay.
Mr. Blakeley	

Daniel Levy, Speaker of the Legislative Assembly of New South Wales, sworn and examined.

147. *To the Chairman.*—I have been in the Parliament of New South Wales for twenty-two years continuously. I have inspected the plan of the proposed provisional Parliament House at Canberra. Some accommodation certainly should be provided for strangers near the main entrance, in order to avoid the necessity for their entering those portions of the House which are clearly intended for the use of members only. That is one of the difficulties we experience at the State Parliament House through not having adequate accommodation for strangers; they will get into the corridors and into rooms which are reserved

for members. There should be rooms in which members can interview visitors, and I think it will be an improvement if the Senate club room and committee room were shifted to another part of the building in order that accommodation for strangers might be provided near the main entrance. The committee rooms of the State Parliament House are at the rear of the building, and we experience no disability on that account. In regard to the arrangement of the seating in the chamber, I prefer the elongated horseshoe pattern. It has many advantages. It gives better acoustics, and allows of the more convenient seating of members. I have not seen the rostrum in operation, but I have read a good deal about it, and am favorably disposed towards it for use in major debates, but not in Committee. It would probably tend to improve the tone of debate. A member addressing the House from a rostrum might command the attention of his fellows better than if he were speaking from the floor of the House, and his remarks would be more impressive. He would be always facing members, thus focussing their attention. In the Legislative Assembly, a member speaking from a back bench faces only a small proportion of the members, and as he is almost on a level with them, he has no means of concentrating their attention, except by the weight of his own utterances. Having regard to the fact that a legislative chamber is deliberative in purpose, I am not in favour of providing a desk for each member. There would be a tendency for members to do their ordinary correspondence at those desks, and pay less attention to the debates than they otherwise would. A member should have some facility for writing in the chamber, but he should not be encouraged to do all his work, and keep his papers there. The chamber should not be converted into a writing-room. I appreciate the necessity for allowing space between and behind the benches, so that members may enter or leave the chamber without unduly interfering with others. Prior to the lowering of the *Hansard* gallery in the New South Wales Legislative Chamber there was a good deal of complaint from the reporters. The gallery was not only higher, but projected over the chamber, and it was difficult for *Hansard* reporters to know what was going on immediately below them. Since the gallery has been lowered there have been no complaints, nor have the reporters, during my term as Speaker, asked for accommodation at the Table on the floor of the House. I think they are quite satisfied with their present accommodation, although at times the suggestion has been informally made by members that the *Hansard* reporters should be placed at the Table. The height of the press and *Hansard* galleries above the floor should be governed to some extent by the size of the chamber. In the Legislative Assembly the press gallery is too high. I think it should be not more than 12 or 13 feet. The press gallery is managed by a committee of pressmen, who allocate the seats and the rooms placed at the disposal of the newspapers. For instance, recently an additional room has been granted to the press, and it will be for the press gallery committee to decide which newspaper shall use it, of course subject to the right of appeal to the Speaker. There has been complaint at times in regard to the dining accommodation for the pressmen. There is only a comparatively small dining-room, and as we cannot accommodate an indefinite number of pressmen, admission is regulated by the committee. I do not interfere except that when they made representations at one time for the provision of an additional waiter, the President of the Legislative Council and I wrote to the Government on the subject. It is right that in a city like Sydney the press should have accommodation at Parliament House, and facilities for getting refreshments. I would be sorry to put any obstacles in their way. A separate entrance and direct access to their rooms and the press gallery would be a distinct advantage. If I were designing a new

Parliament House, I would give the press separate access to the building, so that they need not come into the main part at all. That arrangement would be better for all concerned. There is a good deal of complaint regarding the extreme moisture of the atmosphere in the Legislative Assembly chamber, and no man knows the justification for it more than does the Speaker. Parliament sits in the summer months, and often has late sittings in the worst portion of the year. The ventilating plant does not include any means of taking the moisture from the atmosphere. I think that the present conditions are extremely dangerous to the health of members and officials. In regard to the parliamentary library, we do not give any facilities to the ordinary public because the Public Library is close at hand. Occasionally persons like Judges of the High Court will come to the parliamentary library for a special book. At Canberra, it will probably be an advantage to combine the parliamentary and national libraries, if that be practicable. It would seem a pity to have duplicate libraries. In the early stages of the occupation of Canberra, it would be desirable, if possible, to give the public access to the parliamentary library, so long as they did not interfere with the rights and conveniences of members. What arrangement could be adopted to prevent the abuse of the library by persons wishing to use it as a lounge, I am not prepared to suggest without consideration. It would be impracticable to make a public parliamentary library a general reading library, except by setting apart certain space for the public.

148. *To Senator Newland.*—There must be some limit to the number of pressmen that can be served with meals at Parliament House. It could not be considered reasonable that any pressmen in the city should be able to get refreshments at Parliament House; that privilege should be confined to men doing parliamentary work. I understand that last year we issued not less than 100 badges to pressmen, and if a large proportion of the badge holders came to the House, and expected to get dining accommodation difficulty would arise. I do not think that a newspaper should expect that more than two or three of its staff should be supplied with refreshments at Parliament House during the sitting hours.

149. *To Mr. Mackay.*—I am not prepared to say that all persons doing duty at Parliament House should have dining accommodation. Most of the members of our staff, including the messengers, obtain refreshments at the House, but I do not think that right extends to the policemen on duty. Probably the best place for the rostrum would be at a spot near the Speaker, so that the occupants could face the whole House. I can see no objection to it being placed slightly to the left or right of the Speaker. The small library adjoining the Legislative Assembly chamber is used by members more as a retiring room than as a library. Its contents are confined to old books of reference. When the House is not sitting, some members use that room for writing. The walls of the chamber should be on the outside of the building, and there should be no other room to intervene between the chamber and the gardens or other open spaces. That would enable direct access of fresh air and natural light.

150. *To Senator Plain.*—Meals in the parliamentary dining-room are charged for *a la carte*, with a minimum charge of about 1s. 9d. per meal. Recently, the Refreshment Room Committee has been dispensed with, and the President and I manage the refreshment rooms with the assistance of the House Secretary. The financial results are satisfactory. We do not make any profit, but we lose very little money.

151. *To Senator Foll.*—Though the public be given access to the parliamentary library at Canberra, it should not be a lending library. I am not making a definite suggestion to combine the parliamentary and national libraries, but it does seem that it would be a pity to have duplication in a small place like Can-

berra must be at its inception. With slight modification, the parliamentary library could be made a national library, and facilities given to the public without detriment to members. The public should not be allowed access through the library to the parliamentary building; that would destroy privacy, to which members of Parliament are entitled. Ultimately, there should be a separate national library, to which books from the parliamentary library might be taken for reference purposes only. The present accommodation in the Legislative Assembly of New South Wales is sufficient for the number of members in the House, but the accommodation for strangers is inadequate. Most members of Parliament now make the parliamentary building their office. A large number of them come there regularly in the morning and remain for the greater portion of the day. That fact has to be taken into consideration and provided for. Unfortunately, there are no facilities for strangers who wish to visit members, and that disability is very pronounced when the House is sitting. The consequence is that the members are forced to resort to the undesirable practice of interviewing strangers in the lobbies. With that exception, our parliamentary building provides ample accommodation for members. I would not place pressmen under the same restriction as members of the public—requiring them to send in their cards in the ordinary way to any member whom they wished to interview. That procedure would be too harsh. After all, pressmen have certain functions to perform. The public desire to know what is taking place in Parliament; the newspapers do not always give an accurate account, but I would not be inclined to cut down any privileges which pressmen have hitherto enjoyed. Of course, they are not permitted to go into the party rooms, and, strictly speaking, not into the corridor outside the party rooms, but that rule is more often violated than observed. If the pressmen have their separate means of ingress and egress, I do not think they will find it necessary to encroach on those parts of the House which are intended for the private use of members. Separate rooms are provided for each Minister, and good use is made of them. A separate room for each member is not practicable, necessary, or desirable. Now and again a number of members think that they have special claims to separate rooms, but, taken all round, members are very well accommodated in the State Parliament House. A number of amanuenses assist them with their correspondence. At times, some members have attempted to make improper use of the services of these ladies. Prior to the last general election it was reported that members were getting the amanuenses to do electioneering work, such as the copying of thousands of circulars. As soon as the matter was reported to me, I ordered the practice to be discontinued. Attempts have been made at other times, too, to use the services of the amanuenses as if they were private secretaries to members; they would be asked to open members' letters and reply to telegrams. That, too, has been stopped. In connexion with Parliament House there is a tennis court and bowling green, and I think they are very desirable adjuncts. On hot evenings members go from the chamber to the tennis court and the bowling green to sit and smoke. There is no gymnasium, but there are some very large bathrooms, and dumbbells, Indian clubs, &c., are provided. A gymnasium in Parliament House is desirable.

152. *To Mr. Cook.*—Looking at the layout of the proposed provisional Parliament House and the designation of the various rooms on the plan, ample accommodation seems to have been provided for members. At the present time, there are three parties in the State Parliament—Ministerial (National), Opposition (Labour party), and the Progressive party. Each party has not only a general room for its members, but also special accommodation for the leader, whip, and secretary. Three or four members who are unattached

to any party are provided with a fine large room opening on to a big verandah, and they are very comfortable. Within the last two or three weeks a demand has been made for special accommodation for a new party that has arisen, and I am now considering the means of meeting that demand. Sometimes an individual member thinks he has a claim to a room to himself. In the past it has happened that a member has "squatted" in a room which has not been very much used, and he has remained in uninterrupted possession until circumstances have compelled the Presiding Officer to ask him to vacate the room. I think the tendency will be for the number of parties to increase, and in the Parliament House at Canberra provision should be made for three or four parties at least. At the present time, in each State Parliament, as well as in the Commonwealth, there is a recognised Government party, an Opposition, a third party, and a number of independents. The tendency of proportional representation is to increase the number of parties. A small garden space at the back of each chamber, to which members could have direct access, would be an excellent arrangement. It would probably tend to promote good feeling amongst members and improve the general morale if there were conveniences for members to meet on a friendly footing in congenial surroundings. In the Legislative Assembly of this State there is an independent ladies' gallery, but ladies are admitted to the Speaker's gallery also if they are accompanied by gentlemen. Having regard to the altered status of women, the fact that they are enfranchised and eligible to sit as members, I do not see any necessity for segregating them in a special ladies' gallery. When visitors are accommodated with seats behind the Speaker's chair, and the ladies accompanying them have to go to the ladies' gallery, unnecessary inconvenience is caused.

153. *To Senator Newland.*—It is very desirable that the officers of the House, especially the Clerk, should have rooms close to the chamber. Sometimes documents are required urgently, and if the papers are in remote portions of the building inconvenience and delay are caused. There is no vital necessity for every officer to be close to the chamber, but the Clerk of the House or the Clerk of Papers should have an office near by.

The witness withdrew.

Francis Walsh, Librarian, Parliament of New South Wales, sworn and examined.

154. *To the Chairman.*—The library of the New South Wales Parliament is not available for the use of the general public, but we supply information to Government Departments. Since 1910 there has been closer investigation into prospective legislation, and such research brings us more into touch with officers of Departments who are engaged in preparing information for Ministers. Books are made available to lawyers and law students only when they borrow through members. This is essentially a library for parliamentary and Government purposes. No books are supposed to be taken out unless signed for by a member, or issued on his written order. That rule is not always observed. One of the main essentials of a parliamentary library is accessibility to both chambers of the Legislature. The disposition of the library rooms, as shown on the plan of the provisional Parliament House, at Canberra, seems to me to be suitable. The general layout seems very appropriate. The newspaper room might be brought closer to the legislative chambers, because it is usually the newspapers that are required in the House by members during sittings. The transposition of the library accommodation in order to bring the newspapers nearer to the chambers is worth consideration by this Committee. It is desirable that the accommodation for the cataloguing staff should be con-

veniently situated. All the cards of the catalogues will be in cabinets, and it is necessary that they be handy to the library itself. Open spaces on all sides of the library are essential, so that books or valuables may be removed in event of fire. When the large room of the library at the State Parliament House was constructed in 1906, the fire brigades representative pointed out that, if ever a fire broke out, there would be no means of access to the library in order to get books out, and that open spaces adjoining the library were essential. The accommodation on the plan now before the Committee seems to provide all that is likely to be necessary, assuming that special provision will be made for the National collection. Of course, good ventilation is very desirable. Apparently, in Ottawa, there is a combined parliamentary and public library, because I notice that, in some of the reports, two librarians are mentioned, the parliamentary librarian and the public librarian. I think it would be desirable to keep the two establishments apart, as is done at Washington. There the existing Congressional library is separated from the library of the two Houses of Parliament, but the two are connected by an underground tunnel with some automatic means of transferring books hurriedly when required.

155. *To Mr. Mackay.*—The main portion of the library will be occupied by parliamentary records. These records accumulate more rapidly than ordinary reading or text-books. From the United States Congressional library we receive 170 to 180 volumes per annum, and the records of the House of Commons and the House of Lords run to about 100 volumes per annum. To house them there must be a big reserve space, but for general text-books a large reserve is not required, because when a more up-to-date book is added, the old one is removed. Of course, if it were desired to include general literature a reserve space of probably 25 per cent.—which could be converted into shelving—would be required. I think the general lay-out of the Mitchell library in Sydney is quite satisfactory to serve the purpose of that section of the Public Library. Steel shelving is essential having regard to the ravages of the borer, and the loss that might be caused by fire. Such shelving occupies less space, and is more adjustable than wooden shelves. The general arrangement shown on the plan of the library for Canberra seems admirable. In our State Parliament House, the library officials have no separate rooms in which to do their work.

(Taken at Sydney.)

TUESDAY, 17TH APRIL, 1923.

Present:

Mr. GREGORY, Chairman;	
Senator Foll	Mr. Cook
Senator Newland	Mr. Jackson
Senator Plain	Mr. Mackay.
Mr. Blakeley	

Hugh Wright, Librarian, Mitchell Library, and Acting Principal Librarian of the Public Library, Sydney, sworn and examined.

156. *To the Chairman.*—I have inspected the plans of the proposed provisional Parliament House at Canberra and I do not think it possible, if the library accommodation is to be as shown there, to combine it with a public library, especially if Canberra is to grow into a large city of 250,000 inhabitants. But it would be possible to do that by enlarging the area allocated to the library. I see no objection to that course, provided that the library be not in the centre of the parliamentary buildings. If the library were placed in an annexe, it might serve both parliamentary and public purposes with advantage. If a library centrally situated were

open to the public, the parliamentary building would be thrown open to strangers, but if the library rooms were transferred to the south end of the building the visiting public could be kept away from the administrative and parliamentary quarters. It is essential that the library accommodation should be proof against fire and burglary, for, even though all the books be stamped, there will be some rarities which will be coveted by men with a certain mental kink. There should be ample space to accommodate the present supply of books and reserve space for expansion. I notice that no provision has been made for an Archives Department. The Committee might well consider whether the Archives Department should be operated in connexion with the Parliamentary Library or be part of the National Library. The archives are really the official records of the different Government offices presided over by Ministers, and if they are to be accommodated at Parliament House it will be necessary to allow more space than is provided on these plans. I do not approve of a basement for a library, except for packing and unpacking cases and parcels and for binding. At Canberra the bindery will probably be run in connexion with the Government Printing Office. It is a mistake to store valuable books in a basement, because of the danger of mildew. That trouble may not be so bad at Canberra, where the atmosphere is much drier than in Sydney. Here the atmosphere is moisture-laden for eleven months of the year, and if there is not a strong circulation of air in the basement, mildew deposits and spoils the bindings. In the Mitchell Library basement electric fans pump fresh air into the building and draw off the impure air. That system maintains a good circulation, and keeps the building clean. All departmental papers over ten years old should be concentrated in some building. Of course, those that are used as the working tools of a Department must be kept in the Department. A Committee consisting of either the under-secretaries or chief clerks of all Departments could go through the records and decide which may be destroyed. That is done in England. Official papers over twenty years old are forwarded to the Public Record Office in Chancery-lane. A lot of papers are placed on Government files which after a few years are useless. The files should be dealt with by a qualified committee, and only those papers destroyed which that committee has certified are useless. I think that space for the preservation of these archives should be provided at Canberra. They could be kept in a dry basement. Paper will not rot until it becomes wet. I do not see any necessity for the transposition of the library and newspaper rooms as shown on the plans of the provisional Parliament House. The librarian should have a room apart, but the assistant librarian, cataloguers, and accountants should be accommodated in the one room. It has been said that if a man is put into a room with an ink-pot, a couple of pens, a block of paper, and a typist, that room will soon develop into a department. Avoid that possibility by giving only one man a chance to build up a department. In a Parliamentary Library it is not necessary to keep the newspapers so far from the other reading room. The room set apart for the cataloguing staff is probably intended to house the cabinets containing the catalogue cards, as well as the assistants who do the cataloguing. When a book enters the library it must first be checked with the invoice; then it must be collated. It must be marked with certain symbols inside, to show that it has gone through the accountant's hands; then it must be classified and numbered, and finally catalogued. The same officer would not do all that work. One would put the books through the preliminary stages before they were forwarded to a senior officer for cataloguing. The cataloguing staff needs several tables and a number of presses. Although the plan sets aside a room for cataloguing, it may be used for some other purpose also, as, for instance, the storage of one special class of

books. The book stacks show accommodation for approximately 75,000 volumes, and I think that will be ample for the Parliamentary Library for a quarter of a century. Should it be necessary to enlarge the area, there is plenty of space in the garden. There are two reading rooms, one for newspapers and periodicals, and the other for books. They should be ample to meet the requirements of members. Generally the plans of the library quarters are excellent. The basement room for the bindery is rather narrow; it should be about 20 or 25 feet square. There would be at least four men employed in the bindery, and the room should provide space for machinery. If the binding is to be done at the Government Printing Office, the room set apart for this purpose could be converted into a strong-room. Such accommodation is required for the storage of treasures. The Petherick collection should be housed in one wing of the book stack until the National Library is built. All the stacks should be of steel, thus reducing the fire risk. Books will not of themselves burn. When a fire breaks out in the library, it is the water that does the damage. The State Library at Albany, New York, a wooden building, was wholly destroyed by fire. As the wooden shelves burnt they broke, and all the books dropped to the floor, where they smouldered. Actually more damage was done by the water than by the flames. The ventilation in the Sydney Public Library is bad. Through faulty construction of the building, no provision was made for adequate ventilation by electric fans. In addition, the Library grew very rapidly. In some years we added as many as 4,000 volumes, and it has been necessary to put in extra press accommodation. The result has been that the windows along the side, which formerly helped to give ventilation, have been partially blocked. There is no mechanical method of ventilating the building.

157. *To Mr. Blakeley.*—I do not think that the responsible officers should be accommodated outside the library proper. I see no necessity for an outside room for the assistant librarian; he should be in the library itself. If the partitions shown on the plan were removed, and the whole library accommodation converted into one large room, the newspapers could be placed at one end, and the officers could work at tables along the sides, and always be available to render assistance to members. If the partitions were removed, the room would be 136 feet long by 46 feet wide. If necessary the cataloguing rooms could be placed at either end, and, from that point of vantage, the officers could supervise the library. I do not like the idea of shutting officers away in private rooms, but it may be necessary to provide a cloakroom for the staff.

158. *To Senator Foll.*—The travelling lights are very satisfactory, and I dread the time when we may not be able to replace the long horizontal tubes we are now using. In a reading room a noiseless floor is desirable. On my trip to Europe and America, in 1913-14, I made special inquiry into noiseless flooring, and I found that the best material of all is the cork tile, about half-an-inch thick. The new reading room in the Royal Library, Berlin, was to be covered with cork tiles. The same material is used in the New York Public Library reading-room and some of the principal cataloguing rooms. It is much better than rubber. The latter is very nice at first, but it does not long remain soft and silent. I spoke to the architect of the British Museum, and he proved to me that the rubber tile becomes hard and noisy. Carpet is expensive and dirty. Wood laid on concrete is all right. In some of the American buildings, I saw concrete made with sawdust instead of sand. One advantage about it was that tacks could be driven into it. Good results might be obtained by making the floor of sawdust concrete, and covering it with cork tiles. The new reading room of the British Museum, which is devoted to fine art books, is floored with cork tiles. It is desirable to be dependent on artificial lighting as little as possible. I prefer the overhead lights, with muffled

glass shades, amber tinted. For individual reading lamps, I like the electric bulb with a nice little shade painted green on the outside. For overhead lights the best are the semi-indirect.

159. *To Mr. Cook.*—The plans of the library at Canberra have been well thought out, and I do not think that any system of artificial ventilation will be required.

160. *To Senator Newland.*—The only dampness experienced in the basement of the Mitchell Library is due to the moisture in the atmosphere causing a little mildew, which would do damage if not removed. The cleaners wipe off the mildew once a month with a hard brush, and we have also used essence of lavender. We have no provision for introducing warm air. In the British Museum warm air is pumped into the building, and that contributes both to the comfort of patrons and the preservation of the books. At Canberra the atmosphere would be dry, and the site well drained. It may be necessary to have artificial heating in the reading rooms in winter, but otherwise artificial ventilation will not be necessary. I do not care for bays and projecting book stacks in a public library, but in a private library they are not a disadvantage. I assume that members of Parliament are trustworthy, and therefore bays will not be a disadvantage. They provide more shelving space, but for a reading room in which you are providing space for 75,000 volumes bays would be a mistake, and would spoil the architecture. Years ago, we had bays in the old Public Library, and the number of books stolen and mutilated was surprising. For the sake of architectural effect and efficient supervision, it would be better not to have bays.

161. *To Mr. Mackay.*—There are in the Public Library, Sydney, over 200,000 books, and in the Mitchell Library 110,000. It is wise to allow plenty of room for expansion. Twenty-five years hence Parliament House, at Canberra, may be confronted with the same problem as we have had to deal with. The Commonwealth may launch out upon big developmental schemes, and may not be able to spare the money for the erection of an entirely new parliamentary building or library. If adequate reserve space be allowed now, it will be easy and inexpensive to add additional book stacks to the original library. The area occupied by the garden, at the rear of the newspaper room, could be utilized for a five-story building with double floors. It would only be 80 or 90 feet high, but would accommodate over half a million books. The present allowance of 25 per cent. for increase in shelving is ample. A parliamentary library does not grow at the same rate as a national library, because of the more restricted scope of the books it contains.

162. *To the Chairman.*—In the Public Library, Sydney, the cataloguing is done in rooms off the reading room. There is an area of about 60 feet by 10 feet divided into four rooms. Too much space has been allowed on this plan for the cataloguers in a library of 75,000 volumes. Their work could be done at the end of the library.

163. *To Senator Plain.*—The cutting out of the partitions in the centre of the library would reduce the shelving available for books. I suggest that the newspapers and periodicals be advanced to the space now allocated to the cataloguers, and that these officials be accommodated either near the main entrance or along the sides.

164. *To Mr. Jackson.*—Valuables like presentation caskets should be kept in a strong-room. A library should not be a museum. An historical museum might be an adjunct to a library, but it is undesirable to have showcases in a library. We have them in the Mitchell Library, but when the building is extended I intend to move them out of the reading room. Persons walking about a reading room, curiously engaged in looking at historical relics, are an annoyance to serious students.

(Taken at Sydney.)

WEDNESDAY, 18TH APRIL, 1923.

Present:

Mr. GREGORY, Chairman;

Senator Foll	Mr. Cook
Senator Newland	Mr. Jackson
Senator Plain	Mr. Mackay
Mr. Blakeley	

William Irons, Secretary of the Bricklayers' Union, sworn and examined.

165. *To the Chairman.*—I am aware of the proposal for undertaking a large building programme at Canberra, and the matter has been casually mentioned amongst the members of my organization. The union is entirely opposed to piece-work, because it means shoddy work; there is not the slightest doubt about that. Day labour is not expensive if the work is carried out in a proper manner. As a general rule, it is the supervision of Government works, not the labour, which is costly. Often there are more officers than men. I have found that so in Sydney. I admit that I have no definite information to put before the Committee in support of that statement, but I consider that the work at Canberra should be carried out by day labour. I am opposed to the butty-gang system, because it promotes too much jealousy; all the men desire to be bosses. Tradesmen will not leave Sydney to go to Canberra unless they are assured of good living conditions as well as good wages. I am not acquainted with Canberra. I have not had any representations from the men employed there in regard to housing conditions. There is a fair demand for bricklayers in this State, but I think there are ample tradesmen to meet it. Very few applications for men have been made to me. A supply of first class labour for Canberra will depend upon the conditions offered. Bricklayers in Sydney are being paid up to 28s. per day. An award of the State Arbitration Court is operating in Sydney, but the actual wages are much higher. There is likely to be a demand for building labour for some time to come. The ruling rate paid by master builders is 22s. per day, or 2s. 9d. per hour, in Sydney, and in the suburbs up to 28s. per day. Higher wages would have to be paid at Canberra to attract the same class of workmen. I understand that the climatic conditions there are not as good as in Sydney, and that in the winter men would lose a lot of time on account of wind and rain. Wind would not interfere with a man working on a building up to a height of 26 feet, but during high wind it is impossible to work on a building of three or more stories.

166. *To Mr. Blakeley.*—The union is opposed to sub-contracting. I cannot offer any suggestions in regard to the provision of accommodation for workmen at Canberra, but I do not think that a wage less than 25s. per day will attract bricklayers thither. I think my union is a party to the industrial award made by the Disputes Committee at Canberra.

167. *To Senator Plain.*—Men prefer to work in Sydney, and they ask for extra money on jobs in the country. Fairly constant work is offering in Sydney.

168. *To Mr. Jackson.*—There are no unemployed on the books of the union. Of course, jobs are being finished every day, and some men may come to the office of the union for further employment, but mainly the men go and find another job for themselves. Some of the men receiving 22s. per day may not be first class tradesmen, and a few extra shillings per day is offered by contractors who want the services of the best men. Some married men have their homes about Sydney, but not all single men would go to Canberra. A married man who desired to get away from "the old woman" might go.

169. *To Senator Foll.*—I am aware that the cost of erecting cottages at Canberra is fairly high, and runs

into about £900 for three rooms; but I do not think that a reduction of rents would make much difference to the workmen. If men get high wages, they can pay high rents. I received, in Johannesburg, wages higher than are paid in Sydney, and I heard no complaint about the high cost of building. If a man is awarded a fair and proper wage, he can pay a high rent. The cost of building is largely due to supervision; the work is overloaded with the salaries of supervisors and other overhead expenses. Judges in the Arbitration Court have said that workmen should live near their work, and the Arbitration Court does not make an allowance which would enable men to live in the suburbs. A fair day's work on a cottage is 700 to 750 bricks per day. On facework a man will not lay more than 500 to 550 bricks per day. It would not be wise to import bricklayers from the Old World. A few years ago, some tradesmen were imported, and when they arrived there was no work for them. The building trade fluctuates; in three months there may be stagnation, and hundreds of men walking about the streets looking for work. There is a good deal of activity in the building trade in New South Wales, but it cannot be called a boom. The employers do not engage their men through the union. For years we have been trying to get our members who are out of work to register at the union office, so that when employers want men we can supply them. If an employer asked for any particular man and he was out of work, we would send him, but if he was not available we would send the man entitled to the next preference.

170. *To Mr. Cook.*—I believe the award wage at Canberra is 23s. per day and 44 hours per week. A man will not go there for 23s. if he can get 25s. in Sydney without any trouble. Men are not paid full time in Sydney, but I do not see that they would be better off in Canberra paid full time at 23s. per day.

171. *To Senator Newland.*—I believe there is a shortage of homes in Austral'a, but that does not necessarily indicate that there will be a constant demand for bricklayers; concrete is displacing bricks to some extent. The union does not object to boys being engaged as apprentices. If a boy comes to me and expresses a desire to learn bricklaying, I send him to the Builders' Association. The union itself is not concerned with the training of apprentices, but we do not object to boys coming into the trade in a proper manner. Men who are working with a decent boy will teach him the trade. When I was at the trade, the members of the unions were the bosses, and took sub-contracts for bricklaying. If a man had an apprentice but had not enough work for him, he transferred him to another man who was busier; and thus the union saw that a boy learnt his trade. Until the Arbitration Act came into force there had been no apprenticeship for about 30 years. A boy went to work at the trade, spent a month or two with a piece-worker, and then passed on to another piece-worker. He continued going from one job to another, and did not learn anything. Men trained in that way have got into the trade, and I think their inferior workmanship adds to the cost of the job. The union does not interfere with its members who take contracts for brickwork; the award provides for piece-work, but it is recognised that this tends to produce inferior work. If a practical man is in charge of a job there need not be any slumming. If the Commonwealth Government applied to the unions for bricklayers for Canberra, and the conditions offered were favorable, we would do our best to supply them. I do not think very many married men will leave Sydney.

172. *To Mr. Mackay.*—The pay in country districts is generally higher than in Sydney. Men usually get a country allowance, although the actual wage is about the same as in the city. The majority of the tradesmen of to-day are efficient. An apprentice does not receive any certificate of competency unless he attends the technical college. The practical proof of a boy's

efficiency at the end of his time is that his boss is prepared to pay him a full journeyman's wages. If the boss will not accept him as a qualified journeyman he tries for work in some other quarter.

173. *To the Chairman.*—I have heard members of the union say that they are paying 30s. to 35s. per week in rent. A cottage comprising four rooms and a kitchen costs 35s. to £2 per week. I do not think that a man should pay more than a day's wages in rent. A fair number of our members have either bought homes or are buying them on the instalment plan. Any married workmen who went to Canberra would require comfortable homes for which they would be prepared to pay a day's wages in rent. Workers' homes in selected localities, even at higher rentals, would be more satisfactory than the temporary accommodation provided at Canberra now. I do not think it would be practicable to construct the cottages on the butty-gang system, or to let small contracts to the workers. I have already said that, under the butty-gang system, all the men want to be bosses, and I think it leads to abuse. If Canberra takes 200 bricklayers the labour market will be short for a time. Men will not be available at Canberra under the existing award. About eight or nine months ago the Commonwealth Works Department asked me by telephone for bricklayers for Canberra. The wages then offering were 2s. 9d. per hour. I replied that if the Government were prepared to pay 3s. per hour, country allowance, fares, and travelling time, they would get the men, but I heard no more. Subsequently the Government advertised, and through the Labour Bureau engaged men for less than 3s. per hour. Some of the men who take work in the country continue to keep their homes in or about Sydney, but the majority prefer to take their wives and families with them.

174. *To Mr. Blakeley.*—I do not know of any men who have accepted employment from John Howie and Sons, contractors, at Canberra.

175. *To Senator Plain.*—Labourers are being advertised for at up to 23s. per day. An ordinary labourer is paid about 2s. 4d. per hour. A bricklayer receiving 25s. per day should pay 25s. per week in rent; a labourer who is receiving only 21s. per day should pay only that amount in rent. I cannot make any suggestions as to what class of house can be built to be let at those rentals. The Government would be wise to sell cottages to workmen, but the buyer should not be expected to pay too much for supervision. A man who owns his house is more satisfied and settled than a man who is paying 35s. per week without acquiring any permanent interest in the house. I do not suggest that that should apply to leasehold lands; I believe in the freehold system.

176. *To Mr. Blakeley.*—I think the Government would be wise to sell land in the Federal Territory.

The witness withdrew.

John Nathan Turner, secretary Carpenters and Joiners Union, New South Wales, sworn and examined.

177. *To the Chairman.*—I have heard a lot of talk about the proposed building programme at Canberra, but the matter has never been submitted to the union in a formal way. A demand for 700 or 800 artisans for Canberra would harden the labour market, but I look upon work at Canberra in the same light as work elsewhere, except that it is to be done within a certain period. The amount of building work required by the community and the number of building tradesmen available are just about in the proportions necessary to keep the industry going steadily. If reasonable conditions were offered at Canberra, there would be no difficulty in getting a couple of hundred carpenters to go there. I have not been at Canberra, but I have been at other places where a large number of men have been employed for a short period. The work

at Hume Weir will last for eight or nine years, but I know from my own experience that men are constantly coming and going. Although the Government have established a township, and endeavour to give the men every consideration, they will not remain there permanently. The building of the Federal capital will necessitate at the commencement a supply of labour disproportionate to the general population of the city, and a large number of the men cannot be expected to stay there permanently. For instance, when Parliament House is built, the Government are not likely to build a second. The job will be finished. Once the principal buildings are erected, and the city is established, its requirements of building labour will be no greater in proportion to population than those of Sydney and Melbourne. It is generally held that a man should pay in rent not more than a day's wages. In America the building tradesman pays less than one day's wages. There the hourly rate is high, and the hours are shorter. In some places the working week is only 40 hours, but 44 hours is more common. Carpenters and bricklayers receive a higher rate per hour than they do in Australia, but the cost of material is much less. Here native timbers are as dear on the job as is timber from America, where a higher wage is paid to the lumberer. The cheapness of timber and other materials is the main factor accounting for the cheaper houses in America. Australian hardwoods make the best flooring, but they are not suitable for ceilings unless thoroughly seasoned. I was near Esk, in the Brisbane River district, before the war, and I know that Oregon could be brought from America cheaper than timber could be got from the mill half-a-mile away. The union would be absolutely opposed to the workers entering into small contracts for the erection of cottages at Canberra. Our organization has always fought sub-contracting or piece work, because it leads men to take work at non-payable prices. In New South Wales piece work was abolished when the first award for carpenters and joiners was made. Prior to that a system of sub-letting wood work was in operation, and although competent tradesmen priced the job, they found at the end they were not making wages. The principle adopted by the Arbitration Court in New South Wales is that on work let out men should earn at least 10 per cent. more than time wages, but we object to that, too, because we regard it as the thin end of the piece-work wedge. It is very difficult to compute the value of labour in a cottage. Cubing may be a sufficient basis for a building taken in the lump with a certain amount of margin in regard to material, but when men are asked to do a particular job for a stated price the tendency is to pinch them. The piece-work system is responsible for most of the inferior workmen who are to be found in this country. A man who is not competent enough to work at a daily wage will take a "labour only" contract, and if it takes him a long time, it does not matter. When piece work was in operation, we found that it was the incompetent man who took "labour only" contracts.

178. *To Senator Foll.*—The union does stipulate that a man must possess certain qualifications before he is admitted to membership. The rules provide that before becoming a member of the organization a man must be a fully qualified carpenter or joiner. The State Arbitration Court has made us add to our rule that no applicant shall be refused admission unless he is of general bad character. Thus the Court forced us to take into our union men who otherwise would have been rejected. There may be a few of our men who are not fully qualified. The supply of carpenters in Sydney is equal to the demand. At the present time there is a slight slump in the demand for carpenters. For years our members have registered at the union's office for employment, but the labour bureau system has taken from the unions some of the responsibility they previously accepted in regard to the distribution of work. At one time men out of work attended at the union

office daily, and to some extent that system still applies. In Sydney to-day about 40 members of our union are registered for employment. We generally reckon that the number of men out of work is equal to three times the registrations; that means that there are 120 carpenters out of employment to-day. It would be an advantage to workers if houses could be erected more cheaply than at the present time. Taking the world's market for carpenters, wages in this country are about as low as they are anywhere. The Australian rate is approximately the same as that in England, and lower than in Africa and America, and, I think, the Argentine Republic. There is a house shortage throughout the world, and the wages in Australia are certainly as low as in any other British country. The Arbitration Court has never made any limitation in regard to apprentices, although we asked that they should be limited, so as to insure that they will be taught their trade better. A shop employing three journeymen and twenty apprentices could not teach a boy his trade; but as the builders have been able to produce evidence that the apprentices are very few, the Court has not made any limitation. I do not think it would be wise for the Government to sell houses in Canberra. It would be some advantage to a number of men to own their houses, but the majority of the building tradesmen who go to Canberra will not remain there for any length of time. When the city is established it will carry a permanent staff of carpenters, and those men will avail themselves of any opportunity of acquiring homes. It is true of all communities that the man who owns his own house is probably a better citizen than a man who is merely a tenant. It is natural for a man to desire to own a home. At the Hume weir the New South Wales Government assisted men to obtain houses by giving them the ground rent free and timber at cost price. A number of men put up houses of two and three rooms, and made quite decent residences. But if, after being there for twelve months, one of these householders incurred the displeasure of the foreman or engineer, and was sacked, he would be burdened with a house of which he could not dispose. When men are bound up with the employer in regard to a residence or other liability, there is a tendency for them to become servile. I object to the employer having any such hold over his men. It would not do to lead men to believe that they can get permanent work at Canberra, thus inducing them to establish homes, and then, after two or three years, dismiss them. The building worker is a nomad, but the Government will have no difficulty in getting labour at Canberra if the conditions are satisfactory.

179. *To Mr. Cook.*—The initial building programme at Canberra will attract there a fair army of workers in the building trade, but, as happened in San Francisco, when the first rush is over a large proportion of the men will be obliged to leave. I think the carpenters are working as efficiently and cheaply as possible. I do not think that the cost of cottage construction at Canberra would be reduced by letting a contract for 200 cottages to private tender.

180. *To Mr. Blakeley.*—Speeding up and getting more work from men at slightly increased cost is one of the main reasons for our opposition to sub-contracting. At Canberra, carpenters should receive at least 4s. per day more than in Sydney. The carpenters are a party to the award of the Industrial Disputes Committee at Canberra. There is also an award of the State Arbitration Court, and a Federal award which does not apply to New South Wales. The State award was in operation when the dispute at Canberra took place, and our men were receiving 20s. per day and a country allowance and other concessions. The Federal Government issued a proclamation appointing an Industrial Disputes Committee, which took evidence and made an award. The Government obey the award only so far as it suits them. They are not paying the award rate to the maintenance carpenter at Duntroon College,

because they say that he should be under the New South Wales award. First of all, the Minister gave approval to pay this carpenter at the Canberra rate, including back pay, but a few days ago we received an intimation that that order had been cancelled. So we do not know where we are in regard to the Industrial Disputes Committee's award. The Government say that it does not apply to any men except those who were parties to the dispute. If that view be adhered to, the conditions at Canberra will be fairly chaotic. At the present time we are appealing against the Arbitration Court's award of 46½ hours in Sydney. If we succeed in retaining the 44-hour week, men will not go to Canberra at the rate of wages awarded by the Industrial Disputes Committee. I have not received any application from John Howie and Sons for carpenters to be sent to Canberra, but I have heard of some men who have gone there. I understand that there is a clause in the contract to the effect that Howie and Sons are not to pay more than the Federal Government is bound by the award to pay.

The witness withdrew.

William Alfred Redfern, Organizer, Carpenters' Union, New South Wales, sworn and examined.

181. *To the Chairman.*—I have been at Canberra, and I found that the cottages erected at the civic centre, and occupied by some of our members, are too far from their work; there is no means of transport to and from their homes, and no shelter in winter time. In wet weather the roads are not good enough for bicycles. I stayed in the hutments at Molonglo Camp twelve months ago, and I do not think they are fit for human habitation, but I have heard that the cottages are being improved. The rental is not cheap for the conveniences that are offered. Men are paying 6s. per week for three rooms, and 2s. per week for each extra room. There is a community laundry, and a woman has to arrange practically a week beforehand to use it. There is also a common water closet. Our men do not want brick cottages at a rental of £1 per week, and they do not desire to live in the internment camp. When workers first went to Canberra, the Government gave them a certain amount of material with which to erect a home on a piece of ground. For ground rent they were charged 6d. per week, and so long as the houses were 50 yards apart the tenants enjoyed privacy, which they do not get at Molonglo, without incurring the expense they have to meet at the civic centre. Of course, there was no sewerage system. If good men are to be attracted to Canberra, they must be made comfortable; the first essential is a considerable increase in the wages. If cottages are built more than half-a-mile away from the job, the men will not occupy them. A distance of a mile between the job and the cottage is too great, because there is no means of transport and the men would be exposed to the elements in the winter. Weatherboard cottages would be just as suitable as brick. Men want privacy and low rentals. Quarter-acre lots would not be too large at Canberra, because, as there will be no sports meetings or theatres to attend, men will probably devote their spare time to gardening. The minimum frontage should be 50 feet.

182. *To Mr. Blakeley.*—My experience was that commodities were very much dearer at Canberra than in Sydney, and we were absolutely at the mercy of the storekeepers in Queanbeyan. Even if a co-operative store were established at Canberra, it would have a monopoly. At present, the men there have to pay high prices for inferior goods while employed there. I sent to Queanbeyan for a saw for which the ruling price in Sydney was 13s., and I was charged 26s.

183. *To the Chairman.*—I think a day's wage is too much to pay in rent. The only way to reduce the rentals is to evolve a standard cottage, in either brick or wood. The time when the Government had the best

mechanics at Canberra was when they charged them only 6d. per week for their housing. People living at Canberra are isolated, and they get no enjoyments. In order to make life attractive, Canberra must have good stores and a school, and offer opportunities of employment to children as they grow up.

The witness withdrew.

John Millard, State Secretary and Federal President, Australian Builders Labourers' Federation, sworn and examined.

184. *To the Chairman.*—I have been at Canberra on many occasions, but not since 1919. The first obstacle to getting good men there is the insufficient housing accommodation and the cost of construction. Certainly, if the Government want a good class of workmen to go to Canberra, they must provide accommodation for them and their families. The capital will not develop as a residential city unless family men settle there. In the past, accommodation has been sadly lacking, and the workmen built a sort of Little Bourke-street of old tins and bags. The only decent cottages were those occupied by the foremen. The single men lived in tents. The Government must set about the provision of cottages. Houses could have been built cheaply years ago; probably four rooms and a kitchen could have been erected for £500 if the Federal Government had given the material free of overhead charges. Labour is not the greatest factor in the cost of a cottage; more than two-thirds of the money is represented by material. To-day, oregon is cheaper than local hardwood, and is being used in all the cottages. I prefer a brick cottage of four rooms, including the kitchen, with a wooden outhouse and bathroom. The sizes should be varied in order to meet the requirements of different families. A quarter of an acre is not too large a block for a workman's cottage, and the Government could stipulate that the ground be properly kept. Most of the tenants would utilize the ground for gardens and poultry.

185. *To Mr. Blakeley.*—Good men will not go to Canberra unless good wages and working conditions are offered. We estimate that 4s. per day should be paid as a country allowance to the man who goes to Canberra, leaving his family in Sydney. There will be not the least difficulty about getting members of my organization to go to Canberra from Sydney, Melbourne, and various country centres. The Federal Arbitration Court award prevails at Canberra, and the Industrial Disputes Committee has no right to interfere with the conditions which the Federal Court has prescribed.

(Taken at Sydney.)

THURSDAY, 19TH APRIL, 1923.

Present:

Mr. GREGORY, Chairman;

Senator Foll	Mr. Cook
Senator Newland	Mr. Jackson
Senator Plain	Mr. Mackay.
Mr. Blakeley	

The Right Honorable William Morris Hughes, P.C., M.H.R., Barrister-at-law, sworn and examined.

186. *To the Chairman.*—I am asked whether I would recommend the construction of a temporary Parliament House, a provisional Parliament House, or a permanent monumental building. The answer must necessarily depend upon what object the Committee has in view. A monumental building, worthy of the place, would take many years to erect, and, as I am one who desires that Parliament shall assemble at Canberra as soon as practicable, I am in favour of a provisional building. It would be a mis-

take for Parliament to go into a building of a flimsy and unworthy character. The provisional building seems to represent the happy medium between the impromptu and unworthy, and a monumental building worthy to house the National Parliament of the Commonwealth which will take years to construct. I cannot express an expert opinion as to the extent to which the provisional building could be made a stage in the construction of the permanent monumental Parliament House, but I can hardly think that it is possible to construct a provisional building on the permanent site in such a way as not to delay the construction of the permanent edifice, or prove an embarrassment in respect of design. Besides, who are we to say what design should be accepted for the monumental structure? But we do know what we want now, and unless we are to wait until the sands of time have run out, so far as the present generation is concerned, we should select a temporary site, place a suitable building upon it, and transfer Parliament to Canberra without delay. When we are there we shall be better able to say what is a suitable site, and certainly we shall be more qualified to say what would be a suitable building. I suppose there is hardly a member of this Committee who has not his own opinion about the total unfitness of the present Federal Parliament House, in Melbourne, as a place in which to conduct reasoned debates. Its acoustic properties are bad, and its sanitary arrangements—if it has any, which I take leave to doubt—are vile; as a factory it would be condemned. It is the repository of most diseases; at any rate, I know of none that are not there. It seems beyond repair; the ingenuity of man and the mastery of science lag hopelessly behind in the endeavour to overtake its many defects. The air in the chambers is tested for purity, and arrangements are made for pumping in hot or cold air, according to the season, but the scheme so works that, on cold days, we get cold air, on hot days hot air, and on all days rotten air. In regard to the site for the permanent building, I would reserve all the best in the neighbourhood, and allow Parliament, when it is settled in Canberra, to make the choice. The building on Capitol Hill, whatever it be, will dominate the landscape and be the most prominent architectural feature in the lay-out of the city. Having regard to the architectural features of Rome, Athens, Washington, and all the other great capital cities of the world, the most important building in Canberra should be that in which Parliament sits. Usually such a building is crowned with a great dome as the central architectural feature, and round about are grouped the public offices. Therefore the dominating site at Canberra should be utilized for Parliament House, and nearby the public offices should be placed. I do not know what Mr. Griffin means by "The Capitol." To both the Greeks and the Romans, and certainly to the Americans, it means, if it be anything but Parliament House, the place where the head of the Government resides. It is the Seat of Government, and you may say fairly that the Government is enshrined in the head, whether be he the King, the Governor-General, the President, or some other person who is the symbol of government. I am assuming that the space at our disposal is, for all practical purposes, unlimited. In a democratic country, whilst there must be grades in society, these should be only such as are imposed by the demands of discipline and order, and are represented by Parliament and the heads of the State. Therefore the parliamentary building and the official residences should be on the commanding site. It is proper that the residence of the Prime Minister, too, should be there, and the buildings should be grouped in such a way that all the contours would blend one into another, so that, in the distance, one would say of the whole group, "That is the Capitol." I think it would be wrong, historically and architecturally, to put the residences of the Governor-General and the Prime Minister in the domi-

nating positions and Parliament House below. The parliamentary building, together with Government House, or the residence of the head of the State, should be part of one contour. Whether the central architectural feature should be the dome of Parliament House, or a great public hall, or library, is a matter for the architect to determine, but the head of the State cannot be put anywhere else but in the centre of the picture. Subject to those circumstances, which must obtrude themselves into a discussion of this matter—the circumstances of this country, the fact that it is a Democracy, that Parliament represents the people, and that the representative of the King and the Prime Minister are, in themselves, only symbols of the people, in whose hands all power resides—the place in which Parliament meets should not be noticeably detached from the other buildings of the Capitol group. I concur in the proposal to provide, near the entrance to Parliament House, a number of small rooms in which members may interview strangers. My general objection to the present Parliament House in Melbourne is that, although it is very magnificent, it is most inconvenient. It is nearly all corridors, and whilst these are very beautiful, there should be more room for strangers; the public, after all, are the electors and courtesy should wait upon them. They should not be required to wander all round the building or, like storks, stand in a corner on one leg. I recommend the provision of about half-a-dozen rooms for the interviewing of strangers. In regard to the central reception hall, I am not quite sure what will be the effect of a hall comprising a central portion 26 feet high, surrounded by corridors 10 feet high and 20 feet wide. I wish this building to be, although provisional, both beautiful and useful. It is right that there should be a reception hall large enough to meet the ceremonial and social needs of Parliament. The Queen's Hall, in the Federal Parliament House, Melbourne, is one of the most magnificent rooms of its kind in the world, but the roof is too high, and consequently the acoustics are bad. I approve of the proposal to provide open garden spaces, which will be directly accessible from the chamber. I attribute some of the difficulties of ventilating the present Parliament House to the fact that the chambers are entirely shut in by rooms and corridors. I have seen the rostrum in operation in France and America. It is curious that a man like me should be conservative, but I prefer the present system by which a member rises in his place. In the French Chamber of Deputies the members ascend the rostrum, and my observation is that it tends to make speakers theatrical. A man feels that he has to make an oration, and gesture and declamation are inseparable from the rostrum. Both those things are very bad, although, I admit, that I am guilty of them. I am in favour of the old British custom of a member rising in his place. The proposal to provide members with desks, single or double, and to allow a space between each desk and around the back of the seats so that members may move in or out of their places without disturbing others, is the system in operation in the American Congress. We live in a world which most of us think is right, because it is the only world we have ever known. In both the Parliaments of which I have been a member the seats have been in the form of benches without desks, and I have naturally assumed that God so intended. In Congress I noticed that members sat at desks in chairs resembling a theatre stall. I am sorry to appear a rank Tory, but our own old-fashioned form of seating appeals to me. It is frightfully inconvenient, I admit, as most old things are. The idea of making the central gangway of the chambers open on to garden spaces is good. I am convinced that much irritation and trouble, and prolongation of debates, arises from insanitary conditions, such as lack of sunlight and fresh air. Ample dining accommodation should be provided for the press. Representatives of the press throughout the Common-

wealth will be at Canberra, and they will constitute a little world of their own. The newspaper columns are the channels by which news of the doings of Parliament will flow to the people. It is most important that the pressmen should be comfortable and feel that they are part of the institution. Their part will be that of recorders. In this great Commonwealth there can be no other way by which the people can be informed of the proceedings of Parliament. The number of people who will go to Canberra, although considerable in itself, will be negligible in comparison with the bulk of the population. Therefore every accommodation should be provided for the press. There is this selfish consideration also that uncomfortable men become irritable, and they are always likely to be more hostile than those who are comfortable. Feed a man, and treat him well, is an axiom of domestic happiness. I think the press should be given private access to their rooms without traversing the corridors intended for members. In regard to the number of members that the chambers may eventually accommodate, one is hardly able to say to what extent, if at all, the Constitution will be amended. But if it be amended the people will probably demand a reduction of the *personnel* of some of the State Parliaments. That would cause an increase in the membership of the National Parliament. Such a development is very much in the air, and may never come about, because the United States Constitution has remained practically unchanged for 150 years. However, with the growth of population the world is being gradually filled up. Those spaces which formerly held out inviting hands to the great populations of Europe have been nearly filled, and the stream of people must turn in the direction of Australia. The rate of increase of our population was greater than that of any other country in the world for the decade 1911-21. I am satisfied that, although there may be fluctuations in the migration barometer, there will be a sharp upward turn, and our population will not be far short of 10,000,000 twenty-five years hence. There are 76 members of the House of Representatives now, and probably, with an alteration of the Constitution, that number would be increased to 100. Making an allowance for an increase of population the chamber of the House of Representatives should be designed to accommodate 200 members. In a country like Australia the basis of representation cannot be the same as in England. The circumstances of the two countries are so vastly different. States so widely separated and districts so different in resources and climatic conditions cannot have adequate representation unless they return a sufficient number of members of Parliament. It may be said that increased representation involves additional expense to which people will object. I reply that it is better to pay a little more for good representation than to save a little money and get bad or no representation at all, for that is what the present system amounts to. Let the architectural concept of this building be such as will enable effect to be given to the people's will in regard to representation without structural alteration. At the stage of development at which we find ourselves now, and bearing in mind that we are proposing to build, not a permanent, but a provisional Parliament House, there is no necessity to provide in it the accommodation which a national library would require. It will be sufficient to provide a Parliamentary Library of ample dimensions. The archives should be stored at Canberra in some part of Parliament House. The archives generally would be under the control of the head of the Government in Australia, the titular head is the Governor-General, but his functions clearly do not indicate him as the natural and proper custodian of the archives. On the other hand there is the Prime Minister, the head of the Executive; the people's representative and spokesman, the man in whom is reposed the authority of

the people. I can hardly conceive of anything that comes within the compass of the Commonwealth over which the Prime Minister, as head of the Government, ought not to have, and, as a matter of fact, does not have, complete authority. I suppose, therefore, you may say that the archives will be under the control of the Government. I am aware that the architects have suggested that the competition for the monumental Parliament House should be proceeded with, and that any buildings erected now should form a nucleus of the permanent Parliament House. One hesitates to pit his uninformed opinion against that of experts. No doubt there is a great deal in what they say, but we have waited very long for this Federal Capital. War and other circumstances have stood in the way of its realization, and it is high time that a start was made upon the construction of the city. We cannot be masters of the future, but the present is ours. Postpone the commencement of Parliament House for twelve months, in order to allow of a competition, and then a request will be made for a further postponement of six months, because somebody has not heard of the competition, or has not completed his design. Then many months must elapse before the plans can be adjudicated upon. Then Parliament will demand ample opportunity to express its opinion on the plans. Then the competitors, whose designs have not been accepted, will start to pull the strings, and there will be a second adjudication for their benefit. I am strongly in favour of establishing the Parliament at Canberra. The only way to do that is to start building the provisional Parliament House now. It would be presumptuous on my part to express an opinion upon what the architects have said, but my own view is that it would be better for us to build immediately upon a provisional site, and within a reasonable time after we go to Canberra competitive designs for the permanent monumental structure may be called for. The construction of the permanent features of the Federal Capital will occupy very many years, but, in the meantime, Parliament must go there. Therefore, I am opposed to delay and favour the erection of a provisional building. I am afraid that the competition would involve great delay. It is the fatal tendency of man to find some excuse why he should not do a thing. I realize thoroughly the forces that are fighting for the postponement of the Federal Capital; they are very powerful. I am speaking, not of political parties, but of vested interests of various kinds—not only property interests. People do not like being dragged from a place in which they have taken root; they cling like clams to a rock. I am for building the Federal Capital now, believing delay to be dangerous. I fear if we do not do it now it will never be done.

187. *To Mr. Jackson.*—I do not contemplate that, with an increase in the number of States, each State would necessarily return six senators, but I should say that the number of senators may increase to 70 within the life of the provisional Parliament House.

The witness withdrew.

Edward Riley, M.H.R., sworn and examined.

188. *To the Chairman.*—The Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Charlton) has asked me to appear before the Committee to represent his views upon the plans for the provisional Parliament House. The ground plan seems to me to be almost a copy of the present Parliament House in Melbourne. Any building erected as a provisional Parliament House at Canberra should be of such a character that it can be used for a public school or university, or some other public utility, after Parliament moves into its permanent home. A great deal of money ought not to be spent on provisional buildings. Any structure erected as proposed should have permanent uses. The bricks will have a life of hundreds of years, and, therefore, the building should

be designed to be ornamental, in order to fit in with the general surroundings. I do not like the idea of brick walls to a certain height and, above that, white rough-cast or plaster. If portion of the main façade were cased in trachyte it would be an ornament to the city. The building as designed could be erected in twelve months if the Government so desired. I urge the Committee to insist that the building be one of which Parliament need not be ashamed. If finished in rough-cast, it will look cheap and barn-like. Already in the cottages at Canberra good brickwork is being hidden by rough-cast. Let the main elevation, at all events, be attractive. This building will be the central feature of the Federal city, and Parliament will be judged very largely by the class of building it erects there. If we are confident of the future of this Commonwealth, we should not hesitate to erect buildings that will be both ornamental and a testimony of our faith in the possibilities of our country. A long line of low buildings, with white walls and red roofs, will look like a farm-house. The temporary or provisional Parliament House should not be too close to the site of the permanent monumental structure, otherwise it may become the centre of the governmental group. Besides, a building that is to be utilized later for a university or national museum should not be jammed right against the permanent Parliament House. The buildings as planned will be expensive, because of the very wide spread of roof. The same accommodation could be got at cheaper cost by carrying the building to two stories. The roof is a very expensive part of any building. During 50 years' growth there will be a big increase of population at Canberra, and other buildings will develop around the provisional Parliament House. I suggest that any neighbouring buildings should be of a temporary character, so as not to interfere with the site of the permanent Parliament House. Mr. Griffin has made some very great blunders in his lay-out, and the time will come when the details of his plan will have to be modified. We should not be bound too closely to the details of the lay-out, and, therefore, I would suggest a site for the provisional Parliament House further away from Camp Hill. Strangers' rooms near the main entrance to Parliament House are necessary. The plan does not show much accommodation for them or for members. The proposal to have a central reception hall seems all right, but I would prefer that the enclosing walls be removed and supporting columns substituted, and the surrounding corridors thus made part of the one large main hall. I object to the chambers being enclosed by rooms and offices. I like the arrangement in the Queensland Parliament House, where casement doors open from the chamber direct on to a large verandah or balcony and a little exclusive garden. The benches in the present Parliament House are very inconvenient, and I think that single or double desks with sufficient space between to allow of members passing to and from their seats, without disturbing others, would be an advantage. In the present Parliament House, the chamber is the only place where members can write; they cannot write in the party rooms or the library. If a single desk be practicable, I would prefer it to be a double desk. The population of the Commonwealth may be expected to more than double itself in 25 years, and, if parliamentary representation increases proportionately, the Parliament will consist of twice as many members as at present. There should be seating accommodation in the House of Representatives for 150 members. We must look well ahead. For instance, a big immigration scheme has been launched in Western Australia, and if it is successful the representation of that State will have to be increased in another decade. Probably New Guinea also will require representation. There should be ample reserve space to allow of an increase of members. In regard to the suggestion to adopt the rostrum, I believe that a little platform about 6 inches

high, and a little desk, at one side of the Speaker would be sufficient. I would not care for any rostrum in the nature of a pulpit; but a member speaking from a slight elevation would have a better command over the House. Under existing circumstances, any member of the Opposition speaking at the table is interrupted by the conversation of half-a-dozen members near him. Perhaps the rostrum would tend to improve the calibre of debate, because a man would not rise to speak unless he was well prepared. It would not be necessary to use the rostrum in Committee. The press gallery should not be more than 9 feet above the floor of the chamber. The present system of accommodating the *Hansard* reporters at the table is inconvenient to both the reporter and the members of the Opposition. The reporter is continually harassed by members walking past him, or stopping to converse behind his chair, whilst to members the fact of the reporters walking in and out is annoying. I think that *Hansard* should be given separate accommodation; the reporters could very easily be placed at a table in front of the Speaker and behind the rostrum. I agree with the proposal to transfer the *Hansard* rooms from the Senate side to the House of Representatives side, where the greater part of the work is done. The suggestion to raise the two interior wings to two stories meets with my approval. Members should not be subject to interference by the public and the press, and separate access to the House and press galleries for representatives of the newspapers would be a big advantage. With regard to the library plan, I do not see any merit in the central partitions. It would be preferable to accommodate the attendants and cataloguers at either end of the room. Seating accommodation in the dining-room for 250 guests should be sufficient to meet the requirements of Parliament for many years.

189. *To Mr. Cook*.—I do not regard the excavation of 10 feet at the southern end of the provisional site as serious. I prefer Camp Hill as the site for the permanent structure. Any departure from Mr. Griffin's plan in that regard will involve an alteration of the whole lay-out of the governmental group. Before deciding to place Parliament House upon Kurrajong Hill, regard should be had to the distance that would separate it from the hostels and administrative offices. I would prefer to study the two sites before expressing a definite opinion as to their relative merits. No one can predict with confidence what increase there will be in the number of parliamentary parties, but the political outlook is changing throughout the world, and it is possible that in the near future there will be new parties, such as the Socialistic party, seeking representation in Parliament on separate tickets. The plans before the Committee do not allow enough margin for developments of that kind; there are no spare rooms that can be allotted to new parties. I do not anticipate that there will be any loss of ventilation through the rear of the provisional Parliament House being set 10 feet into the hill. Pressmen who are engaged in reporting the proceedings of Parliament are undoubtedly part of the parliamentary institution, and, therefore, it is right that adequate accommodation, including dining-room, should be given to them. Similarly, the police on duty in the House should be provided for. Brick makes a good solid structure, but I think that ornamental stone casing is essential if the House is to have a decent appearance. We must remember that this provisional building will last for at least 50 years. Stone facing would not mean a very great increase in the cost. The extra cost of laying heavy foundations in concrete, with a view to the possible addition of extra stories in the future, would be warranted.

190. *To Mr. Jackson*.—As a representative of a city constituency, I find that 40,000 electors are sufficient for one man to look after, and in country electorates that quota is too great.

191. *To the Chairman*.—I do not think that four private dining-room would be sufficient. Special arrangements should be made for heating the chambers and rooms in winter time. I have been a member of the Federal Parliament for twelve years, and the number of members who have lost their lives or their health through the unsatisfactory accommodation and ventilation of the building at present occupied by the Commonwealth Parliament constitutes a tragic record.

The witness withdrew.

The Hon. Sir Elliot Johnson, M.H.R., sworn and examined.

192. *To the Chairman*.—If we could afford to do so it would be highly desirable to start the erection of the permanent Parliament House, but in the present condition of public finance that course is apparently not practicable. The wiser plan will be to recognise the strong probability that, at least, 25 or 30 years will elapse before it will be possible to build the permanent monumental structure. Therefore it is necessary to erect a building which will meet all foreseeable requirements for the next 30 years. I suggest that it be built of such material that, if it be necessary to demolish it, when it is no longer required for parliamentary purposes, the building may be utilized for other buildings elsewhere. I have always objected to the placing of a building of a more or less temporary character on a site just in front of that which has been ear-marked for the permanent building. I understood that the original idea of the Government Architect was that the building should be of a very temporary character, and be demolished at the expiration of the term for which it was designed. I pointed out then that, having regard to the expanding activities of Parliament and the administrative Departments, the accommodation contained in the temporary legislative building would probably be required for other purposes by that time, and, therefore, that if practicable it would be better to erect the buildings on a site where they need not be disturbed at the expiration of the time for which they were required by Parliament, but be available for some other governmental purpose. The Advisory Committee may have had special reasons for proposing to place the provisional building at the foot of Camp Hill. I am certain that, even if we had the money and labour at our command, we could not erect a suitable permanent building within three years. I mean, of course, a building of noble dimensions and dignified design that would be monumental in its character. Undoubtedly the provisional structure should be of brick. It is absolutely necessary that whatever building is erected should be of such materials that it will not be subject to climatic influences and the ordinary processes of rapid decay. A timber structure would be subject to the ravages of white ants and dry rot. I favour a brick building, especially as such very fine bricks are made by the Government brickworks on the ground. Mr Griffin planned to place on Kurrajong Hill a monumental building which he called "the Capitol," but what it would be used for I do not know. My opinion is that that hill should be the site of the monumental Parliament House. Undoubtedly Parliament House should be the dominant architectural feature in a legislative city and, as all avenues are focused on the Capitol site, Parliament House should be placed there. I understand that the knoll to the north-east of the governmental area, and facing the ornamental lakes, is ultimately to be removed and used for filling. But as the ornamental waters and other beautifications may be deferred for very many years that eminence would, in my opinion, be more suitable as a site for a provisional Parliament House than the one that has been recommended by the Advisory Committee. There is a possibility of Mr. Griffin's scheme not being carried out in its entirety; at any rate, some of its features

cannot be built for very many years, and, pending the completion of the scheme, that site might well be used for the provisional or temporary parliamentary building. If the buildings are of material which can be removed and utilized elsewhere there need not be any serious disadvantage in placing them upon a site from which they must ultimately be removed. If the intention be to adhere to Mr. Griffin's lay-out, any undue development about the temporary buildings can be obviated. It is not necessary to have all the administrative buildings concentrated about Parliament House; there may be some advantage in not having them too close, so long as they are within reasonable distance, say, not more than half-a-mile. I have always considered that the site selected for Parliament House is unsuitable. When the draft plans were placed before me as Speaker I drew the attention of the Government Architect to the necessity for providing rooms in which members might interview strangers. The plan now before the Committee is really an amplification of that then submitted; the original draft provided no accommodation for Ministers, and little for members. I suggested that it was necessary to have adjacent to the vestibule rooms in which members could interview people calling upon them. Such rooms should be near the main entrance, and yet not too far from the chambers. There is no reason why the proposed Committee and Reception rooms, and the Senate Club room, which are shown on either side of the main entrance, should not be divided into a number of small rooms, say, four on the House of Representatives side and two on the Senate side. I do not see why the central reception hall should be entirely enclosed, but if the interior hall, shown on the plan, and the surrounding corridors are thrown into one big hall we may lose a certain amount of privacy at the entrance to the chambers. I do not like the proposal to have so many entrances from the reception hall; they would tend to make the building draughty and destroy the privacy of members passing between the chambers and the Library, and the other back parts of the building. The corridors need not be 20 feet wide; I think 12 feet would be ample, or, if they be reduced to 15 feet, the central reception hall could be made 10 feet wider and longer. I do not think that the rostrum would have any influence on the tone of debates, but it would certainly enable a speaker to be better heard, and it would be more convenient than the present system by which members rise in their place to address the House. The disadvantage of the present House of Representatives is that members, speaking on the floor of the House, are not properly heard by the press, or by members sitting in certain parts of the chamber. The speeches are best heard from the back benches. I prefer the American, French, and German semi-circular arrangement of seats, with a tribune or rostrum, because it enables a member addressing the chamber to be heard to greater advantage. That arrangement would be better for the members, the press, and everybody concerned. It would be a decided improvement to have either single or double desks, preferably single. Every member should have his own desk, and as we shall have plenty of space available that is practicable. There are disadvantages in the double desk, such as the risk of members getting their papers and notes mixed; moreover, with the single desk the member would have more convenience and privacy. I do not think that an enlargement of the chamber would cause any serious acoustic disabilities that could not be overcome. The American House of Representatives had the semi-circular arrangement of seats, and in response to the agitation by members, it was altered, but, finding the re-arrangement not so good, they restored the semi-circular seating. Sir Henry Lucy, in writing of parliamentary procedure, states that the old system has been reverted to within the last half century. I think that statement needs verification, however, because recent illustrations of the House

of Representatives still show a semi-circular arrangement. The best accommodation for *Hansard* would be a little railed off table in front of the main table. Perhaps it would be advisable to have a rostrum or raised platform on either side of the Speaker, and the *Hansard* reporters, from a little table below, would face the member speaking. Seated at the table, as at present, the reporter has his back to half the House. The present press gallery, above the Speaker's chair, is too high, especially when members are speaking from the front Ministerial benches, near the Speaker's chair. No member speaking within 6 feet of the pairing pens, on any of the three tiers of seats, can be heard well in the press gallery. A gallery 10 feet above the floor will, perhaps, be rather high if members are to speak from their places, but if they are to speak from the rostrum, that would be a reasonable height. The press should have a private entrance, and it would be a great advantage to them if they had direct access to their rooms, without having to pass through the main corridors. There is an objection to making the corridors too public, and members often complained to me, during my term of Speaker, about the manner in which they were molested and bailed up by members of the public and the press, especially during the consideration of the Tariff. Members do not always wish to be waylaid by strangers, and there is no reason why they should not have privacy if they want it. In the present Parliament House there is a press gallery committee, which controls the seating in the galleries, and the press accommodation generally, and that arrangement is very satisfactory. Undoubtedly a dining-room should be provided for the press; in fact, there should be dining accommodation for everybody associated with the work of Parliament. The House of Representatives sits more frequently, and usually for longer hours, than does the Senate, and therefore it is advisable to transfer the *Hansard* quarters from the Senate side to the House of Representatives' side. The arrangement of the library I would prefer to leave to the judgment of those intimately connected with its work. When the original plans were submitted to the President of the Senate and myself, as Speaker, we arranged for the heads of the various parliamentary Departments to consider the plans, and suggest what accommodation would best meet their requirements. The plans now before the Committee were drawn after consultation with the departmental heads. I think it is essential to provide separate rooms for the librarian, assistant librarian, and library accountant. The librarian's office should be in such a position that he can command a view of the whole library, and maintain a general supervision of his officers, but if the suggested arrangement of the library quarters will have the effect of placing at a disadvantage others associated with the work of Parliament, an alteration will be necessary. It is highly necessary that means should be provided of regulating the heat of the chamber at all seasons of the year. The building at present occupied by the Federal Parliament is very unsatisfactory; it presents engineering difficulties, but some system of heating more efficient than that now in use in Melbourne should be adopted. I concur in the proposal to provide direct access from the chambers to a loggia and private garden. If necessary, the room for the assistant clerk of the House of Representatives, and the corresponding room on the Senate side, could be dispensed with, and access given from the central aisle of the chamber to the sunken gardens shown on the plan between the centre of the building and the wings. Open spaces on either side of the chamber would be preferable to a garden at the back of the Speaker's chair. Accommodation for 90 members in the House of Representatives should be ample for 25 years, the probable life of the provisional building. The Federal Parliament has been in existence for over 20 years, during which the membership of the House of

Representatives has been increased by only one. On that basis provision for an increase of fourteen in the next twenty-five years should be ample. That Australia will double its population in 25 years is rather too optimistic an expectation, but there would be no harm in making provision for, say, 100 members. The dining-room plan follows closely the suggestions which Mr. President and I made to the Government Architect. Small dining-rooms, in which members may entertain visitors, are provided. Perhaps it would be wise to increase the number of them, and it might be possible to have a large room divisible into cubicles by movable partitions or curtains. Members who are entertaining friends usually desire privacy.

193. *To Mr. Mackay.*—I do not think that the central reception hall should be used for the hanging of portraits and other paintings, which are now hung in the Queen's Hall, Melbourne, for the sole reason that there is no other accommodation for them. Provision for them will be made in the library. I am not prepared to say whether or not the caretakers' cottages provide adequate accommodation; that must depend upon the size of the caretaker's family, but there is ample ground space to allow of additions to the cottages if required at any time. We have to bear in mind that we shall later establish a national library, and the Petherick collection, which is now part of the parliamentary library, will, we hope, be added to considerably. The library at Canberra will require much larger space for books than we have at the present time, and storage space proof against damp and insects. We have not the requisite accommodation at the present time, and the storage bill amounts to a considerable sum each year. That is because cases of books and other records are stored in various parts of Melbourne—a dangerous system of storage, but one which we cannot avoid. Some most valuable and irreplaceable works are stored about Melbourne, and if they were destroyed, though we got the insurance value, we could not replace them. Therefore it is necessary to have a large storage space, with adequate protection against fire, damp, insects, and dust. A strong room, too, is absolutely necessary. The parliamentary library possesses some very valuable records—Burke and Wills' diary for instance, and other historical documents, which certainly have not been improved by frequent handling. Some of the writing upon them has been partly obliterated, and we have found it necessary to store them in a strong room. Valuable works such as these should not be accessible to everybody who enters the library. I spoke to the architect of the necessity of housing the nucleus of the national collection, until a separate building is erected, and suggested that the parliamentary library should have ample basement accommodation, including a strong room, and another room for the storage of cases.

194. *To Mr. Jackson.*—I think that a quota of about 25,000 electors per member would be fair. That, of course, would involve an increase in the number of members. My estimate of the probable increase in the next quarter of a century is based upon the experience of the last twenty years, with some allowance for an accretion of population by immigration. But, unless immigration develops far beyond what we may reasonably expect at the present time, I think accommodation for 90 members on the House of Representatives would meet all requirements.

195. *To Mr. Cook.*—I have always favoured Kurrajong Hill as the site for the permanent Parliament House. I was the first to suggest the Yass-Canberra district as the area in which to establish the Federal Capital city, and, walking about the district with Mr. Scrivener, Colonel Vernon, Colonel Owen, and Colonel Miller when the survey camp was on Camp Hill, I was firmly impressed with the idea that, as Kurrajong Hill dominated the whole landscape, it was the proper site for Parliament House. If the Committee should adopt that view, the provisional Parliament House should be placed on the knoll

to the north of Camp Hill. It must be remembered that we may retain for an indefinite period the provisional Parliament House, and also the knoll; Mr. Griffin's proposal for the removal of that knoll may not be proceeded with, and we shall probably find, when the time comes to vacate the provisional building, that the accommodation contained in it will be required for other purposes. If provisional buildings are placed on Camp Hill, they may possibly interfere with the general development of the governmental area. I would not like to see Mr. Griffin's plan interfered with unduly, but we cannot foresee what may happen in the future. If the monumental building is to be on Camp Hill, it would be a mistake to locate the provisional building just below that site. If the provisional structure is to be dismantled at the end of 25 or 30 years, the knoll is a much more suitable site than the one suggested to the Committee, which will involve a 10-ft. cutting at the southern end. Present indications are that the number of political parties will increase. We cannot say with any degree of certainty what will happen, but I do not think we should anticipate that new parties will be born in such considerable numbers as to warrant a substantial alteration of the plans of the proposed provisional Parliament House. All that need be done is to allow sufficient space for expansion of the building should the need for more accommodation arise. Parliament can hardly be expected to assemble at Canberra in less than two and a half to three years. The growth of the Capital city will depend to a large extent upon the land policy and the inducements given to private people to build homes and establish businesses. Canberra will be the Seat of the central Administration, and I should think that in twenty years it will probably have a population of 25,000 to 30,000. Assuming a population of 6,000, mostly civil servants and their families, at the inception of Canberra, the number would probably be 15,000 at the end of the first decade. The earlier the authorities define their land policy, the better. If Parliament intends to proceed with the building of Parliament House and other public structures, the land question should be dealt with at once. Encouragement should be given to private people to build, provided they do so in conformity with the general design of the city and upon plans approved by the Commonwealth authorities. If we are to have a system of leasehold, workers who want to build their own homes should be encouraged to do so. It would be a great relief to the Commonwealth if private enterprise were allowed to build homes for the large number of workmen who will be there during the construction period. So long as the Government are protected by ownership of the land, as much as possible of the domestic and commercial building should be left to private enterprise. It would be a very good idea to call for competitive designs for 300 or 400 cottages of varying types. If the construct on is let to a private tenderer, the bigger the contract the better the terms upon which the builder will be able to buy, and consequently the cheaper the cost of construction. The present cost of cottages is excessive; therefore, I favour leaving the construction of homes to competitive tender. I submit to the Committee the plan of a very nice little house recently built at Oatley, New South Wales, by the War Service Homes Department. It is of brick, on rubble foundations, and comprises bedrooms, 12 feet by 12 feet and 12 feet by 13 ft. 6 in.; a living room, 16 ft. 10½ in. by 12 feet; a kitchen, 12 feet by 10 feet; a front verandah, 5 feet by 16 feet; back verandah, 16 ft. 10½ in. by 4 ft. 6 in.; laundry, 12 feet by 7 feet; and bathroom, 8 feet by 6 feet. It was built by private contract for, I think, £726. Building blocks at Canberra should have a frontage of not less than 45 feet; I would prefer blocks 50 feet by 150 feet. I do not think a quarter-acre block is too large; people should be encouraged to grow flowers and vegetables.

196. *To Senator Newland.*—I saw some of the cottages in course of erection at Canberra, and they seemed to be rather on the small side. I do not care for rough-cast; it spoils good brickwork and encourages dust, damp, insects, and decay. In suggesting that the rooms for strangers should be provided where the Senate club room is shown on the plan, I did not mean that the club room should be eliminated. There should be a club room for each House, which would be a common meeting ground for members for all parties. What I had in mind was that the area allocated to the Senate club room is the most convenient for the strangers' rooms, which I think are necessary. The general plan of the building is not too much spread out. It is a good idea to have plenty of open spaces and gardens. In practice, the arrangement shown on the plan will, I think, not be found inconvenient.

197. *To the Chairman.*—The Ministerial party room measures 33 feet by 25 feet. It would be advisable to make it larger, because it may be required for a combined meeting of Ministerial supporters in both the Senate and the House of Representatives.

(Taken at Sydney.)

FRIDAY, 20TH APRIL, 1923.

Present:

Mr. GREGORY, Chairman;

Senator Foll	Mr. Cook
Senator Newland	Mr. Jackson.
Senator Plain	Mr. Mackay.
Mr. Blakeley	

George Herbert Godsell, ex-President of the Institute of Architects, New South Wales, and President of the Federal Council of the Australian Institutes of Architects, sworn and examined.

198. *To the Chairman.*—I have had an opportunity of inspecting the plans of the proposed provisional Parliament House, and temporary administrative offices. I have not visited Canberra, but I am conversant with Mr. Griffin's lay-out of the city, and it is my hope and the desire of the architects of the Commonwealth, I believe, that that scheme shall be, as far as possible, carried out in its entirety. The designer's conception of the Capitol is something in the nature of a hall of fame which will contain archives, historical records, and works of art, but I am inclined to think that the Houses of Parliament would be better situated on Kurrajong Hill, which Mr. Griffin has reserved for the Capitol. The Houses of Parliament should be the principal building in the city, and should occupy the dominant site. Prior to the war an international competition for designs for a monumental Parliament House at Canberra was initiated. It was twice postponed, and ultimately I was told that the Federal Government intended to abandon the competition, notwithstanding that a great many plans had been drawn up and many architects here and abroad had incurred much expense in the preparation of their competitive schemes. When the members of the Federal Council of the Institutes of Architects waited as a deputation upon the then Minister for Works and Railways (Mr. Richard Foster) fifteen months ago, he excused the Government's attitude by saying that a permanent building could not be erected in the time within which Parliament should meet at Canberra. Had the Government taken steps in time the competition could have been completed, the ideas of architects all over the world could have been obtained, and the carcass of the future monumental structure could have been erected with such temporary additions as might be necessary to meet immediate needs. As extensions became necessary year by year they could be added per-

manently and, bit by bit, the whole scheme could be completed, and at least £200,000, which a provisional building will cost, would not be thrown into the gutter. Moreover, the Government would avoid the stigma of breaking their pledge to the architects of the Empire. To-day the Government stand convicted of having repudiated a contract, and I have a cable from England promising financial support from the Royal Institute of British Architects to establish the rights of competitors in connexion with what they consider a slur upon the profession throughout the Empire. Some of the best brains in the architectural profession in Australia were represented on the deputation which waited upon the Minister for Works and Railways, and we showed conclusively that the carcass of a permanent building could be erected as easily and expeditiously as the provisional building now proposed, and not a penny of the taxpayers' money would be thrown away. We were ridiculed, our proposal was turned down, and we were told that the officers of the Department knew as well as we did what was required. Having regard to the fact that the competition had been twice postponed, that schemes had been thought out, and drawings prepared by many firms, six months would have been sufficient time to allow for the completion of the competition. Had that course been followed the Government would have been as far advanced to-day towards the erection of a permanent structure as they are in regard to the suggested provisional building. The Institutes of Architects of the Commonwealth have no direct representation upon the Federal Capital Advisory Committee. Mr. John Sulman, who is a member of the Committee, is a Fellow of the Royal Institute of British Architects and a Fellow of the Institute of Architects of New South Wales, but he has ceased to practise; he devotes his time to consultation and to doing many good things, but he does not represent the architectural profession, and was not nominated by us. The combined institutes, represented by the Federal Council, should have been asked to nominate a member of the Advisory Committee. We offered to provide a representative, free of cost to the Government, but our proposal was rejected. Had the competition for the Parliament House been carried to completion work upon the permanent building could be started now. The provisional Parliament House should be the carcass of the permanent building, and should be built upon the permanent site. If the Government had obtained 100 designs from architects all over the world—and they would not have obtained less—they would have had the product of the brains of 100 able firms all looking at the scheme from different angles, and that accumulation of knowledge would have been of material assistance in this great undertaking. The scheme now before the Committee does not appeal to me as the foundation of a great capital city. It is a paltry scheme and a paltry idea; it has not the foundation of one great conception. I am told that the provisional building is to be removed after twenty-five or thirty years, but I have never known a public building that was intended to be temporary be anything but permanent. The New South Wales Parliament House is a case in point. There have been competitions for a design for a new permanent building, but the old structure, plus repairs and additions, remains. Surely at a cost of £200,000, which will grow to £300,000 before the job is finished, the Commonwealth could provide at Canberra the nucleus of one great building. The "pretties," the ornamentation, the great facade, need not matter for the time being; the building could be constructed from the interior and developed outwards. The accommodation that is essential now could be built for £300,000 provided that some of the quarters, which are not to be retained permanently, are treated inexpensively. One thing is essential: the officers and staff of Parliament will be at Canberra always, and any portion of a big

scheme which will not have to be removed should be built on permanent lines in order that as much comfort as possible may be provided. It may be said that the appearance would be unpleasing until the monumental features were added, but I have never known a good line, however simple, even as the carcass of a building, to fail in producing a good result. In any case, nothing could be more objectionable in appearance than the provisional building designed by the Department. The wiser course would be to definitely decide upon the site for the permanent building and build thereon a provisional or nucleus structure to which the monumental features could be added later. The first essential is to re-open the competition for the design of the permanent Parliament House. And I would include also the administrative offices and the full development of the governmental triangle. Having accepted a design, the successful competitor should be consulted as to what portion of the building could be erected for the money immediately available, and what portions could be deferred, how he would make the building pleasing in appearance for the time being, and what temporary accommodation he could offer. Plans of Parliament House could be in the hands of the adjudicators six months after the re-opening of the competition, provided that the original conditions were adhered to. If the site of Parliament House were altered from Camp Hill to Kurrajong Hill, a difference in levels and outlook would be involved, plans would require to be remodelled, and more time would be necessary. If a permanent monumental building is erected at any time on Camp Hill, the provisional Parliament House cannot remain immediately below it. It will be essential to remove the temporary building sooner or later for the development of the city, according to Mr. Griffin's scheme. Probably, the points of view of the layman and the professional man differ. The architect is trying to view this city as a symmetrical whole—the conception of a big master mind. This is an attempt to design a new city as thoroughly as Sir Christopher Wren re-designed London after the great fire. St. Paul's Cathedral, Hampton Court, every building, from the modest private residence to the great palace, were designed by the one master mind, and a uniform type of architecture was preserved throughout. To play with a great scheme like Canberra will be to make Australia the laughing-stock of the world. The professional journals in England are asking, "What about the Canberra competition?" They are laughing at us. For a Parliament House, quality must be considered, and quality will not be obtained unless the Government get the drawings that were prepared for the competition, and which reveal the ideas that are in the greatest architectural minds. The accepted design will set the standard of future construction. Canberra is to be the Capital city of what will be one of the greatest countries in the world, and we must commence right. The Government are not doing that. These makeshift proposals make the Commonwealth a laughing-stock. I am confident that the buildings required for the temporary housing of Parliament can be portion of one great scheme if the design is prepared in the manner I have suggested. The only cost to the Commonwealth would be the amount of the prize money, and that would be a very small consideration compared with the throwing away of £200,000 or £300,000 on a temporary structure that will look like a cricket pavilion. On behalf of the Federal Council of the Institutes of Architects I must impress upon the Committee the desirability of representing to Parliament the light in which the Federal Government's action is viewed by the architectural profession throughout the Empire. It is right that the construction of the Federal Capital should be governed by an expert Advisory Committee, but a competition will probably bring under notice a first class firm of architects or a strong man, who will point the way of development, and his suggestions would be ap-

preciated by the Committee. The competition, especially if it includes the lay-out of the governmental group, will give a lead to Parliament in regard to the future development of Canberra. The extra time and money involved would be well spent for such a result. Parliament will not assemble at Canberra any earlier by adopting temporary measures. On a permanent job you could commence work more expeditiously and do away with a lot of departmental red-tape, especially if an Advisory Committee, aided by the author of the accepted design, were allowed to control the work.

199. *To Mr. Mackay.*—I did not apply the word "paltry" to the draft plans as such; I had in mind the disparity between these proposals and the conception of building a great capital city. Why waste £300,000 upon temporary expedients when the carcass of a monumental building can be erected for approximately the same amount?—I am quite sure that permanent use will be made of the so-called provisional buildings, and that is why I do not desire them to be erected. Is not the Commonwealth going to build a great monumental city? Every letter from the Minister is carefully designed to instil into our minds the idea that before any monumental building is undertaken the architects of the profession will be consulted. What will be the good of putting up a glorious building and setting immediately below it a structure that will always be an eyesore? I do not mind how modest any provisional building is so long as it is portion of a definite and permanent scheme. The construction of this city must be governed by a sense of proportion, and everything done must have some relation to the ultimate objective. Shall we, bit by bit, build a city more beautiful than Washington, or shall we create something that will be the laughing-stock of the Empire? Admittedly, a population of 5,000,000 people cannot regard this project in the same way as can a population of 120,000,000; but, even within the limits prescribed by our means, we can create the carcass of a permanent building and add the architectural effect later. All that we do should be a contribution towards the one great *ensemble*. If a competition for the design of the governmental group were held, you would get the scheme of one master mind for a type of building, and every structure, whether modest or ornamental, would be following one line, and you would get a balanced and symmetrical result. The plans now before the Committee cannot by any stretch of the imagination be regarded as portion of one big permanent scheme; there is no cohesion about them. The whole proposal is farcical. Proceed with the permanent building, construct the interior shell of brick, and tackle the big facade later when the money is available. Let the standard of development be set by the architects who successfully compete for the design of the building.

200. *To Mr. Blakeley.*—Every building we erect, whether cottage or temple, is a monument of something, either of efficiency or inefficiency. Every building in the Capital city will be part of a great national monument. If the Government were to proceed with the competition for the Parliament House as it was initiated in 1914, the site and the conditions to be the same, and a design were accepted, the successful architect would be a man whom Parliament would wish to employ to carry out the construction and design other portions of the city. I do not say that he should necessarily be given the job of designing the whole city, but probably he would be a very helpful adviser to the Government, and his services would be retained, and he would lay out the conditions of future competitions under the directions of an expert board. Private firms are a great deal more expeditious in carrying out work than are Government offices, and both the designing and construction of the building could be done quicker by private enterprise than by the Government. I could not agree to any alteration of the terms of the original competition without giving adequate consideration to all

architects who have already been engaged in the competition. Without consulting my colleagues, I think that the competition could be re-opened and closed in six months. I admit that that would handicap younger men who have come to the fore in the profession since 1914. Alternatively the whole governmental group could be included in one big broad scheme, and the competition extended for twelve months. To some extent the exterior walls of a nucleus building would look crude, but there are methods of embellishment by the use of corridors and loggias, and by the careful subdivision of the work. Probably the central portion of the house front, including a little bit of the permanent ornamental work, would be erected first, and the sides left unfinished. For the time being you would have the dignity of the completed portion, and it would be an indication of how the remainder of the building would develop. That would make Parliament more anxious to complete the work. I am well aware of the state of the Commonwealth finances, but the Government are adopting the more expensive course by resorting to temporary expedients. Before I became President of the Institute of Architects in New South Wales a suggestion in regard to representation on the Advisory Committee was made by the Federal Council. The then President was in a bad state of health, and was not able to attend to the matter. We were not asked to nominate a member, but we learned that a private architect was to be appointed, and we submitted our nomination, which was ignored. The nomination from the profession should have been made by the Federal Council, representing all the institutes of the Commonwealth. The architects' organizations have not made any suggestion to the Government that competitive designs for groups of cottages should be invited, but a member of the Advisory Committee did say to me that if I did not make so much fuss about the non-completion of the competition for Parliament House, the architects throughout the Commonwealth would be afforded an opportunity of competing for a number of cottages costing the enormous sum of £30,000. I do not regard that remark as an attempt at intimidation, or a threat of boycott. The suggestion was that I should not continue calling attention to the manner in which the institutes had been treated by the Government. In other words, I was being advised to be silent in regard to the main competition that apparently has been abandoned or I would jeopardize the efforts of the Advisory Committee to promote other competitions which would give the profession further work. While we felt that the Government had broken faith with us we could not accept what looked like a sop. The Federal Council and the architects of Australia are anxious to give the Federal Government all the assistance in their power. It is not a question of fees, expenses, or time; they are prepared to do what they can for the good of the Commonwealth. So far, all our efforts have been rejected. We have been told that we were not wanted, and were a nuisance. The only competition promoted by the Commonwealth has been set aside without compensation to any of the firms working on plans. Naturally the architects lack confidence in the Government or the Advisory Committee in regard to further competitions. One competition was started and abandoned, and possibly after we have put in six months' work on designs for cottages that competition, too, will be cancelled. Nevertheless, we are still willing to help on a proper basis, but old scores must first be cleared up.

201. *To Senator Plain.*—The competition for cottage designs to which I have referred was promoted in Victoria, and a copy of the conditions was sent to my institute for approval. The construction of cottages, as well as the big buildings at Canberra, should be part of one big scheme. You cannot put blotches of red here and black there, white walls here and red

walls somewhere else, line cutting line, and everything out of proportion. Therefore, a competition for the general lay-out of the groups of buildings would be advantageous, and would involve very little loss of time. At present the majority of the Advisory Committee are Government officers. There should be an equal number of private members and Government officers, with an independent chairman. All buildings at Canberra, even those outside the governmental group, should be thrown open to competition. The more brains that are enlisted in connexion with this work, provided that the assessing of the buildings to be erected is cautiously done, the better will be the result. A competition would bring private contractors on to the job. All contractors have a certain labour following. Some of our contractors have had men in their employ for 30 years. By calling for competitive designs and tenders men will be called on to the job who will stay there. The work will be done for private enterprise more expeditiously than for the Government. Every contractor who goes there will take his following with him. The ordinary artisan who works for the Government has not much chance of becoming more than a bricklayer or a carpenter, as the case may be, but a man working for a private contractor has before him the possibility of becoming foreman.

202. *To Senator Foll.*—Every Government requires a good architectural adviser and a staff to carry out the repairs and upkeep of buildings, but for all new buildings the Government should seek the assistance of the outside profession. Undoubtedly, there is a tendency for the departmental architect to produce the one class of work, and too great a similarity in design, but the outside man, having to earn his living in competition with his fellows, has to keep himself well posted with all the developments of the profession and maintain the reputation of his office. The consequence is that his knowledge of the trade, materials, and technical advances, is always up to date. Nowadays private firms are never consulted by the Government in regard to the erection of public buildings. The amount of money involved in the erection of a provisional Parliament House would provide, in the nucleus of a permanent building, all the accommodation shown on the draft plans. I am thinking, not of what the provisional building is estimated to cost, but what will be the actual expenditure. A building of that character is never removed until it falls down. The carrying out of the accepted design for the permanent building need not be deferred until the successful architect, if he be a man outside Australia, can arrive here to supervise the work. A great deal of the work could be proceeded with according to his detailed plans and specifications before he came to Australia, or under the supervision of somebody sent out from his office. Of course, a great many men who would take part in the competition, if it were re-opened, were debarred from doing so during the war. They should have an opportunity of participating in the re-opened competition. The Federal Council is prepared to nominate a representative on the Advisory Committee if requested by the Government so to do and to assist the Government in every possible way, without fee or reward.

203. *To Mr. Cook.*—The most important building in Canberra for many years to come will be Parliament House. Looking to the possible growth of Canberra, with the broadest possible vision, one cannot see a Capitol on Kurrajong Hill for so many years that it seemed to us proper to place Parliament House upon that site. If a provisional building is erected, it should be placed on Camp Hill, for the reason that from that position it will be earliest removed; there might be more chance of the provisional building being pulled down within a reasonable time. Out of regard for the financial position of the Commonwealth, I desire every penny to be spent efficiently, and upon the provision of something that will be permanent, not a makeshift affair, which will be expensive if it has to

be pulled down. I am advised that the draft plan does not provide all the accommodation that Parliament will require. Probably with the additions that will have to be made the building will cost £200,000. Add to that the cost of fitting and furnishing, and I think my estimate of £300,000 will be found to be nearly correct. I think that the ignoring of the architectural profession was due to the hostility of the then Minister for Works and Railways, Mr. Foster. The cost of cottages at Canberra must depend to a large extent on the number to be built, and whether the work is made sufficiently attractive to good contractors, who have a following of capable artisans. After all, what counts is not the wage paid, but the amount of work done for it, and that all depends on the class of men one employs. If 300 cottages are to be constructed, tenders should be called for them in one lot. A smaller number could be advertised, but the contractor's allowance for his plant, and the consideration he can offer to his labourers is governed by the amount to be spent. On a big contract, he can afford to spend more in the initial stages than on a small contract. If the Government had taken the architects of the Commonwealth into their confidence, and asked for their assistance, some very valuable advice would have been given whereby great savings could have been made, and still can be made.

The witness retired.

Bertrand James Waterhouse, Honorary Secretary of the Federal Council of the Institute of Architects, New South Wales, sworn and examined.

204. *To the Chairman.*—I have heard, and confirm, the evidence given by Mr. Godsell. The general idea of the first competition was that, in addition to providing a building which would be suitable for parliamentary purposes, it would set a type which would influence the other structures to be erected later. Therefore we felt it of primary importance that the design of Parliament House should be decided first. The provisional buildings should be rather in the nature of a satellite group so that they will not interfere with the more monumental structure to be erected later. It would be advisable to erect a nucleus of the permanent Parliament House rather than a temporary building, because we should get some permanent value for the money we are spending, and something which will be valuable indeed to the people of Australia in the future. Such a shell would be the finest possible incentive to the people to aim at the fulfilment of an architectural monument that would be the central feature of the Capital city. If a temporary building is erected that incentive will be lacking; the tendency will be to put up with what we have already got. The permanent nucleus will be a continual inspiration to our citizen's pride to bring the scheme to complete fruition. I hope the architectural competition will be revived. The Government seem to have committed a serious breach of faith with competitors all over the world. An architect whom I met in England during the war asked me what the Government intended to do about the competition, and I found the profession in the Old Country anxious to compete for a great national work within the Empire, of which they and we are citizens. I hope that those men will have the opportunity to compete, and I do not think that they will take any exception to the competition being re-opened to architects the world over. Such a competition would take a year to complete. Six months would be sufficient for the completion of the designs already commenced, but if the competition is re-opened a year must be allowed in order that new competitors may have a chance. If an expenditure of £200,000 or £300,000 is to be incurred, I believe that the accommodation required immediately could be provided as part of the permanent structure. I hope that no provisional structure will be erected on any part of the area to be ultimately occupied by a permanent building. One of the conditions of the first competition was that the parliamentary buildings should be so designed in the roof area

that, looked at from the Capitol, the roof or skyline would be the important factor. Assuming that a temporary building were erected on the site suggested, you can imagine the spectacle that would be presented in looking down on these buildings from the permanent Parliament House above. Undoubtedly some temporary buildings will be necessary, but they should be away from the main area to be ultimately occupied by the monumental Parliament House. A provisional building near the permanent site cannot be used as a permanent structure, without interfering to some extent with the monumental edifice. A building of brick with concrete foundations and tile roof, if conscientiously constructed, should last fifty years. The views stated by Mr. Godsell are concurred in by members of the Federal Council. We urge that any expenditure incurred now be in connexion with the kernel of the final structure, that the permanent site be definitely fixed, and the building placed there immediately. There could be no greater incentive to the citizens of Australia, and particularly to the architectural profession, than to feel that they had started to create a building which would ultimately be of a grand and monumental character. The first essential is to hold the architectural competition. It would be impossible otherwise to erect an internal shell in the hope of some day surrounding it with a monumental facade. Whatever is done should be part of the general accepted design. Let the competitors know that portion only of the accepted design will be erected at present, and that it must be the nucleus of the future monumental building. They, in drawing their plans, can take that requirement into consideration. I should say that a year must elapse from the time the competitors' designs are invited until the building is actually started. If the competition be world-wide the designs could be to hand in nine months; allow the successful architect three months in which to prepare his working plans of that portion of the building which is to be proceeded with at once. A little delay will occur if a London or Canadian architect should be successful. He would require to be in Australia to confer with the Advisory Committee in regard to the method of procedure. Our regret is that through the policy adopted by the Government time has been wasted. Even a temporary structure, if it is to cost upwards of £200,000, is a job of such magnitude that it should be the subject of competition, at any rate amongst those architects who have already spent some time and money in the preparation of designs. The cancellation of the competition, besides being a breach of faith, has meant to some men a loss of some hundreds of pounds. That there has been a breach of faith is indisputable. A competition was advertised. A number of architects registered their names as competitors, and from time to time were supplied with information regarding the conditions of the competition. They were then advised that owing to the outbreak of war the competition had been postponed. Later, they were notified that the competition was revived, and, finally, they were told that it was abandoned indefinitely. The technical papers in other parts of the world are asking what is to be done in regard to the competition, and if the architectural profession in countries outside Australia is to have an opportunity of competing. An intimation should be given to the competitors that certain buildings adjacent to Parliament House would be wanted for other structures, and they should be asked to allocate portions of the lay-out for that. One of the objects of the original competition was to discover, as well as a good plan for Parliament House a suitable type which would dominate the whole of the governmental group of buildings. I think three-storied buildings in that area would be quite all right. Probably that would be the maximum height. The most effective groups of buildings are those in Paris, and I do not think that any of the monumental structures, except the domes, are higher than three stories. If a satisfactory *ensemble* is to be obtained the buildings must not be too high. An endeavour should be made to eliminate bare red brick

walls, and to substitute something resembling the Italian colouring—white and cream walls which, besides being more pleasing, are suggestive of coolness in warm weather. Plain cement coloured, the colour varying slightly in the groups, would be quite satisfactory. In regard to the construction of cottages, whether competitive designs and tenders be invited for 100, 200, or 300 cottages, it is essential that the design shall include the lay-out. Allowing eight cottages to the acre, you will be dealing with 30 or 40 acres. If you build over that area about 300 cottages without any regard to lay-out you will create nothing but a hotch-potch. If you intend to build 300 houses in a group, ask the competing architects to lay out the whole area to suit single houses or groups of houses as the designer may think fit, and, in addition, to submit types of houses suitable for the group. To any one accustomed to town planning and the grouping of structures, a contour plan of the area with the cardinal points would provide sufficient data in regard to topography. The competition for cottages should be purely local, or at any rate limited to Australasia. It is a great help to the designer of a house to know something of the lay-out. The adoption of this course would not interfere with Mr. Griffin's general lay-out of the city. The only desire of the architects would be to see that the lay-out of the cottage groups harmonized generally with the scheme for the future development of the city.

205. *To Senator Newland.*—I know that the aim is to have single houses, but it is very difficult to build single houses cheaply. The only way to effect economy is by constructing a group of houses not more than two rooms deep. That has been successfully tried in England, but I know that there is a great prejudice against it in Australia. Cottages in and about Sydney, with the simplest fittings throughout, costs about £125 per room. The rooms would be about 10 feet square. For about £650 you might erect a living room, two bedrooms, and a combined kitchen and laundry. That presupposes a site on which the foundations are not excessively costly, and includes sewerage and water supply connexion, but not the lighting installation. Such a house should be let for about £1 a week. An architectural competition for cottages would probably result in producing, firstly, a very fine lay-out for the area—and I regard that as equally important as the type of house—and secondly, good types of cottages, and if the construction were carried out by private practitioners and competitive tender the price would be reduced to bedrock. There are in Sydney many architects who have specialized in domestic architecture and grouping of houses, who would be glad to compete. I do not think there would be any difficulty in the way of getting a successful competition. The external finish of a building is a matter of personal taste. Some prefer brick, some roughcast, and others plain cement. I think that there should be a group of from 20 to 40 houses alike, and another group slightly different, and so on. The difference would be brought about by slight change in aspect. Red brick walls and red tiled roofs are too glaring, a white or cream-coloured wall with a brown tile roof is much more effective. We get in Sydney four or five different shades of roof tiles, varying from dark red to chocolate and blue; almost any colour one may desire is being produced. There could be half-a-dozen houses finished in one colour scheme and a little variation shown in all the other groups. The Parliament House at Canberra is to be a very important monument, and we should make such a start with it now that there will be nothing for posterity to pull down, but rather an incentive to them to add until they bring this beautiful structure to completion. We are not criticising the men who are responsible for the plans before the Committee. The Department is working under conditions of which we have no knowledge; we do not know what restrictions are placed upon them, but we say on principle that there should be a competition for the parliamentary buildings, and holding that view we do not feel inclined to criticise the plans of the provisional building.

206. *To Senator Foll.*—The white wall with a red roof is preferable to the red brick wall and the red roof. The white wall requires a certain amount of maintenance, but that only amounts to an occasional coat of whitewash. Roughcast on brick gives quite a satisfactory job. The additions to some of the main buildings at the University and some of the temporary structures are finished in plain cement, and not roughcast. The mere premium for the successful author of the lay-out and plan of a group of cottages is not a very great inducement to architects to take part in a competition. The big inducement is the opportunity of actually carrying out the work, and I do not think firms would compete under any other conditions. The Government might get designs from keen young draughtsmen, but good firms to whom could be entrusted the carrying out of big works would not compete. Probably in a competition for cottages there would be three premiated designs and three architects would be employed to carry them out, and thus you would get diversity of design. The work of the successful architects would be to prepare the working drawings, specifications, and plans, and call tenders for groups of houses as instructed by their client, who would be the Government. They would supervise the erection of buildings on a percentage basis. The maximum commission is 6 per cent., but on repeat work, such as cottages, it gets as low as 3½ per cent., according to the number. The designers would naturally endeavour to effect every possible economy in their plans. To ask an architect to act as builder is to create a loophole, which is very undesirable. That procedure is unprofessional; it is not done, except in rare instances, and it does not meet with the approval of the Federal Council. It would be of very great advantage from every point of view if the brains of the architectural professional throughout Australia were brought to the aid of the Government, and that is something which the architects might in fairness ask for. We have a Chair of Architecture at the University, and registration of architects. Boys are asked to attend the University and go through a strenuous course. Later, they travel before starting work in an architect's office; for years their only opportunity of getting work is by competition, and to whom but the Government should they look for opportunities for competition? The adoption of the day-labour principle by the Government has dissociated the architectural profession from the monumental works of the State. All large Government structures should be thrown open to public competition. That is the only means by which an architect can hope to do some of his country's work. This has particular application to a monumental city like Canberra. At the present time there is difficulty in securing bricklayers. In respect of every other trade we are able to get along fairly well. A great number of tradesmen have migrated from Sydney to Melbourne because they are offered higher wages. If the large quantity of building work at Canberra that is suggested is to be proceeded with, the time seems opportune for inducing good tradesmen to come from overseas. We want more tradesmen. There is work for them to do, and those that come will be adding to our population.

207. *To Mr. Cook.*—I do not approve of the erection of wooden buildings. The object should be to erect structures that will not be costly to maintain, and to introduce anything of a temporary nature would be very foolish. With wooden buildings there is a greater fire risk, and a possibility of damage by white ants and borer, apart from the difficulty of getting perfectly seasoned timber. In addition, the cost of maintenance makes timber buildings very undesirable. Economy in construction will depend very largely on the type of house adopted and the careful handling of the material. In no circumstances would I support the erection in Canberra of wooden buildings.

The witness withdrew.

Leslie Wilkinson, Professor of Architecture, Sydney University, sworn and examined.

208. *To the Chairman.*—The Federal Council of the Institute of Architects represents all the State institutes, and should certainly be represented on the Federal Capital Advisory Committee. I understand that representation was asked for. In connexion with a project like the Federal Capital, it is desirable to have a body of experts to advise the Government, but it should be very clearly understood that the function of the Committee does not include the designing of buildings. There is a very great danger of the Committee almost trying to design buildings, which no committee can do. It should do no more than submit recommendations with regard to the designs referred to it. I have visited Canberra. Until I studied Mr. Griffin's plan carefully, I always understood that the term "capitol" meant, as it does in America, the legislative hall which houses the Parliament. Now I find that there is a separate site for Parliament House, and obviously "the Capitol" is designed for some other purpose. I have discussed it with various men, and there are several uses to which the site might be put. Many of us wish that we could erect there a great cathedral; but, as this is definitely a governmental centre, I cannot imagine any more fitting climax to the whole scheme than parliamentary buildings on the site allocated to the Capital. An architectural competition for the design of Parliament House should be held, and whatever structure is erected now should be the nucleus of the monumental buildings. I am the honorary secretary in Australia of the Royal Institute of British Architects, and I think it is my duty to take this opportunity of stating the claims of architects throughout the world, particularly in Great Britain in regard to the competition that is in abeyance. In London, and all over the Empire, many competitors' designs were nearing completion when the competition was cancelled years ago, and I think that the competition should be re-opened, subject to additional conditions which would not undo the work candidates have already done, but the Government might suggest to them that, owing to the changed financial position, it is desirable that they should so arrange their designs that the Government could proceed with the erection of a carcass building undecorated inside and not monumental outside, but which could be added to as funds were provided, and would, in the meantime, suitably house Parliament on the permanent site. It would not do for me to suggest that architecture can be added to buildings at any time, but in many of the great buildings of the Old World the marble veneering and the imposing facades were added years after the main structure had been erected. Some of the great churches in Italy are still without their facades, and probably always will be. The carcass of the parliamentary buildings could be built and the wastefulness of a provisional structure on a temporary site could be avoided. I should think that the architectural competition could be re-opened in a few weeks, any altered conditions being sent abroad by cable to the architectural institutes, which would distribute the information in their respective countries. Allowing the competitors on the other side of the world two or three months in which to prepare their designs, the competitive plans could be received and assessed, and working plans prepared in twelve months. I think it would be well to hold separate competitions for the design of Parliament House, and the design and lay-out of the governmental group. The great grievance of the architects of the Empire is that the original competition into which they put both time and money is indefinitely postponed. The Government should rectify that grievance, and, perhaps, at the same time institute other competitions; it might be found to be an advantage to have one man to do the whole of the work in the governmental group. The withholding of the competition for Parliament House

is regarded by the architects' profession as a breach of faith. Everybody knows that the war has changed the financial outlook of every country, and the architects feel that if the whole project for the creation of a Federal Capital city had been abandoned for the time being there would be no cause for complaint. But the work is being proceeded with, and participation is being restricted to the official architects. Private enterprise should be given an opportunity. Men spend years in training themselves for a profession, and they are denied the opportunity of displaying their talents in connexion with the great buildings of State. I am opposed to a provisional structure, but if one is to be built I would sooner that it were placed within the area allotted to the permanent buildings, thus avoiding the danger of other temporary buildings growing around it, and making such an established group that it would be impossible to get rid of it for many decades. Any building that is erected should be located in accordance with Mr. Griffin's general lay-out. The whole of the building programme at Canberra should be thrown open to public competition, but I do not think the Government would be wise to ask for competitive designs for cottages if they continue to withhold the bigger competition for the parliamentary buildings. The profession would regard the smaller competition as a sop intended to keep them quiet, and architects would probably refuse to have anything to do with it. After all, 300 cottages do not represent much architecturally. I have no objection to tiled roofs, but they need not necessarily be bright red. The building should look cool, and the tiles should be uniform in colour. The general lay-out of the provisional Parliament House seems correct, but even a provisional building might be made a little more effective architecturally. The design is a little choked up on the main axis, and the reception hall is not in a very dignified position; there is nothing leading up to it. The method of seating in the chambers is for Parliament to decide. It is a question of the French *versus* the British system. With the former you have the rostrum, which leads to the theatre form of seating. The British system of allowing the member to catch the Speaker's eye, and then rise in his place, leads to the seating arrangements to which we are accustomed. I like the rostrum. It is dignified, and a man thinks twice before he speaks from an elevated position. He will not leave his seat and ascend the rostrum unless he has something to say worth while. Galleries in a hall or chamber tend to improve the acoustics. A gallery, projecting 2 or 3 feet into the chamber, would not interfere with the acoustics at all. Very often trouble is experienced with the acoustics simply because the walls are not sufficiently broken up. A rectangular room is generally better acoustically than the horseshoe or theatre form. I think it is generally accepted that a rectangular room, with a flat ceiling, cannot be improved upon, provided materials are so employed which will not produce echoes. The London County Council Chamber had the horseshoe type of seating, and difficulties were experienced. Obviously sound waves come off a curved wall in a more complicated way than they do off a straight wall. I think it is very much easier to arrange for a man speaking at one point to be heard at all points than to provide that a man, rising anywhere in the House, shall be heard everywhere. In regard to the main reception hall, it seems to me that the corridors throttle the hall. Perhaps the plan would be improved if the width of the corridors was reduced to 15 feet and the additional space thrown into the hall. The provision of garden space directly adjoining would make the chambers much more delightful to work in. The winter climate at Canberra can be very severe, and heating of the building, by either steam or hot water, will be necessary. A court or garden at the back of the Speaker's chair would materially improve the ventilation of the chamber. The general opinion is that

the more natural the system of ventilation is the better for everybody concerned. You can do too much in the way of artificially tempering air; it becomes like distilled water, which, as a drink, does not satisfy anybody, although, theoretically, it is the right drink. I should be inclined to remove the foul air from above. It is a good idea to employ both extract and plenum. Theoretically the object of drawing the air downward is to avoid drawing the dust from the floor upward, but it is a more expensive system than removing the vitiated atmosphere from above. Next to acoustics, ventilation is the most important factor to be considered in a legislative chamber.

209. *To Mr. Mackay.*—If possible, the chambers of a building to be erected in instalments should be amongst the first permanent features; but, if a great monumental reception hall were included in the scheme, the architect might build the carcass of that hall and temporarily put both chambers or some other rooms into it. I should like to see the walls of the chambers built of brick or concrete in their permanent position, and without expensive finishing make the accommodation comfortable and appropriate. No money has been wasted on the Sydney Conservatorium of Music, but it is a very nice place in which to enjoy a concert. It was formerly only the courtyard of a stable. The erection of the nucleus of a permanent building would not increase the expense. Make no attempt to give any appearance of finish; the more unfinished the building looks, the sooner it will be carried to completion. The present draft plan is very useful as a schedule of the accommodation that will be necessary. Some of the competitors might flatter the promoters of this plan by adopting it and making it more monumental. Certainly, the assessors will require to draw up some schedule of rooms and requirements. The more freedom you allow the competitors, the better; but in a modern bi-cameral Parliament House every architect must adopt this right-and-left treatment. Any permanent carcass would be of concrete or brick. The sum of £200,000 is a large amount of money to expend on a provisional building. If it can be decided that 100 years hence these chambers need not be very much larger, I see no reason why they should not be built on the permanent site at no greater cost than that of a provisional building.

210. *To Mr. Blakeley.*—The chambers should be designed to allow for an increase in members, following the increase in population; but we all hope that representation will not increase proportionately to population. There must be a limit to the size of a chamber that can do useful business. A permanent building would possibly be of grander dimensions than the provisional structure that has been planned; and, therefore, the nucleus or shell would cost a little more money, but the competitors would adopt a style that would allow of eventual decoration without requiring much preparation originally. I do not wish to say anything that would prevent the transfer of Parliament to Canberra as soon as possible. As architects, however, we think that a provisional structure should not be built, and that, if the recommendations of the Federal Council of Institutes of Architects had been accepted twelve months ago, the Government could have been just as far advanced with the permanent building as they are with the provisional building. The delay which has occurred is not the fault of the profession, which will still try to do its best through its art for the Commonwealth as well as for itself. The private practitioners feel that far too much State and Commonwealth work is done by official architects, and probably that the Advisory Committee has not helped to improve the existing state of affairs. The shelving of the competition is but the natural result of too much committee. A private practitioner cannot do work in the way that committee work is done. A committee is right enough acting on behalf of the nation

as client. Let the Government find their architect, let him recommend a contractor, after inviting public tenders, impose all sorts of penalty clauses in the contract, and the work will be done in half the time that it would occupy in the ordinary departmental way. In regard to the size of the chambers, the building could be so designed that, if 50 or 60 years hence more accommodation were required, the chambers could be extended into the area allotted to courtyards or gardens. There must be corridors or other means of circulation about the chambers.

211. *To Mr. Cook.*—I do not see why the skeleton building I have suggested should not be erected for 25 per cent. more than the estimate of the purely provisional building. Obviously, the latter is lower than a monumental structure should be. Add something to the height and omit some of the finish shown on these plans.

212. *To Senator Foll.*—A lot of the smaller rooms might be designed to carry extensions. I am regarding the height shown in the plans of the provisional building as workable; I see no necessity for making the permanent skeleton higher at the start, but build it so that eventually it can be carried to two stories. I do not want a building placed upon a temporary site, because historic associations will gather around it, and it will never be possible to entirely remove it. I would suggest that the minimum of building be undertaken at the start, and it may be that a certain amount of convenience may have to be sacrificed for a time. But rather than build a great colonnade in front and a mere shed behind, I would build the internal skeleton first and defer the colonnade until later. The possibility of a year's delay in the commencement of this work is not sufficient cause for sacrificing the very great advantage that would result from the commencement of the permanent House. A year goes quickly, and the delay is so important from an architectural and national point of view that it should be accepted as necessary.

213. *To Senator Newland.*—The private architects get no share of the building work carried out by the State Government of New South Wales. All that work is done by the official staff. Another grievance of the architects is that the work is carried out by a Works Department presided over by an engineer. There is a Government architect, and he has to report to a Board of Reference, but all architectural work is considered part of the functions of the Works Department. The only Government work that has been done by a private practitioner in recent years is the State Savings Bank building.

214. *To Mr. Mackay.*—The provisional Parliament House will be such a special type of building that it cannot be very useful for any other purpose. The suggestion that it may be used later for other purposes makes me think that it will not be as temporary as it should be.

(Taken at Sydney.)

MONDAY, 23RD APRIL, 1923.

Present:

Mr. GREGORY, Chairman;	
Senator Foll	Mr. Blakeley
Senator Newland	Mr. Cook
Senator Plain	Mr. Jackson.

James Oswald Fairfax, Newspaper Proprietor, sworn and examined.

215. *To the Chairman.*—I hold strongly the opinion that it is necessary for the Federal Parliament to meet at Canberra at the earliest possible date, because until there is a national Capital we shall not get a truly national Parliament. A great many other people share that opinion. It would be in the national interests of

Australia to proceed with the work with the utmost despatch, so that Parliament may be in session at Canberra as soon as possible. I have visited the Federal Territory, but my inspection was not sufficiently detailed to qualify me to express an opinion regarding the merits of alternative sites for Parliament House. I have heard it suggested that Parliament House should be on Kurrajong Hill, with the residences of the Governor-General and the Prime Minister on either side. That seems a very appropriate grouping of what must be the principal buildings in the city. My personal opinion is in favour of the erection of a provisional building that will meet the requirements of Parliament for 50 years, leaving the erection of a more permanent and expensive structure until a later date. That is my personal view; I am not speaking as representative of the Empire Press Union in this matter. The question of press accommodation at Canberra was considered at the annual meeting of the Australian section of the Empire Press Union recently. We felt that it was of the utmost importance, not only to the newspaper proprietors, but also to the public, that there should be good press facilities in the new Parliament House. Canberra is far removed from any big centre of population, and the press is practically the only means of communication between the member and the electorate. Lord Morley has said that the press is "the wife of democracy." We have a democratic form of government in Australia, and it is most important that the public should have every facility for knowing what takes place at Canberra. I am fairly well acquainted with the accommodation in the New South Wales State parliamentary building; I have also visited the House of Representatives in Melbourne and the press gallery in the House of Commons. I have discussed the accommodation to be provided at Canberra with the chiefs of staff of some of the newspapers; in fact, a meeting was held at my office in order that we might get the views of men who have done parliamentary gallery work. Their view was that the accommodation for newspaper reporters should be on the floor of the House rather than in a gallery. Not only could they hear better from that situation, but, being able to see better, they could produce a better report. The experience in the New Zealand House of Parliament affords some guide to us in that respect. At one time, the press were accommodated in the gallery, subsequently they were accommodated on the floor of the House, and the improvement in the reporting was noticed at once. If it be at all practicable to accommodate the newspapers on the floor of the House at Canberra we strongly urge that that be done. We have come to the conclusion that there should be a minimum of 30 seats; but, if the provisional House is to be used for 50 years, it would be desirable to provide more accommodation, because there is sure to be more newspapers in the different capital cities by that time, and, of course, the provincial press will grow more and more important every year. It will not be amiss to provide 50 seats for the press, for every variety of newspaper, as well as press agency, will desire to be represented there. It is quite likely that in years to come, as the Commonwealth Parliament grows in importance and deals more extensively with Imperial concerns than it does now, the great English newspapers will have correspondents at Canberra. A press gallery only 9 feet above the floor of the chamber would be better than a higher gallery, but not so good as seats raised only 3 or 4 feet above the floor. Everything would depend upon the acoustic properties of the chamber, but the Inter-State galleries in the present House of Representatives are far more satisfactory than the high gallery. A low gallery projecting over portion of the floor would interfere with the hearing in the press gallery. Some of the members seated under the gallery could not be seen, and I doubt if they could be heard. I do not think it probable that there will ever be as many as 70 pressmen in regular attendance at Par-

liament House at Canberra; I should think that 50 would be a safe allowance. If some of the press representatives were accommodated on the floor and others in the gallery, there would probably be a little jealousy, as there always is, but everybody cannot get front seats. I understand that there will be a telegraph office in the parliamentary building, and direct wires to Sydney and Melbourne. It is of the highest importance that we should have from the press rooms to the different newspaper offices direct telephone communication, in order to get the latest possible news through. The payment for such a service would be a matter for arrangement; the newspaper proprietors might be prepared to lease private wires under reasonable conditions. I approve of the control of the press gallery by a committee of pressmen, subject, of course, to final control by the newspaper managements. Outside the gallery there should be, at least, twelve transcribing rooms allotted to the various newspapers. If more room could be provided, so much the better, but it would be unreasonable to ask that all the big newspapers in the Commonwealth should each have a separate room. That, of course, would be the ideal arrangement, because it would give more privacy; but, if that be not possible, we think we can manage with twelve rooms by grouping together the newspapers that work in association and have common interests in different ways. There would be seven distinct newspaper interests in Sydney, none of which would care to be associated in the same room as others, because that would interfere with their competitive work. Those interests are the *Sydney Morning Herald*, the *Daily Telegraph*, the *Daily Mail*, the *Sun*, *Evening News*, probably *Smith's Daily*, and a Labour daily. Some of those papers would be allied with different newspapers in other States. For instance, the *Sydney Morning Herald*, if it could not get a room for itself, would work in co-operation with the *Argus*, and the *Daily Telegraph* would probably join up with the *Age*. But in no circumstances could the press do with less than twelve rooms. A special room for the leader writers is desirable, but we recognise that that would be in the nature of a luxury. If the room allotted to his newspaper were fairly large, he could write there; alternatively he could go out of the building. Each room should accommodate seven or eight men. The *Sydney Morning Herald* would probably have three men in Canberra permanently. The more facilities we have, the more accurate and satisfactory will be the work of the press. The press accommodation in the precincts of the House of Commons has had to be considerably extended, but, unfortunately, the press gallery itself cannot be enlarged. We are assuming that if there were about seven transcription rooms for the metropolitan newspapers, five other rooms would be sufficient to accommodate agencies and the country press association, or some other organization of the kind. We have reduced our requirements to a minimum. There really should be more rooms than twelve, because, as Parliament grows in importance, there will be in the gallery representatives of big agencies like Reuters, which have international ramifications. It will be better to provide beforehand all the accommodation that will be necessary than to economize now and later find that the work of the press cannot be done efficiently owing to insufficient accommodation. The country press agencies could work in a common room. In a good big room fairly well fitted a lot of work can be done by those pressmen who will go to Canberra on special occasions to represent minor interests, but whose work in the gallery would be intermittent. For instance, the *Farmer and Settler* has a representative in the New South Wales Legislative Assembly gallery only when something of special interest to the rural community is under discussion. No doubt, similar sectional interests would be irregularly represented at Canberra. It would be desirable to have a dining and refreshment room at Parliament House for the press,

because Canberra will not possess the catering facilities of big cities. In the present Federal Parliament House those men who cannot get seats in the dining-room allotted to the press can easily get meals elsewhere. But at Canberra there may not be any such facilities, or, if they exist, they may not be convenient to Parliament House. The newspaper proprietors have not considered the provision of a common club house for pressmen at Canberra. Upon that subject there is a divergence of opinion. Some are inclined to think that a common club, wherein pressmen representing different interests become closely associated interferes with their originality and independence—that there is a tendency to pool news, and competition suffers. It would be desirable to provide adequate dining accommodation at Parliament House, so that the pressmen may not have to leave the building, especially in the winter, which, I know from experience, is very cold. If the population of Australia increases as we hope it will, accommodation in the House of Representatives for 150 members within the next 50 years will probably be necessary. As to the advisability of introducing the rostrum, I have seen it in use in the French Chamber of Deputies and the Hungarian Chamber at Budapest, and I was not favorably impressed. The members indulged in much more gesticulation and action than do members in the British Parliament. I am conservative enough to prefer the old British system of a member rising in his place.

216. *To Mr. Blakeley.*—If a competition for the design of the parliamentary building be held, and the conditions are made available at once to architects in different parts of the world, it might be possible to have the designs assessed and the working drawings completed in twelve months. But that would mean unduly rushing the competition. It would be wiser and more expeditious to proceed with the erection of a provisional Parliament House without calling for competitive designs. It is not practicable for the newspapers to make common use of the three large press rooms shown on the draft plan. Newspaper men require a certain amount of quiet, and it is not fair to ask them to produce a good report in a crowded room. The closer the press rooms are to the gallery or chamber the better, because there is less loss of time in going to and fro. I suggest that as much as possible of the accommodation shown on the plans be utilized by subdivisions for separate rooms, and that further accommodation be provided in the wings. In the House of Commons there is a press refreshment-room, and I am almost certain that the journalists are able to get their meals there. The provision of a common club room or building has never been the subject of formal discussion, but the managements would do anything reasonable for the comfort and convenience of the men serving them at Canberra. I would be sorry to say that the press clubs in the capital cities have been detrimental to the interests of the newspapers; I believe that the vast majority of men are loyal to the papers they serve. I admit that something in the nature of a press club at Canberra would be no innovation, but the existing clubs in the capital cities are a responsibility undertaken by the men themselves; the newspaper managements have nothing to do with them. The whole question of accommodation at Canberra is rather nebulous at present. If the pressmen are living in hostels, where they will be naturally thrown together, they will not require a separate club. One can hardly judge what will be required at Canberra until the conditions obtaining there are known.

217. *To Senator Plain.*—A room 18 feet square would be fair accommodation for a group of three or four newspapers. It is impossible to say whether each of the big newspapers will have separate representatives at Canberra, or whether groups with similar interests will have some sort of common service. In designing the building it might be found practicable

to have smaller rooms. If each of the three large press rooms shown on the plan were subdivided into three small rooms, each might accommodate one newspaper, but would hardly be large enough for a group. The number of pressmen attending the parliamentary gallery varies. I think that in the New South Wales Legislative Assembly 33 is the maximum and 20 is about the average. On big occasions the weekly newspapers may send a man there to write a special article. About 100 tickets for admission to the press gallery of the State Parliament are issued, but they are personal, and not transferable. If a leader writer wants to attend the gallery, he must produce his ticket. He might use the ticket only once in a session, but a man doing parliamentary work regularly uses his ticket on every sitting day. If there is to be a press club at Canberra, undoubtedly it should be conducted by the pressmen themselves. It would be a gracious act on the part of the Government if they erected the building, and the pressmen would appreciate it very much. I strongly favour the erection of a provisional Parliament House. Fifty years hence we shall know better what the requirements of Parliament are. For the time being, no more money should be spent than is necessary to provide adequate and decent accommodation for Parliament for, say, the next half-century.

218. *To Mr. Cook.*—If you could be sure of what should be the character of the permanent structure, it would be feasible to erect now the skeleton of the monumental building, but I do not see how that can be provided for at the present time. In any case, even the skeleton of a monumental building would require to be carried out in a more substantial and expensive style than will a provisional building. If a competition is to be held, it should be world-wide, so that we may get the best design the world's architectural brains can produce. Since the competition was first promulgated war has intervened and absolutely altered the economic position of Australia. The country's finances have gone millions to the bad, and it would be hardly fair to hold the Commonwealth to a proposal made under conditions entirely different from those which obtain to-day. Having regard to the altered economic conditions, no reasonable professional man should regard the non-completion of the competition as a breach of faith on the part of the Government. If a provisional building at a cost of £200,000 would last for 50 years, it would give good value, and it might be better to get that value than to spend a large sum on a building which experience may prove to be unsuitable. Raised benches on the floor of the House are almost the ideal provision for pressmen. They should not be put behind the Speaker's chair if that can be avoided, because, although theoretically a man addresses the Speaker, in practice he speaks directly across the chamber. I do not think there will be any architectural difficulties in the way of providing press accommodation on the floor. It will take up some of the floor space, but in a chamber of the size of that proposed the space occupied would not be material. Those pressmen whom I have consulted are unanimously of opinion that they could do their work better on the floor than in the gallery. Reporting in the gallery in the present House of Representatives is done under very great difficulties.

219. *To Mr. Jackson.*—Probably more pressmen attend Parliament House at Melbourne than would attend at Canberra. It may be that on special occasions men attend the gallery who are not assigned for parliamentary duty but are interested in the proceedings.

220. *To Senator Foll.*—In asking for 30 seats in the press gallery I had in mind regular pressmen rather than freelances. If freelances are to be admitted without restriction, more accommodation will be required. In the Legislative Assembly, twenty pressmen is the regular average, and 33 is the maximum, and that may be taken as a working ratio of regular attendants to occasional freelances. There may not be much scope for free-

lances in Canberra, whereas in the big centres of population there are many, and they can do other than parliamentary work. As to the suggestion that the press should have separate means of access to their rooms, without having to traverse the main corridors, it is regrettable that there should ever have been any trouble over the intrusion of pressmen into precincts which are supposed to be reserved for members. It is not the general body of pressmen who give trouble; they recognise the right of members to privacy. But the privileges accorded to pressmen can be well controlled by the President and the Speaker. I would like the newspaper representatives to have the greatest freedom compatible with the rights of members. Certainly, if any members of our own staff trespassed, and the matter were reported to us, we would deal with it promptly. The reservation of parts of the building for the exclusive use of members can be, and is, regulated by the presiding officers. In the ordinary way, responsible pressmen do not take unfair advantage of the privileges which are accorded them. But, at times, members do wish to see them and communicate information to them. Special rooms in which members and the pressmen could confer would be desirable, but, generally speaking, the less hard-and-fast rules the better. There will not be at Parliament House many pressmen except the more responsible journalists, and if any men do abuse their privileges they will have to be dealt with. It would be a pity, from the point of view of both the press and members, if any undue restrictions were imposed.

221. *To Senator Newland.*—It would be a great convenience to the pressmen if they could be catered for at Parliament House. It may be that the parliamentary dining-room does not pay its way, but the more diners the establishment can serve the more economically it can cater. If the parliamentary dining-room caters for the press as well as members, the payments of the pressmen will be helping to make the room pay. It would be hardly practicable to charge pressmen more for their meals than is paid by members and officers of the Parliament. After all, the pressmen are serving a public purpose as well as purely commercial interests, and they should be subject to the same tariff as others who use the dining-room. Reasonable accommodation and creature comforts are necessary to enable pressmen to carry out their duties.

The witness withdrew.

Francis Marien, Journalist, sworn and examined.

222. *To the Chairman.*—I come before the Committee to represent the views of *The Sun* Proprietary. I have had experience of reporting in the New South Wales State Parliament. There the press gallery is much too high. I am prepared to fall in with the suggestion of Mr. Fairfax that the pressmen should be accommodated on the floor of the House, but we would not press that claim. A gallery 9 feet 6 inches above the floor of the chamber would not be too high. The fatal objection to accommodation on the floor of the House is that the pressmen, although in the House, are not of it, and they would like an opportunity to occasionally relax. A gallery 9 feet 6 inches high, and projecting 2 feet into the chamber would be quite acceptable. At present the parliamentary reporters of *The Sun* represent four newspapers—the Sydney *Sun*, the Newcastle *Sun*, and the morning and evening *Sun* in Melbourne. Possibly later we shall have other papers. The Sydney *Sun* will maintain in Canberra three men for its New South Wales service. I agree with Mr. Fairfax that the minimum number of pressmen for which accommodation should be provided is thirty-six. There is likely to be an increase in the number of newspapers, and probably in twenty years the press requirements will be double those of to-day. In order to make the place comfortable, and allow room for expansion, accommodation

should be provided for seventy pressmen. On important occasions, ten years hence, when each newspaper is represented by a double team, even that accommodation will be crowded. There should be plenty of aisles, so that men may leave or enter their seats without inconveniencing others. As we would be rushing information to the Newcastle and Sydney issues, we would probably have four or five men taking ten minute turns. The *Sun* would require a room to accommodate about six men. Between the provincial newspapers there is not the same competition as between the big metropolitan journals, and a common room would do for them. Dining accommodation for the press should be provided in Parliament House. At Canberra there will not be much prospect of getting meals outside the building. When Parliament opens, their picked men from all the big newspaper offices will be selected to go to the Federal capital, and unless they are treated well it will be difficult to get good men to stay there. I do not think that the newspapers should be called upon to help in building the city by providing a club room for their representatives; they will help to build up the city by the publicity they will give to it.

223. *To Senator Foll.*—It would be a good idea to give both the press and members of Parliament quarters exclusive to each, but the pressmen should have easy means of access to members whom they have occasion to interview. Until the perfect pressman and the perfect politician are evolved, press men will always wait about the corridors and party rooms, because it is their business to get information, but it would be convenient if a room were set aside in which Ministers or members who had information to impart could give it to all the press representatives in common.

224. *To the Chairman.*—I hope that pneumatic tubes will be established between the press rooms and the telegraph office, so that messenger boys will be eliminated. There should also be direct telephones to each newspaper room. During day sessions every second will be of importance to afternoon papers, and their room should be convenient to the press gallery. We would like one room for representatives of the four *Suns*. I approve of the system of controlling the press gallery by a committee of pressmen subject to a right of final appeal to the Speaker. Nowadays competition is so keen that there is no team work or pooling between representatives of rival journals. Therefore the different staffs require to be kept apart. In regard to the housing accommodation, I do not think the public will be prepared to build homes on leased land; the fee-simple would be a bigger inducement. There will be at Canberra a large body of pressmen of good standing, and the question of providing residential accommodation for them is important.

225. *To Senator Foll.*—When the Federal Parliament is established at Canberra, more interest will be taken by the press in Federal politics, and the public will benefit in that way. Naturally Canberra will attract a great deal of press notice at its inception, and afterwards there will be staffs of pressmen there with nothing to do but attend to Federal departmental rounds, and report parliamentary proceedings.

The witness withdrew.

Herbert Ernest Ross, Architect and Consulting Engineer, sworn and examined.

226. *To the Chairman.*—I am a member of the Federal Capital Advisory Committee, whose functions under the general commission are to investigate matters referred to us by the Minister in relation to the building of the capital city, and to submit from time to time reports in such order as appears advisable to us. There is no doubt that greater continuity of operations could be obtained, and a good deal of delay avoided if some committee or board were given executive power within certain limits prescribed by the Government. The plans of the proposed provisional Parliament House

were first approved by the Advisory Committee in a general way, but we recognised that, as this was a matter of great domestic interest to members and officers of Parliament, there would necessarily be variations in detail after closer consultation. I should think that a competition for designs of a monumental Parliament House would mean a delay of at least eighteen months. First of all, the scheme would have to be formulated to such extent that the Government could advise the competitors in detail of what the requirements of Parliament would be. That information must be drafted, printed, and circulated abroad. Then ample time must be allowed for the preparation of plans. I think there has been some misconception on the part of competitors in the original competition regarding what is now intended by the Government. It must be obvious that to speak of forming a nucleus of something, such nucleus to be complete in itself, is to state a paradox. Parliament House must be complete with all its associations, and a nucleus building cannot afford such completeness. It is not as though some portion of the monumental structure could be erected, such as a central hall, or any part less than the whole, which would give Parliament the convenience and comfort it has a right to expect. Moreover, an attempt to begin the permanent Parliament House would involve delay, not only in design, but in construction also. Until the time has arrived for the monumental structure to be erected, I cannot conceive that any good purpose can be served by re-opening the competition. One of the instructions to the Advisory Committee was in relation to cost, and I am not far wrong when I say that a monumental Parliament House would cost almost as much as the total amount for which we expect to get the city ready for occupation. Therefore, you will see how hopeless it is for us to consider at this stage competitive designs for Parliament House, plus administrative offices. On the moral aspect of the non-completion of the competition, I am not able to offer an opinion, but I doubt very much whether many competitors have put much work into their designs. Knowing the profession as I do, and the time that has to be expended upon major projects, I doubt that much money has been spent by architects, but more than one competitor has declined to accept the remission of the project, and has gone ahead with his work. As an economic proposition a nucleus building cannot be considered for a moment. If the nucleus is to approximate the monumental class, portion of it may be built, but when you proceed to extend the building to its final dimensions, you will incommode Parliament by construction operations all round it. Our proposal is that a provisional building shall be erected suitably distant from one or other of the probable sites of the permanent Parliament House, and that it shall be constructed with the avowed intention of moving it entirely when the final scheme is commenced. I do not think it would be proper to utilize this provisional building for administrative offices. It is obvious that if a building were erected at the present time at a cost of anything like £1,000,000, the interest up to the time when the provisional building would be pulled down would show an economic loss in comparison with a temporary building with a life of 25 or 50 years as a maximum, even if the latter were entirely destroyed when the permanent building was ready. A nucleus building would necessarily include some of the heavier monumental construction, and I cannot conceive what portion, except the two chambers, and probably the central hall and vestibules, could be suitably attacked at once. The risk of disturbance is a serious obstacle to the erection of a monumental building in stages from time to time. As to the most suitable site for Parliament House, we have before us in the Griffin plan the conception of a city of great beauty, in which some purely æsthetic and monumental features are intended, and it is just as

consistent to reserve Capitol Hill for a mainly monumental structure in respect of which utility is a secondary consideration, as it will be to spend large sums of money on lakes, or any other æsthetic feature. I do not favour Kurrajong Hill as a site for Parliament House. After great thought, I am of opinion that the site on Camp Hill suggested by Mr. Griffin is, within narrow limits, the most suitable. Parliament House, with its associations and various necessary unit, will be a building which, from some point or other, will not be a perfect monument. It may have a fine front, or a fine side, but there will be some aspect of it which will not be happy, or, if happy, not useful. Therefore, I would reserve Kurrajong Hill for a building of a highly æsthetic character. Another consideration is that that elevation is not sheltered from the prevailing wind. I concur in Mr. Griffin's proposal to reserve it for purely monumental purposes. The Advisory Committee hold the opinion that, during the next 30 or 50 years, Parliament should enjoy whatever prospect was contemplated in the original design for Parliament House; that is to say, the building should be on an axial line between Kurrajong Hill and Mount Ainslie. I personally believe that the very fact that Parliament House was situated there would promote the final development of that axis on accepted lines. I am opposed to the erection of a parliamentary building away from the main axis. The site proposed just below Camp Hill is sufficiently remote from all other permanent buildings; it will be in the centre of the administrative group, and therefore convenient for members and the public, and, meanwhile, Parliament being located on the proper axis contemplated by Mr. Griffin, would be in a position to insure the development of the plan in such a way that when the permanent Parliament House was erected in its allotted place, the whole scheme would be complete. Admittedly the knoll overlooking the ornamental waters is a very fine site, but I am satisfied that if Parliament House is located there, it will introduce a most disturbing factor in Mr. Griffin's plan. There would be no reason for ever removing it from that site, and there it would stay. One must not be deceived with the idea that these provisional buildings are really temporary. Buildings of brick and hardwood with a good tile roof, in such a place as Canberra, might stand for 500 years. Therefore, one has to consider not only the immediate necessities of the case, but also what would be the future developments of the city. I have the very greatest respect for vested interests. They are one of the most immovable things in the universe, and once Parliament House is located off the main axis, vested interests will be created, which we will never be able to disturb.

227. *To Senator Newland.*—I conceive that the building to be erected on Kurrajong Hill shall be a national monument of some kind. Every nation has something to commemorate in marble and stone, and I think the Capitol was never intended by Mr. Griffin to be anything more than a monument—something beautiful and noble to crown the architectural scheme but having no particular utility. Storage of the archives there is possible as an accessory to the monumental idea, but anything in the nature of utility would be a secondary consideration. I do not think that Parliament House should be placed there. Such a building could never be of the monumental character of that which I consider should be on Kurrajong Hill. I cannot conceive of any utility structure so beautifully proportioned from all aspects as to suit such a position. A building symmetrical from all sides would not develop from a utility plan. That portion of the Griffin plan which provides for the residences of the Governor-General and Prime Minister to be on either side of the Capitol I have never regarded as happy. To place anything of a vocational character on a monumental hill would be a mistake. Assuming that this

memorial will be of gigantic proportions, the residences at the base will have a disturbing effect. I am speaking with lofty ideals of the future of the city. Undoubtedly there is ample room for a parliamentary building on Kurrajong Hill; it would occupy practically no greater area than the base of the structure suggested by Mr. Griffin, but it would not have the lofty towering character of the monument I have in mind. The Advisory Committee has not dealt in detail with the treatment of Kurrajong Hill, because we have always regarded the whole of the area between Capitol Centre and the Molonglo Basin as likely to be the subject of a world-wide competition which would evolve some very beautiful schemes. Neither temporary nor permanent parliamentary buildings should be placed on Kurrajong Hill, although it is possible that some author would produce a scheme in which Parliament House would be placed on Kurrajong Hill; and, if he could conceive a happy design, that arrangement would be right enough. Apart from the erection of the provisional building on the main axis, we think that the whole of this area should be the subject of a world-wide competition for monumental buildings and treatment. Any temporary building placed on the main axis should be conceived with an idea to complete removal as soon as the monumental buildings are erected. The placing of the provisional Parliament House on the main axis would have a good effect on Parliament itself. It would have as its front garden and park all those ornamental features which are to be developed in the next few years; it would have the same prospect as the permanent Parliament House when completed; and it would at all times have before it the spirit of the ultimate scheme. I would not put any temporary building in a position suggested by the designer for a monumental building. The Advisory Committee formulated the general principle of this provisional Parliament House—a building of one story and of a temporary character. The drafts, which were prepared in accordance with the instructions, were criticised by us from time to time, but we quite recognised that the draft plans were only a scheme for discussion by Parliament and its officers. There are some features which probably the Advisory Committee would have modified but for the knowledge that the plan would be revised by Parliament itself. Probably the accommodation is insufficient in some respects. The reception hall might be improved. I have always thought that it would be better if more or less thrown into the main vestibule or surrounding corridor, with supporting columns instead of walls. That would create a fine central hall with a good architectural effect. The corridors are much used, and there should be no crowding in them. Therefore a width of 20 feet is desirable. Members of the Advisory Committee accept as much responsibility for the production of a satisfactory Parliament House as does the Government architect. Of course, it is not part of our duty to gather data and analyze it, but such data as we get we do analyze. There would be no difficulty in supporting the reception hall without retaining the walls. Pillars or columns could be used for architectural effect, but they are not necessary. The span is only 88 feet, but a centre group of pillars would give a handsome appearance. The most important consideration in a legislative chamber is good acoustic properties. There is always the risk that unless some tried and known model of a building is adhered to, something will go wrong with the acoustics. There are some guiding principles, but it is remarkable how they will sometimes go astray. Artificial means of assisting acoustics are very unsatisfactory, and should not be depended upon; in some instances they have absolutely failed. The echoes are the greatest cause of trouble. If there are many echoes, the voice is not heard clearly and precisely. We discussed this matter at length, and the chambers have been designed to have as few reflecting surfaces as possible, and probably they will be all right. So long as the flat ceiling

is not ornate, it will cause no acoustic trouble. In regard to the shape of the chamber, there is no doubt that the horseshoe pattern, of which the draft plan shows a modification, has its advantages, inasmuch as all members face the Speaker. It has been designed for the system of members rising in their places to speak. The rostrum has a very great advantage when one man is addressing a number of people, because the very best acoustic effects can be got from one focal point; but the same effect cannot be got to that point from other parts of the building. One of the finest acoustic buildings in the world is Covent Garden Opera House, where the audience can hear a pin drop on the stage, but a person speaking in the auditorium cannot be heard on the stage. Therefore, a chamber designed upon the rostrum or forum principle would not enable the member speaking to hear interjections. The rostrum and the Speaker must be practically on the same spot, because if the Speaker were at one end and the rostrum at the other, either the Speaker would not be heard or the person addressing the House would not be heard. Usually the rostrum is somewhere near the Speaker. The Advisory Committee did not go into the detail of seating accommodation; that is a matter for instruction as to what members would prefer. There is bound to be a divergence of opinion regarding the relative merits of separate desks with a number of aisles and long benches such as are at present in use in the House of Representatives. If a desk is to be provided for every member, or every two members, a larger chamber would be required, and, for a number of reasons, it would be better to make the chamber larger than is shown on the plan. I would have liked both chambers extended laterally so as to bring them into close contact with the outside parkway. The idea of a loggia and parkway on to which the chambers would open direct, is excellent. I warn the Committee not to put too many openings in the chamber or you will have trouble with the acoustics. That is certain to happen if a wide opening is made in order to get a garden vista down the central aisle. I think the chambers will stand increase in breadth considerably without their value being interfered with. My own experience in ecclesiastical work is that when the length of a building is not more than twice its width it is quite safe in regard to acoustics. If the rostrum is to be adopted it would be advisable to have separate desks for each member, because, on account of members having to pass to and from the rostrum, there will be more disturbance than under the system by which members rise in their places. If an increase in members is likely to take place within the life of this provisional building it would be better to make provision accordingly now than to spoil the chamber by alterations later. You will not want the press accommodated on the floor of the House. Already in the New South Wales Parliament there is some bickering about the coming and going of the press. Of course, it is very important that they should have comfort and the best opportunities for hearing and reporting the debates. I see no objection to the press gallery accommodation proposed in the draft plan, but I would put the gallery as low as possible for the sake of better hearing. Another fact that must not be overlooked is that the reporter likes to see the member speaking, because, if the speaker cannot be heard very distinctly, sight will often assist the hearing. A gallery 12 feet above the floor of the chamber would be too high; I should say that the floor of the gallery should not be more than 9 feet above the floor of the chamber, if that is consistent with the comfort of members. The gallery should not be set back because that would interfere with the acoustics; it should project within the four walls of the chamber. If the rostrum is adopted a modern amplifier could be utilized, and thus enunciation would be conveyed to all parts of the House, and the reporters would be able to both hear and see the member speaking.

If, however, the members are to speak from all parts of the House that invention will not be of any use. I counsel the Committee to keep the press gallery low, and make the visibility as good as possible. If the gallery is narrow not many of the speakers will be screened. Acoustics are very largely governed by the composition of the reflecting surfaces. The inclination of a public gallery is towards the Speaker, and there are not very many reflecting surfaces there which would catch the echoes. The public gallery should not project more than 15 feet into the chamber. If you attempt to accommodate large numbers of the public you will encounter the risk that the chamber will behave differently empty and full. I am not competent to estimate what interest visitors to Canberra will take in Parliament House, but I suggest that accommodation might be provided for less than the maximum number who may go there. A 15 feet gallery would accommodate 100 people easily. If the gallery can be made shallower than 15 feet by all means do so. It is of the utmost importance that the parliamentary library should be the national library. After all, one book can be read by very many people, and if the parliamentary library is very complete and exhaustive in its subjects it should become a public utility, in addition to the value it gives to members. If the library at Parliament House is to serve a national purpose the accommodation shown on the plan is insufficient. There are objections to giving the public unrestricted access to a parliamentary library, but from an economic stand-point such a storehouse of knowledge should have a general utility. At this stage, at all events, it is right to make the parliamentary library accommodation extensive so that it may serve all requirements and provide storage accommodation for the national archives. I make that suggestion with the idea of giving the greatest accommodation with the money available. I do not think that the plan of the parliamentary buildings is too widespread. The idea of breaking up the buildings by courtyards or gardens is excellent; that arrangement is entirely suited to the climatic conditions at Canberra; it gives a pleasing outlook from the offices—and to that I attach great importance, because a man works, sleeps, and feels better if he has good surroundings—it gives better ventilation and light, and, rather dispersed though the plan be, it is no more inconvenient than a two-story building with lifts and staircases would be. Undoubtedly provision should be made for taking the moisture out of the atmosphere in the chamber. I have always supposed that when the detailed equipment is installed provision will be made for tempering the air to any condition of coolness, moisture, dryness, or warmth that is required. Air conditioning should be part of any system of ventilation where a large number of people are congregated for a long time. Even at Canberra there will be an uncomfortable degree of moisture in the atmosphere, and Parliament is entitled to at least the same comfort as is provided in theatres and other public places.

228. *To Mr. Blakeley.*—If a competition for a permanent Parliament House is held, with a view to the immediate construction of a nucleus building, you could not get the necessary data ready for the calling of tenders inside eighteen months. If that scheme were adopted the only portions of the building that could be treated in a permanent fashion would be the two chambers, the reception hall, and vestibules, and possibly the reading room and library, and all rooms centered about the chambers. But no mortal mind can design a building of which only part will be erected, and that part be complete. Why build something which must be costly, look horrible for fifty years, and be difficult to complete at some later date? If you could go ahead and complete the monumental building, I should say start at once to place a magnificent structure upon the permanent site. But we

are supposed to transfer the Seat of Government to Canberra at a cost of under £2,000,000, which is plainly impossible if £1,500,000 is to be spent on Parliament House alone. The Advisory Committee were instructed by the Minister that it was desired to transfer Parliament to Canberra within a limited time and at a minimum cost, and we transmitted that instruction to the Works and Railways Department. Mr. Murdoch, the Government Architect, then proceeded to design accordingly. He has not had a free hand to sketch some monumental structure; he has to show means of placing Parliament at Canberra cheaply and comfortably, and if his proposals have failed in any respect it is only because he has not had complete information to what accessory accommodation will be required. He cannot be blamed for producing a plan according to instructions. From a health point of view there would be no objection to adding an under story to the two wings, with the sunken garden at window-sill level. A partial basement, under the library, for storage purposes would conduce to compactness in the scheme, and there is no doubt that the additional story on the wings would improve rather than detract from the aspect of the building. The Federal Capital Advisory Committee have considered the best means of providing additional space, and we favour the creation of that additional story on the two wings. If the chambers are altered to open on to a loggia on either side there will be a displacement of certain rooms shown on the plan. Another pavilion on the flank has been shown as a means of possible future extension, but from the point of view of concentration of accommodation about the library a semi-basement story is the best solution. I do not think it would be advisable to bring the library and reading room forward to a level with the corridor running down the side of the chambers; the effect upon the chambers themselves would be rather unfortunate. If more accommodation is desired about that quarter I should be more inclined to accommodate the librarian and assistant librarian in portion of the reading room, and put the other library rooms shown on the plan further back. I favour always in a library the largest possible spaces, and I think the library reading room and newspaper room shown on the plan would be more useful and effective if converted into one big room instead of being divided by the cataloguing rooms.

229. *To Mr. Cook.*—Parliament would be dreadful indeed if it were accommodated for five or six years in a temporary building costing £30,000. Members would be incommoded to such an extent that I am sure they could not carry on the country's business. Washington was commenced with certain small halls, but it was so uncomfortable that it was abandoned, and many years passed before Congress returned. I cannot conceive that a purely temporary building would serve any good purpose. I am assuming that Parliament is not disposed to spend a great deal of money all at once, and that both Parliament and the taxpayer would prefer the expenditure upon the Federal Capital distributed over many years. During that time every feature of the city would develop on beautiful lines. Parliament would be perfectly comfortable in the meantime in provisional buildings, which eventually could be removed without any great economic loss. We considered carefully the practicability of a wooden frame structure, but there would be increased danger of fire, and the saving in expenditure would not be sufficient to justify that risk. The provisional plan will give you a building complete in itself, and sufficient to last Parliament for 50 years. In regard to the site, I have been over all the hills, but, taking everything into account, and having regard to the ideals that we are striving to achieve, I am satisfied that it is proper to place the provisional Parliament House on the main axis on the spot suggested by the Advisory Committee. Eventually the building will be entirely

pulled down and scrapped. If the tendency is to enlarge the membership of the Federal Parliament, it is very much better to make provision accordingly now, even though that accommodation may not be required during the life of this provisional building, than to be obliged to enlarge the building later. If Parliament is comfortable there, and has all the conveniences it requires, and more than are given in any other Australian legislative building, it will develop round about its monumental surroundings with a reasonable expenditure of money, and in a reasonable time. Parliament might stay in this temporary accommodation for half a century, and then, if posterity is grateful, the public purse strings may be loosened, and the permanent monumental building created.

230. *To Mr. Jackson.*—The placing of the provisional Parliament House on the knoll near the monumental waters would cause such a disturbing influence that there would develop on the plan something that was never contemplated. There would be plantations, avenues, roads, and other features, and the building would remain there for ever. The Government might declare that the building and the use of that site were purely temporary, and that no other governmental buildings should be built thereabouts, but it is not human nature to observe those restrictions. The development of cities has shown that interests accumulate about a building, and become powerful enough to override every other consideration. I have the greatest possible respect for the influence of vested interests in dislocating any particular plan. Any departure from the plan that is permitted temporarily will become a permanent defect, the more so if the defect is in relation to the parliamentary centre. We cannot cut down a dirty old Moreton Bay fig tree in Hyde Park, Sydney, but what the newspapers are full of letters of protest and criticism. What hope will there be of removing a Parliament House, which has remained in that place for 50 years, and has developed gardens and other features about it? It will have acquired a certain historic association, and everybody will declare that it should be allowed to remain. I do not think it would be advisable to build a purely temporary structure at the foot of Camp Hill. The least costly building that the Advisory Committee can recommend is one such as is indicated by the draft plans. We have not considered what will be the ultimate cost of the whole of the buildings in the governmental group, but they may be expected to approximate £5,000,000 or £6,000,000. I am referring, of course, to the established city with 100,000 or more inhabitants, and if the immigration proposals develop successfully, it may be that in 30 years there will be that population in Canberra. My estimate of ultimate expenditure may seem large, but I do not think you realize how many Government offices there are scattered about the big cities. State Departments are here, there, and everywhere, and, if they were set down on paper with figures showing what is the capital cost of their accommodation, it would be found to run into an enormous sum of money. Add to the cost of the essential accommodation some further expenditure to give the buildings dignity and æsthetic character, and you can see where the millions of pounds go. Some people may cavil at expenditure on æsthetic schemes, but do we not all spend a lot of our personal income on beautiful things for no other reason than that they are beautiful?

231. *To Senator Foll.*—Whether construction be carried out by private enterprise or day labour, the taxpayer will foot the bill, the only difference being that private enterprise will take a little more out of the taxpayer for profit. Private enterprise does not do anything without intending to make a profit. I do not see how the Federal Territory can fail to show eventually a balance on the right side of the ledger. A population of 15,000 is the minimum from which you could expect sufficient revenue to approximately

pay interest and sinking fund on the capital expenditure on the city. The Advisory Committee works in complete harmony with the Government officers. There are on the Committee a representative of the Home and Territories Department, and a representative of the Works and Railways Department, and we have never come to a decision which was not unanimous. There have been strong differences of opinion during discussion, but we have always been able to come to a unanimous vote upon any recommendation or report sent to the Minister. Those officers are in close contact with the Government Departments and have a knowledge of the development of Canberra from its inception; therefore, their point of view and assistance have been of great benefit. There is no doubt that the housing of workmen at Canberra is costing too much; that is the experience everywhere, and it is unfortunate that accommodation has to be provided when building prices are so high. The alternative is a cheaper class of construction, because it is not desirable in the interests of the people themselves that they should be given smaller rooms and a less comfortable dwelling. We can only turn to timber. Brick cottages can be built at Canberra a little cheaper than those already erected, but I personally do not think that much better results can be obtained. When you consider timber construction, you meet with the economic question as to whether it is not better to pay a larger price and get permanency. After all, a timber house is not altogether an asset; it is always a liability for maintenance and depreciation. Certainly a timber house properly built will last 100 years, but there are expenses attached to it which are not incidental to a brick house. I note the plan of a War Service Homes building at Oatley, which I am told was built for £726. I expect that the same building at Canberra would cost £800. The Government called for tenders for the erection of cottages at Canberra, the work was widely advertised, and the greatest possible trouble was taken to get competitive tenders, but without result. You ask why the building costs at Canberra remain high; the reason is not far to see. In the city of Sydney there is a demand for houses, of which there is a shortage of 8,000 or 10,000, and the builders are not attempting to provide them. There is the certainty of rent and profit, and yet the buildings are not being erected. Therefore, you cannot expect that people will go to Canberra to build houses. Furthermore, it is a characteristic of Government work that you never get the value from the workmen that you do in private construction. Whether the workman thinks that, as he is a taxpayer he is entitled to get back some of his own, I do not know. But he never works the same for the Government as he does for a contractor. If we could get competitive building at Canberra, it would be well, but we shall not get it until the Government say that they are wedded to the transfer of the Seat of Government, and that Parliament will go there within a reasonable time. I believe that when a contract for the erection of Parliament House is let, the whole industrial aspect will change. People will then realize that Parliament seriously intends to do something, and there will be competition. If Canberra were thrown open now for the selection of freeholds, the land would be taken up by speculators, who would well and truly squeeze future householders. That would not mean cheap housing; in fact, it would be the worst thing that could happen. If people cannot be induced to build speculatively in a city like Sydney, where labour and material are more conveniently available, and where sure money is waiting on the doorstep, they will not go to Canberra. Private enterprise will do very little at Canberra for a while, and the sooner the Government get that into their minds, the better. In Sydney, there is a shortage of both bricklayers and plasterers. At the present time I have in hand work running into one and a-half million pounds, and I am turning from brick to concrete construction at

greater cost, because I know I cannot get bricklayers. It would be an excellent policy for the trades generally if those sections which are short were reinforced by immigration. It would be good for the trade unions, and it would provide work for other dependent trades. It must be obvious that when there is a shortage of bricklayers other associated trades do not get the work which otherwise would be available.

(Taken at Sydney.)

TUESDAY, 24TH APRIL, 1923.

Present:

Mr. GREGORY, Chairman;	
Senator Foll	Mr. Blakeley
Senator Newland	Mr. Cook
Senator Plain	Mr. Jackson.

Senator Albert Gardiner, New South Wales, sword and examined.

232. *To Senator Newland.*—I am Leader of the Opposition in the Senate. The general elevation of the proposed provisional Parliament House resembles a wealthy squattage rather than a legislative building. I do not like the design. The buildings are too widespread, and on account of the roof area would be too costly. By making a two-storied building, the same accommodation could be put under two-thirds of the roof area shown on the plan. It is possible that my view will conflict with that of architects, for the reason that I favour, not a provisional Parliament House, but a temporary structure built in such a position at Canberra that it can be used afterwards as a university, school, city hall, or administrative building. The construction at this stage of a provisional building at a cost of £200,000 to last 40 or 50 years is wasteful. Let me refer for a moment to the original idea of creating a Federal Capital. The contract made by the several States was that the Capital city should be built within ten years of the inauguration of the Commonwealth Parliament. More than double that time has elapsed, and yet there is no immediate prospect of the Federal Parliament moving to Canberra. The delay may have been reasonable, but in the minds of most of the people of New South Wales it was unreasonable. Therefore, I am of opinion that there should be no attempt to erect an elaborate and costly provisional building now, but that a temporary building should be placed on one of the sites selected for administrative quarters, or the university, or in the civic centre. I would link economy with expedition. We could place a temporary building there in a very short time, and next year Parliament could be sitting at Canberra. The building I suggest would be of brick, and as comfortable as this room. It should be suitable for a post office, or school house, or university lecture room; and, if the builders were in earnest, that kind of temporary accommodation could be provided in six months. It is essential that the original lay-out of the city should not be interfered with. If for £30,000 a temporary building were placed on the university site, that would substantially and well serve some branches of the university for the next thirty years. Parliament could take up its temporary abode there while its future home was being built. Interference with the original lay-out would be a grave mistake; and I am further of opinion that a provisional building such as that suggested will mean a duplication of expense. The money involved in this design could be well expended on the monumental building, and a very small sum of money would suffice for purely temporary accommodation for Parliament during the few years that would intervene before its permanent home was constructed. I would adhere absolutely to Mr. Griffin's plans. They represent the idea of a man whose skill and ability are beyond question, and to depart from his grand conception would

be risky, to say the least. A suitable building for Kurrajong Hill would be, I suppose, the home for the future President of Australia. At any rate, the building placed on that site should be the official home of the head of the Government when the Commonwealth Parliament is established at Canberra, and the building should be the best we can build to represent the intelligence and development of our people. The House of Parliament should take its place in the design, as arranged by Mr. Griffin. It is a wonderfully thought-out plan, and anything that trespassed upon it would mar its beauty and effectiveness. The grave danger before us is that the design may be interfered with by amateurs like myself, who may not see how they are marring the harmony of the whole scheme. If Parliament is earnestly desirous of transferring to Canberra quickly, I suggest the erection of a couple of halls at Duntroon, and that the present buildings there be used for ordinary official and press purposes until such time as we can move into a permanent home. Such halls could be built for a cost of not more than £20,000. The knoll near the ornamental waters would be a most beautiful site for a provisional Parliament House, but I think that the whole of that area on the main axis must be kept intact for the carrying out of the original design. It would be more economical to build a temporary Parliament House on a site where it can be used later for other purposes.

233. *To the Chairman.*—Unquestionably, a number of Government offices will be required adjacent to Parliament House, wherever it be built. The officials connected with the running of the parliamentary machine must be provided for, but buildings such as I suggest could be erected in such a way that they could be used for other purposes after they were no longer required by Parliament. The time occupied in making the monumental buildings ready for occupation would depend upon the amount of money available and the design; but, if constructed under good management, it could be ready in three years; under easier going management in five years; and, at the rate of speed displayed by Parliament during the last 22 years, 500 years. Competitive designs for the monumental building should be invited. I have no prejudice against people in other countries, but when Australia is setting out to build its own Federal Capital city, it might well leave the designing to Australians, so that the city might be a monument to the world of the standard of civilization we have reached. In three years the building could be ready for occupation, and thereafter, proceeding steadily with the development of the scheme, it could be completed in another four years. I cannot imagine that any longer time would be required. I would be satisfied with a temporary building for four years, and I think that for £20,000 Parliament could be housed during that period. You tell me that the engineering services alone for the provisional Parliament House would cost between £30,000 and £40,000. I have had a fair amount of experience in the building trade, and these estimates are so high and elaborate that I am incapable of grasping them. By erecting a couple of halls at Duntroon and utilizing the other buildings there, Parliament could be transferred to Canberra for less than £10,000. Being there, we could then proceed as quickly as possible with the erection of the permanent monumental Parliament House. If a provisional building is to be erected, I approve of the proposal to provide a number of rooms close to the main entrance, where visitors may interview members. I certainly think a stranger should not be allowed into any of the central parts of the building for the purpose of interviewing members; the interviews should take place before they get into the main building. The introduction of strangers into any part of the parliamentary building is most objectionable. In the House of Commons it is very much more difficult for strangers to get a footing anywhere about the precincts than it is in Australian parliamentary buildings. The interviewing of members at Par-

liament House is a most reprehensible feature. I would make Parliament as exclusive as it is possible to be made. Valuable as constituents are, the practice of strangers calling at Parliament House, and sending in a note to call a member from the chamber, probably when an important debate is in progress, is most undesirable. He causes offence if he does not answer the summons, and if he does answer it, he probably misses the most important part of the debate. Therefore, the practice of interviewing strangers at Parliament House should be restricted and not catered for, but if there are to be rooms for the reception of strangers, they should be near the main entrance, so that visitors may not intercept members coming and going on their parliamentary duties, and Parliament itself, even in this stage, when every one must know everything, must be protected from interference whilst debates are proceeding. A member may be devoting particular attention to one matter, and having stated his own opinion in the House is listening to the views of others, when he is called out of the chamber on a matter comparatively trivial. That practice should not be encouraged. In regard to the main reception hall, 15 feet corridors surrounding it would be quite wide enough. Whilst I prefer to be guided by the architect, who has given much thought to making one part link up with another, I am of opinion that an open hall, similar to the Queen's Hall, in Melbourne, would be preferable to an enclosed inner hall, if it be architecturally possible. The idea of providing direct access from the chambers into open garden spaces is excellent. These buildings should cater for (1) health, (2) convenience; and (3) comfort. If gardens, instead of rooms, adjoined the chamber, the latter would be more healthy by permitting of free direct natural ventilation, and providing facilities for members to step direct from the floor of the House into fresh air. I should think that Federal parliamentary representation will double in twenty years. The Constitution provides that there shall be two representatives to one senator. Already we have reached the stage when the House which makes and unmakes Governments is much too small. In the House of Representatives 38 members constitute a majority. Twenty of them are a majority at the party meeting. Under the present system, twenty men may get together, and agree to form a Government, irrespective of the interests of the people, or any one else. Those twenty can divide amongst them the salaries set apart for Ministers, and all other paid offices. I must admit that any of the emoluments that come to them in that way are very dearly earned. I do not regard them as an important consideration, but I do view with grave apprehension the small number of members required to constitute a Government in Parliament, and I believe that very soon the people will realize the danger. Australian politics have fortunately been free of corrupt practices, but within reasonable time the membership of Parliament will double. If the chamber of the House of Representatives were built to accommodate 150 or 160 members that would be ample. I doubt if we can ever advance beyond that number, at any rate during the life of any provisional building. The idea that, in the new Parliament House, members should speak from a rostrum is excellent. One of the worst features of parliamentary debates under the present system is the unpreparedness of the speakers. Speaking from a rostrum would tend to shorten debates, and improve their calibre. A man would scarcely leave his seat to ascend the rostrum unless he had something to say. Of course, I would confine the use of the rostrum to debates on second and third reading stages of Bills, motions, and other major debates. The very fact of a man standing in an elevated position, and facing his audience would improve parliamentary speaking. I do not think it any censure upon ourselves to say that parliamentary speaking is not at a very high level at the present time. I have not given much consideration to the

method of seating members, but the horseshoe arrangement appeals to my conservative nature. I approve of the idea of members having desks in the chamber; probably one desk for every two members would be best. The presence of the *Hansard* reporters on the floor of the House does not disturb the debate, and I have no objection to them remaining there. In regard to the press, I would provide accommodation for the representatives of the newspapers if they paid a fair rental. I am not favorable to a great commercial concern like the press being provided for at the cost of the people of Australia. We should provide for the pressmen any conveniences they require, because they are the principal distributors of parliamentary information, but they should pay for whatever accommodation is provided. At a recent public dinner, no conveniences were provided for the pressmen, but because they knew that the public would desire to know what was said at the dinner, and that it was the business of the press to sell that information to the public, the speakers were reported at greater length, and much better, than the average member is reported in Parliament. The pressmen should have special dining-room accommodation at Parliament House if their employers are willing to pay rental for the building and the wages of the attendants. If the press desires that accommodation in order to advance its commercial undertakings, it should pay for it. It is a sound principle that we should not give to any one section of the community something for nothing. The press must pay for any concession that it obtains. That is my view, and I have the utmost good will to pressmen, because they have always treated me generously. In regard to the members' dining-room, seating accommodation for 250, as proposed on the draft plan, would probably be sufficient. The arrangement of the library satisfies me. The newspaper and periodicals room is used mainly for brief and casual reading; it does not serve the same studious purpose as does the main reading-room. Current local newspapers we read in our party rooms and club rooms. Presumably the exchanges from overseas would be accommodated in the newspaper and periodicals room. The parliamentary library should be a modern library, chiefly for the use of members, and, in addition, there should be a national library covering all branches of literature of all ages, and serving also as a museum for the housing of important historical collections and relics.

234. *To Mr. Cook.*—If it is intended to proceed with the erection of a permanent building at an early date, a temporary building could be erected at a maximum cost of £100,000, but I think it should be done for £20,000. It would be used by Parliament for four or five years until the permanent building was ready, and then it would be available for some other public purpose, such as I have previously mentioned. I can imagine experts estimating the cost of a provisional building at a very high figure, but the temporary accommodation I suggest would have merely a temporary purpose. I repeat that two large halls would serve the requirements of Parliament for four or five years. After much experience I claim to be expert in the interpretation of public opinion, and I say that there is the utmost dissatisfaction throughout New South Wales on account of the treatment this State has received from the Federal Government in regard to the carrying out of the Federal Capital compact. There is no other question which excites so much interest and resentment. I would remove that immediately by transferring Parliament to Canberra without delay. A man who has been a member of Parliament for many years learns to estimate public opinion, and I say emphatically that the integrity of the Commonwealth is impugned from one end of New South Wales to the other owing to the feeling that that State has been deprived of what was granted to it under the Constitution. There is no other political question on which feeling is so strong or mention of which provokes such a quick response at public meetings. If the

Labour party came into power in Federal politics, the Federal Parliament would be sitting at Canberra within two months, and we should proceed with the construction of temporary buildings as fast as possible. We are told in the press that the next session will last from 13th June to 30th August. Parliament could take up its quarters at Duntroon, use all the existing buildings for administrative offices during that very brief session, and by the time Parliament re-assembled in January other temporary offices could be built. The sewerage could be well advanced towards completion, but in the meantime the sanitary arrangements for the students at Duntroon would be quite sufficient for the Parliament. If Yass is the most suitable point to which a railway to Canberra could be built, there is no reason why that line should not be proceeded with at once, because it will help to cheapen building at the Federal Capital.

235. *To Mr. Jackson.*—I do not know of any Parliament House in the world at which the press pay for their accommodation, but up-to-date people like the Australians should lead the world in everything. I would not restrict the pressmen if they discharged seriously the duty of letting the people know what Parliament was doing. If we make provision for the press to conduct a commercial business, any facilities provided at the cost of the people should be paid for. A newspaper is a business undertaking operated for the benefit of its proprietors. That it has a most expert system of obtaining information and conveying it to the general public is a fact for which we should be grateful, but that gratitude should not extend to a subsidy in the form of free office accommodation in which to transact its business at the people's expense. The charging of rental for the use of press rooms at Parliament House would not restrict the supply of parliamentary news to the people. When there is an important debate in Parliament, the people talk about nothing else, and a newspaper that does not give information on that subject to the people must suffer in circulation. Provided there is ample accommodation for the press reporters to hear the debates, there is no reason for other provision being made for them within the walls of Parliament House. They should be given excellent facilities for hearing the debates and for getting messages away, but there seems to be an idea that there should be ample, comfortable, and convenient rooms provided at Parliament House for the press representatives. The pressmen should have the most ample and comfortable accommodation it is possible to obtain, but at the cost of the newspaper proprietors.

236. *To Senator Newland.*—Probably there will be occasions when political parties will be more numerous than they are to-day, and for the smooth working of Parliament it is necessary that rooms for the exclusive use of parties should be provided. If what is happening in South Australia should spread all over the Commonwealth, separate rooms for at least seven parties should be provided. They would serve for other purposes until such time as new parties arrived to occupy them. I am not very keen on the provision of party rooms, except that it is necessary for parties to meet and discuss matters privately; but I do not know whether one big meeting room could not be used by all parties. No matter how high political feeling might run at times, there will always be sufficient good-will amongst the parties to admit of arrangements being made for A to have the party room in the morning, B in the afternoon, and C in the evening. The Senate club room might be used for the meetings of any fourth party that came into the field. Perhaps a gallery raised slightly above the floor of the chamber would be the most convenient accommodation for the *Hansard* reporters. I have not the slightest objection to their having a seat at the table. They move in and out of the chamber with so much precaution against interruption of the speakers that one could scarcely take ex-

ception to their being on the floor of the House. In the State Parliament of New South Wales, *Hansard* seems to do excellent work in the gallery. I have no prejudices either way. The Senate club room would be better situated anywhere than in the front of the building. If garden space is to be provided at the back of the Senate chamber, a club room opening off that space would be most convenient. I do not favour the abolition of the club room, because it is an advantage to all senators to have one room in which they can meet on common ground. Having regard to all-night sittings, during which the librarian and assistant librarian must remain in the building, special rooms for them are necessary. The fact that the *Hansard* rooms as planned will be along the corridor by which members will pass to the dining-room and smoking-room inclines me to think that, if the staff were accommodated in a wing on the first floor, they could have convenient access to a special low gallery, and would be entirely removed from the quarters used by members. I would prefer that members should be separated as much as possible from those who are employed about the House. The attention of the designer should be drawn to the fact that it would be preferable not to accommodate the *Hansard* staff on the ground floor.

237. *To Mr. Blakeley.*—The construction of the Federal Capital has been delayed so long that the consideration of the reports of this Committee should be the first business undertaken by Parliament. Immediately a decision is reached by Parliament in regard to the construction of a provisional Parliament House, tenders should be invited. It is important that the good name of Australia should be preserved. Broken vows have been the cause of trouble throughout the century, and the failure to carry out the undertaking given in regard to the Federal Capital has been the cause of a great deal of unjust suspicion regarding the intention of the Federal Parliament. If a world-wide competition for the design of the monumental building is to be held, designs should be called for immediately, and the information necessary for the guidance of the competitors sent to the capital cities of other countries without delay. I would not allow too much time for the submission of designs, because the building of the Federal Capital has for years claimed the interest of the best men in the architectural profession throughout the world. Therefore, I do not think that the competition need extend over more than twelve to eighteen months. Whatever time is required by Australian competitors should be sufficient for those in other parts of the world. In regard to the proposal of the Institute of Architects to abandon the provisional project and to do nothing until a competition has been held for the design of the monumental Parliament House, having regard to the opposition we have experienced during the last twenty years, my mind at once becomes suspicious of delay, and I think my mind is the same as that of the average citizen of New South Wales. It is all important that further delay should not occur, and that is why I am anxious that a temporary building should be started at once, thus removing suspicion from the public mind.

(Taken at Sydney.)

THURSDAY, 26TH APRIL, 1923.

Present:

Mr. GREGORY, Chairman;	
Senator Newland,	Mr. Blakeley,
Senator Plain,	Mr. Cook.

John Sulman, Consulting Architect and Town Planner, sworn and examined.

238. *To the Chairman.*—The duties of the Advisory Committee, of which I am chairman, were to arrange for the carrying out of the accepted plan of the

Capital as expeditiously and as economically as possible, so that the Federal Parliament might be transferred to Canberra at an early date. We were informed that we were not bound in any way by the competition which had been instituted for the design of a permanent Parliament House. We were also instructed that the Department of Public Works would be the designing and constructing authority for all buildings and services. In accepting the position of chairman, I reserved to myself the privilege of suggesting improvements in the plan, and that was freely conceded. I accepted the condition that the Works Department should be the designing authority, but since then, after assisting the Government Architect to prepare designs for cottages, I represented to my colleagues that any one man cannot produce sufficient variety of designs to suit the general public. My colleagues agreed with me, and we have recommended to the Government that a competition be held amongst all the architects of Australia for various types of design so that the Federal Government may have a much larger choice of type than they otherwise would get. I am glad to say that the whole of my colleagues, including the Federal Director of Works, cordially concurred in that recommendation. The request of the Federal Council of the Institute of Architects for representation on the Advisory Committee is not justified. I am, by request, a member of the New South Wales Institute of Architects. I was vice-president many years ago but little difficulties arose, such as arise in even the best organized bodies, and I retired from the institute, but I was requested by a former president to rejoin, he urging that the institute wished to do me honour for the public work I have given to the community. I have now retired from general architectural work. On the committee besides myself are Mr. Ross, Colonel Owen, Mr. de Burgh, and Mr. Goodwin. We were informed by the Government that it was desired to transfer Parliament to Canberra in the shortest possible time at the least reasonable cost, and on making inquiry as to the Parliament House, we were informed that we were quite free to recommend whatever we thought was best in accordance with the instructions already given to us, and that we need not take into account the competition which had been inaugurated. At the instance of myself, the Committee made a recommendation to the Government in regard to the competition, which Cabinet did not see fit to adopt. The appointment of the Advisory Committee was gazetted in February, 1921, but unofficially I was approached by the Minister in the previous October to undertake this work. If the Government had desired to hold a competition for the design of Parliament House and the governmental group ample time would have been available, but I do not think that that competition should be held. It would be a waste of money, because, since the original competition was inaugurated, there has been a world crisis, and I as a citizen recognise that the obligations of the Government of the Commonwealth, as of the Old Country, are, first of all, to pay off its indebtedness, and to refrain from all unnecessary expenditure. A monumental Parliament House is a luxury which may well be deferred until the Commonwealth and other countries of the world are in a more favorable financial position; in fact, until we have paid our debts. In the original competition the premiums alone amounted to £6,000. In addition, the Government appointed an international committee of adjudicators, whose expenses, had the competition been completed, would have been considerable. So far as my knowledge goes, whilst some plans are already well advanced, none is completed, and certainly none has been submitted. I totally disagree from the contention that we should set about the erection of the nucleus of a monumental building. A permanent structure will require to be of a very solid and substantial character, and the

accommodation required will be considerably in excess of even that suggested by Mr. Griffin in the conditions of the architectural competition, or provided by Mr. Murdoch in the provisional plan. If we attempted to provide that accommodation as portion of a permanent building it would cost twice or thrice as much as any temporary building, because of the necessarily more substantial nature of the construction. The accommodation could not be arranged in so economical a fashion in the form of portion of a permanent building as it could be in a temporary building such as Mr. Murdoch has planned. In his directions to the competitors Mr. Griffin asked for accommodation amounting to 111,700 superficial feet. The area of Mr. Murdoch's plan is 83,170 feet, but I understand that many parliamentary witnesses do not think that he has allowed sufficient space. Accommodation for the librarian is absolutely necessary, although Mr. Griffin did not include that in his directions. To attempt to build a nucleus of a permanent building would be an absolute mistake, and infinitely more expensive than the erection of a provisional building. Mr. Griffin's estimate of £250,000 for the first section of the monumental building is quite fallacious. Kurrajong Hill, according to Mr. Griffin's plan, is to be reserved for what he calls the Capitol, and the foundation stone has been laid there, but I confess that I have no definite idea of what his intention is. I understand that he proposed a sort of monumental building that might perhaps hold the archives of the Commonwealth, and be a monumental record of the foundation of the Commonwealth, and generally be of a memorial character.

I have taken a great interest in Canberra from its commencement. In company with my eldest son, who is a competent surveyor, I spent a whole week between Yass and Queanbeyan before the actual site of the Capital City was decided upon. I came to the conclusion that Canberra was the best site in the whole district, but I did not contemplate the building of the city on two sides of the Molonglo River. We have in Sydney enough evidence of the difficulties which arise through a big city being divided by water, and the difficulties will be much greater in Canberra because of the flood waters. I would have placed the city under the shelter of Black Mountain or Mugga Mugga. I still think that choice was right. I urged upon Colonel Vernon, who was then the Government Architect, that the city should be placed on one side of the river. The separation of the Government centre from the civic centre is a grave defect in Mr. Griffin's scheme, but building has already been commenced in the civic centre under directions from the Cabinet. At the first meeting of the Advisory Committee at Canberra on 26th February, 1921, I laid before Mr. Groom, the then Minister for Works, and Mr. Poynton, the then Minister for Home and Territories, in the presence of my colleagues, the following twenty-five reasons for commencing the building of the city on one side of the river only:—

In pursuance of the request of 22nd January, 1921, of the Honorable the Minister for Works and Railways for advice on six points in connexion with the Federal Capital, I herewith state my views in answer to question 3, dealing with the general scheme of development of the city:—

1. The governmental building area is the keynote of the plan.
2. Development should centre around this for the present.
3. The whole city plan is so extensive and calculated for a population of probably 250,000 that it cannot be realized for a century or more.
4. Hence the various sub-centres can only be realized in the future.
5. If attempted now they would be isolated little settlements, difficult and costly to serve, unfinished in appearance, and a cause of much wasted time in travelling to and from the governmental centre.
6. A nucleus has already been started at the power house, and I advise that this be developed.
7. It is the present tram terminus and most convenient for the supply of building materials to the governmental centre and the adjoining portion of the city.

8. Hence the area bounded by Federal, Wellington, and Eastlake avenues and the Causeway should be developed first.

9. This is in harmony with Mr. Griffin's original proposal for an initial city.

10. It is understood he now favours an area to the north-east of the future civic centre. The objections to this are stated in paragraphs 2, 3, 4, and 5.

11. The area proposed in paragraph 8 is more sheltered than in paragraph 10.

12. It is bisected by the existing high road from Queanbeyan, whereas approach by road to 10 must be made.

13. It affords sites for dwellings for both officials and the civil population.

14. It possesses a central park and parkway.

15. A permanent railway station is shown at Eastlake Circle.

16. A small shopping centre could be formed either here or at the power house, preferably the latter, in the first instance.

17. It would always be needed, and being limited in area could not vie with the market and civic centres when the permanent railway is finished and increase of population warrants their being commenced.

18. This scheme would be by far the most economical, and, under present financial conditions, this is a most important point.

19. The streets and avenues in this section have, fortunately, not been started. They could therefore be laid out on natural lines, and the heavy cuttings and embankments, such as those around the civic centre, avoided.

20. Even if the latter be cut away or filled up at the sides, the allotments fronting thereon will be very unattractive for sale and costly to build on.

21. It is very important that a good impression should be made at the first sale of leases.

22. To render the section north-east of the civic centre available for use, heavy works of surface drainage must be undertaken to catch and dispose of the storm waters from Ainslie and to conduct the local surface drainage along the streets instead of through lots as at present.

23. The area suggested in paragraph 8 is almost free from the disabilities referred to in paragraph 22, and such as exist can be economically met in the lay-out.

24. If banks and other semi-public buildings are erected at the power-house centre they would only be small and suited to 15,000 or 20,000 people for the first twenty years. They would always be required as branches. If erected now at the civic centre they would have to be pulled down and rebuilt later on as the city increases in size, when more important buildings are required. By adopting the power-house centre temporarily this waste would be saved.

25. By adopting the above suggestions a compact, easy to build, and easy to work city would be obtained, in contrast to a scattered, expensive, and hard to manage settlement if commenced to the north-east of the civic centre. I therefore emphatically recommend the former, as it follows the natural course of development, and would be more useful, attractive, and pleasant in every way.

(Signed) JOHN SULMAN.

My colleagues—Mr. Ross was not then a member of the Committee—on being questioned by the Minister for Public Works, said that my contentions were perfectly sound were it not for the instruction that we were to carry out Mr. Griffin's plan. In my interview with Mr. Groom in Melbourne, when I accepted the position of chairman, I was granted leave to suggest any amendment of the accepted design which I thought desirable. My colleagues did not do so, and they felt themselves bound by the instruction. At the end of the conference, at Canberra, Mr. Groom stated that he could not depart from Mr. Griffin's intention to start work around the civic centre. On the Sunday morning—24th February—Mr. Groom said that he and Mr. Poynton had reconsidered the matter, and agreed that my contention was sound, and we could suggest further cottages at the power-house site, and he would give no direction as to the Ainslie-avenue cottages. On Friday, 4th March, 1921, Mr. Groom was in Sydney, and stated to Mr. de Burgh and myself, at the Commonwealth Bank, that my recommendation had been submitted to the Cabinet, which had decided to proceed with the cottages at the civic centre, as previously arranged. I regret to say that Colonel Owen had put in an opposing report countering our proposals for development on the southern side only. He had always been in favour of developing the southern side before the Committee was formed, but he has since been a most pronounced advocate of building on both sides of the river in accordance with Mr. Griffin's intention. The building of the cottages on the northern side of the river necessitates considerably increased expenditure on sewerage, water supply, and storm-water drainage,

and we have had to provide a temporary septic tank instalment for the cottages already erected. The rental of the cottages was discussed by the Advisory Committee. The cost of building at Canberra is necessarily higher than in Melbourne or Sydney, but I do not remember whether we considered it was within our scope to recommend a 25 per cent. reduction in the rentals. Personally, I do not think that that course is desirable. In regard to the cost of bricks at Canberra, it must be remembered that that place is still quite in the country, and the Government have to pay the travelling expenses of men going there. A big city has always the advantage of a large supply of labour, and while men can get employment in the cities, they will not go to the country. That is very largely the reason for the high cost of the cottages in Canberra. We have also to pay heavy freight on all building material, whereas in the big capital cities the emporiums are close at hand. It is not part of the Advisory Committee's work to deal with the cost of material; we advise the Minister only as to the general lay-out. The cottages are as cheaply designed and planned as can be reasonably expected. Cottages with three bedrooms are costing £1,100, and with two bedrooms £800 to £900, the accommodation being similar to that provided in the War Service Home at Oatley, the plan of which is before me. You cannot justly compare the cost of a house built close to Sydney with that of a house at Canberra. It would be of assistance undoubtedly to have a fair supply of cottages for workmen, but while many of them have their homes, or are acquiring homes, in Sydney or suburbs, they will not go to the country. Their families want picture shows and the other diversions of city life. My colleagues who are in active practice tell me that it is necessary even now in Sydney to pay more than the award rates in order to get workmen, and that until an advance on award rates is being paid at Canberra, good workmen will not go there. Cheap cottages alone would not be a sufficient inducement, because the men can get higher than the award rates in the cities. The Advisory Committee is trying to get the cheapest possible cottage, and that is one of the reasons why I urged my colleagues to recommend to the Government that a competition be held to produce, not only varied designs, but the cheapest possible type for construction and working. That recommendation applied to a block of thirty cottages. I think that competition would be worth while, because we are asking for various types in one block that will give the prospective tenants a greater choice than they will get from the Government architects. In regard to the leasing of lands, our recommendation to the Minister was that, in order to recoup the Government for their capital outlay, and obtain the best rental for the leases, the land be not thrown open until the construction of Parliament House has been started. We regard that as the turning point in the whole process of transferring Parliament to Canberra. When the Government are committed to the building of Parliament House, it will give the public confidence that Parliament will be transferred there as soon as possible, and they will be prepared to offer adequate rents for the leases. If the leases were thrown open now they would be disposed of at unremunerative prices. My conviction is that if judiciously managed, as one would manage a private estate, the Federal Capital can be made to pay for itself in course of time. I have had a great deal of experience in the development of estates, and if I were young enough, I would not mind taking over the development of the Federal Capital as a business proposition. If I did not finish with a big fortune, I would think I had been a fool. The example of Washington is sufficient to assure us on that point. In the first place, Parliament and its attendant Departments will take to Canberra a fairly large number of people. Half the public servants will be family men. We reckon that when Parliament is

fully installed at Canberra, with all its Departments and trades, the people and workmen necessary to attend to its wants, and all the other elements which go to make up a self-contained community, there will be a population of at least 20,000. In addition, people interested in politics—deputations, constituents, persons interested in certain Bills, visitors from other countries—will undoubtedly visit Canberra as they visit Washington, and gradually the city, being a very pleasant place, in the midst of fine scenery, and having a bracing climate, will attract a large population, as Washington has done. Possibly, also, there will be a number of wealthy people, and others advanced in life, who will desire to settle in the neighbourhood of the Seat of Government. Within a century, you may have at Canberra a population of 100,000 people, and eventually Mr. Griffin's idea of a population of 250,000 may be realized. Directly you get a settled population there, Canberra will become a permanent working centre, in which workmen can make a living all the year round. At present the city is just passing through the difficult period of installation. The sewerage of Queanbeyan is outside the scope of the Advisory Committee's duties, but is certainly most desirable. I have heard that something is being done there to improve the sanitary arrangements. In regard to the site of the permanent Parliament House, accepting Mr. Griffin's plan as the one to be carried out, I think that the position he has chosen is, on the whole, the best, and my colleagues agree with that view. The Advisory Committee fully and carefully discussed the knoll near the ornamental waters as a possible site for the provisional Parliament House, and we were unanimously of opinion that it was not a desirable spot on which to commence building operations or place a parliamentary building. Notwithstanding its excellent view, the site is unsuitable, because buildings placed there would be out of harmony with Mr. Griffin's plan; moreover, it is very exposed to the wind. On the site we have recommended, at the foot of Camp Hill, the back of the building will face a cutting, 10 feet in height; there will be no view from the back of the building, but there will be relief from wind pressure. We considered it an advantage to cut into the hill there, because the quarters which will abut on that place are the kitchens and service rooms, and it is just as well that they be partially hidden, because the permanent Parliament House will be on the hill above them. Its view will be over the top of the temporary building, and the latter, being low set, its kitchen yards can be masked by plantations and shrubberies. The provisional building is to be built as cheaply as possible in brick, the majority of the outside walls being 11-in. cavity, and the inside walls $4\frac{1}{2}$ inches. Such a structure should last in reasonably good condition for 50 to 75 years, but could be made to last a good deal longer by constantly spending money on it. If I were a member of Parliament, I would oppose tooth and nail any proposal to erect a temporary wooden structure or utilize the accommodation at Duntroon. Parliament House under those conditions would be very uncomfortable. Canberra is a cold place in the winter, and members will experience the need for a solid brick building. My main home has been on the mountains for the last twelve or fourteen years. I spent one winter in a wooden cottage at Leura, and I do not wish to repeat the experience. Canberra will be quite as cold as Leura, and for the sake of reasonable comfort I recommend that Parliament House be built of brick. Allowing for the calling of competitive designs, the adjudication, the calling for tenders for construction, and the actual erection of the structure, a monumental building would not be ready for occupation in less than five years. If Parliament were to go to Canberra in the meantime, any purely temporary building would require to have a life of at least five years, and heating services, water supply, and sewerage

would be necessary. I do not think that money would be saved on a purely temporary building of the necessary size made of fibro-cement and galvanized iron, and plastered inside; the cost would be probably not more than 10 per cent. less than that of the provisional building which the Advisory Committee have recommended. The only saving would be in respect of the walls; doors, windows, roofs, services, painting, decoration, &c., would be the same as in the provisional building. In regard to the design of the provisional building, I highly esteem the Government architect, Mr. Murdoch, as a very capable man. In formulating a draft plan of the accommodation required at Parliament House he had to work in official channels; he was not entitled to go to the members and ascertain their views. The plan is a basis for suggestions, for the Advisory Committee fully recognises that members are the best judges of their own requirements in Parliament House. I approve of the proposal to amend the plan by transferring to another part of the building the Senate club room and the committee and reception rooms on either side of the entrance vestibule, and substituting therefor a number of rooms for strangers. I have had to interview members of the New South Wales Parliament on many occasions, and I found it very awkward to discuss business with them in a corridor or hall. The proposal to open the chambers on to a loggia and garden space is excellent. Mr. Murdoch's suggestion that the wings might be brought forward in order to allow of the introduction of that enclosed garden would be quite in keeping with the design. I should like to say that the Works Department has been very open in all its proceedings, and has submitted to the Advisory Committee for its friendly criticism the draft designs of structural work. The Committee has made a number of suggestions, all of which have been incorporated in the plan. In regard to the main reception hall, I do not like the idea of a hall within a hall. When I questioned Mr. Murdoch upon that part of his design, he said that he must provide wall space for the hanging of paintings. From an architectural point of view I would prefer that the walls of the hall be removed and columns substituted. With corridors 15 or 20 feet wide and a clerestory centre, the hall would be quite efficient acoustically. I suggested to Mr. Murdoch that the space of the hall might be reduced, but he again mentioned the pictures as a factor to be considered. I do not approve of the proposal to bring the front of the library forward to a level with the corridor running past one side of the chamber; if that were done, it would be necessary to narrow the corridors between the reception hall and the chamber entrances. Mr. Murdoch is quite capable of producing a design on a smaller scale if that is desired. Acoustics are a very difficult problem. In England I was an ecclesiastical architect, and built a large number of churches very successfully, but one or two which I thought would be good acoustically turned out badly. The Advisory Committee will, if so requested, pay special attention to the acoustics when the recommendations of the Public Works Committee have been dealt with by Parliament. It is not only the proportions of the chamber, but also the materials used and the disposition of the people in the chamber which determine the acoustic qualities. Of course, the architect has to consider how the chamber is to be used. In churches the voice has to carry from the pulpit or chancel, but in an English parliamentary chamber a member speaking from any part must be heard in all other parts. The Committee must decide whether Parliament will require a chamber on the English pattern or on the Continental pattern—with a rostrum. As a rule, galleries help the acoustics by breaking up the air mass of the building. Probably a chamber with projecting galleries would give better acoustics than one without. The press gallery could safely project 6 feet and be helpful, rather than otherwise. If a gallery projected too far, the members seated

underneath would not hear too well, but the breaking up of the air vibrations is an advantage. The convenience of separate seats and desks for members appeals to me. There are certain advantages in the theatre form of seating; members are more visible, and are speaking forward to a larger number of members than they are when the seating is arranged according to the English system. On the other hand, unless a man speaks from a fixed point in a building of theatre form, the acoustics are not so good. The London County Council chamber which has a rostrum is rather a failure, but that is probably due to its excessive height. Open fires in Parliament House at Canberra are practically impossible; the heating must be done by hot water or steam. There will not be the same amount of water in the atmosphere in Canberra as in Sydney, and during winter the chambers will not require much artificial ventilation. But, as you may not be able to have the windows open always, artificial ventilation would probably be a desirable adjunct. I have never used the system of extracting the foul air at the floor level, but I have heard it unfavorably criticised. The draft plan makes provision for a library for parliamentary purposes only. The national collection should be in a separate building. A fireproof room in the basement for housing valuable documents and records could easily be provided. A semi-basement under the wings of the building would be quite healthy if it opened upon a sunken garden, allowing the admission of plenty of air, and the walls were made damp-proof. I told Mr. Murdoch that the placing of an additional story on the wings would benefit the appearance of the building architecturally. In regard to the dining-room and kitchen arrangements, there is on the top floor of the Commonwealth Bank, Sydney, an electrically operated kitchen, which is very efficient and clean, absolutely under control, and gives off very little smell. I do not think that electric cooking is the most economical, but in future, when electricity is generated at the coal mines and distributed at a much cheaper rate than at present, its use will become much more general.

239. *To Mr. Blakeley.*—Heights of 12 feet and 10 feet respectively are sufficient in the corridors. Some of them are designedly kept low in order to allow more light into the two chambers. There are no architectural obstacles to the placing of a semi-basement under the two flanks of the building as well as under the inside wings. The proposal that the centre aisle of the chamber should lead direct on to a loggia and private garden is good, if the space can be afforded, and the displaced rooms can be provided elsewhere. The more light and air you can get directly into the corridors surrounding the chambers the better. A garden and loggia at the side of the chamber would be more protected than a garden at either end of the chamber. In addition, it would give greater privacy. For the floors of the chambers, rubber paving would be the best. When it was first introduced, I feared that it would not be durable, but I was assured that it would last for many years. I am surprised to learn that some of the paving in the Commonwealth Bank chamber has been renewed; that may have been due to a defect in the material rather than to wear. I have heard of cork tiles, but have not had any experience of them. I most emphatically believe that the Yass-Canberra railway should be completed and ready for work when the Seat of Government is transferred to Canberra. One of the disabilities of travelling to Canberra at present is that the traveller arrives at 4.15 a.m. The Yass-Canberra line will be somewhat costly, but it must be built, and it should be one of the first works undertaken. It would be a very good idea to erect 100 cottages for workmen within the next twelve months. The first report of the Advisory Committee contemplated the erection of cottages for officials only, and the majority of the Committee were of the opinion that private enterprise would build more than

half the domestic house requirements. I did not agree with that, and I do not think that, at the present stage, cottages will be built at Canberra by private enterprise. Probably the Government will have to face the building of the whole of the cottages for officials. If you are going to build cottages for workmen as well, you will be increasing considerably our estimate of the cost of transferring Parliament to Canberra. If we built cottages for officials only, they might be temporarily used by workmen, and when Parliament actually meets at Canberra, there will be more probability of getting private enterprise to build speculatively, and workmen to erect cottages for themselves, or have them built on the instalment plan. We have already recommended that competitive designs for a block of 30 cottages be sought, and the conditions of the competition have been sent to the Federal Council of the Institutes of Architects so that they may voice any objections which they may have. I drafted the conditions, and as they are in harmony with the regulations of the institute, I do not anticipate that any objection to them will be taken. We have provided also that a representative of the architects shall be on the adjudicating board. The relations between the Advisory Committee and the architects have been harmonious, but unfortunately the ex-President of the New South Wales Institute of Architects (Mr. Godsell) has taken up an attitude of very strong opposition to the Committee, especially in connexion with the proposals for the erection of Parliament House. He thought that we were responsible for the competition not being proceeded with, but, as I have explained, we acted according to instructions from the Government. I do not see why the architects should boycott a competition for cottages if it is conducted according to their own rules and regulations. They have not yet agreed to take any part in the competition, but some members of the New South Wales Institute thanked me, and said, "You have got us something, at any rate." Our decision to recommend a competition for cottages was not intended as a sop to the architectural profession. We thought it desirable that more than one mind should be represented in the designing of the cottages at Canberra. We all get into a groove, and we thought that the capital should have the benefit of different men's ideas. I have told my colleagues that we shall probably have to face wooden frame cottages, but it is quite possible that the majority of the Committee will be opposed to them. The cottages are intended to be permanent, but the administrative offices we hope will not remain for more than 20 or 30 years.

240. *To Senator Plain.*—The necessity for building homes for workmen at Canberra will depend upon how quickly work is proceeded with, the extent of building that goes on, and also whether or not we get private enterprise interested. If a big private firm became interested in the construction programme, it would take to Canberra its own workmen, and house them. Of the 600 or 700 cottages that will be required for officials when Parliament is transferred, it was expected that more than half would be provided by private enterprise, but I am doubtful of that expectation being realized. Later we shall have to rely entirely upon private enterprise, except for purely governmental buildings, but until Parliament actually arrives at Canberra the Government will have to build more cottages than we have estimated in our report. Temporary accommodation is provided already in the old internment camp. It is rough, but cheap. Some of the buildings have been transferred to the vicinity of the brickyards, another block to Acton, and a third to near the power-house. Even if good cottages were provided, I do not think that many bricklayers would leave Sydney to go to Canberra. If the Government go ahead with the construction of the cottages that will be ultimately required for officials, they can be used by the workmen temporarily. That policy is being followed to a limited extent now with the cottages

already erected. The more cottages that can be built, and the more speedily they are built, the better. The rent of the land is a small factor in the cost of housing accommodation. I do not think that private enterprise will be interested in Canberra until there is a certainty that Parliament will assemble there within a short period. The Advisory Committee have recommended the establishment of a sort of *Crédit Foncier* system by which officials may be assisted to erect houses for themselves. Many of the officials who will be transferred already own their own buildings in Melbourne, or are acquiring them on time payment, and they will not be able to build in Canberra unless the Government do come to their aid. I am opposed to the placing of the permanent Parliament House on Kurrajong Hill. Every member of the Committee holds the same view. but Mr. Murdoch put a scheme before us, and we have placed an anemometer on Kurrajong Hill in order to test the wind velocity. I think the site will be found to be far too windy for the health and well-being of members and officials. Even the site recommended by the Advisory Committee is not as sheltered as I would like it to be, but it is better than Kurrajong Hill. The latter is extremely steep on one side, and it would be necessary to slice off a piece of the hill in order to get an adequate area to hold the parliamentary buildings. Moreover the contours of the ground are such that the permanent administrative offices of the future could not be brought into as close touch with Parliament House, on Kurrajong Hill, as is desirable. The departmental plan did place Parliament House on Kurrajong, and a quadrant of buildings all round it; but I do not think that would answer so well as Mr. Griffin's lay-out of the governmental area.

241. *To Mr. Cook.*—It would be desirable to build the Yass-Canberra railway at once if that be possible. The provisional Parliament House when no longer required as such, could be used as administrative offices while permanent offices were being erected. At times there are serious divergencies of opinion at the meetings of the Advisory Committee, and some of our recommendations have been carried by a majority vote. In Sydney there is a shortage of skilled building tradesmen, particularly bricklayers, carpenters, plasterers, and plumbers. There are not enough skilled workmen to do the work now offering in the city. If the proposal to extend Martin-place is adopted the difficulty of getting an adequate supply of skilled workmen for Canberra will be accentuated. The unemployed are the unskilled men. Any decent skilled workman in the building trade can get work. My personal opinion is that the system now in operation of rebating 25 per cent. of the rental value of the cottages at Canberra is unavoidable. On the whole the Works Department has done very well under great difficulties. The Government advertised for tenders without avail. One tender was received for the erection of cottages, but the Department has had to carry on the job. The laying of the sewer main was advertised all over Australia, but no tender was received. I have informally discussed with the Minister the question of prohibition in relation to the Federal Territory; in fact, when the proposal for the first hostel was before us I raised the question as to whether there should be a bar. The question is still undecided. My own opinion is that the majority of workmen like a drop of liquor and do not abuse it. A certain number of men do abuse intoxicants. I have been at Canberra on Saturdays and Sundays, and I know there is a considerable exodus of workmen to Queanbeyan in order to get a little week-end relief or enjoyment. I strongly recommend a trial of the Gothenburg system. In Sweden the sale of liquor is controlled by the municipality, and any profits are applied to local benefits of all kinds. The manager is allowed to get a profit only on the food sold, not on the drinks, and there are heavy penalties for serving

a man who has already had enough intoxicants. If the manager serves a man with enough liquor to make him drunk he runs the risk of losing his billet. There is every facility for getting a reasonable quantity of drink, but there are safeguards against abuse. Fifty years ago Sweden was a very drunken country, but evidence was adduced at the town planning conference in London, in 1910, that it is now one of the most sober countries in the world. Owing to town planning, the fostering of Swedish exercises, and the restriction of alcohol to reasonable use, the Swedes are now one of the most virile races in Europe. I favour the adoption of some method of control similar to the Gothenburg system rather than abolition or prohibition. In regard to the provision of cottages at Canberra, I prefer brick construction if it can be done at a reasonable price, but if we are obliged to reduce the cost we shall have to resort to wooden frames. I object to the galvanized iron walls. Fairly pleasant cottages can be built in wood. In some of the continental Parliaments in which the chambers are built in the theatre form the press are seated on the floor of the House, and they are then well within focus. In some chambers they are railed off, and there is a little stairway from the enclosure which gives access to the writing or retiring rooms on a lower floor. That struck me as a remarkably good arrangement. If a membership of 200 in the House of Representatives is contemplated that scheme might work very well. Certainly it would be very advantageous for the pressmen, because they would be in the very best possible position for seeing and hearing. Ample accommodation for the pressmen should be provided, because their work is very onerous. The Government should provide that accommodation. Parliament represents the people. If there were no pressmen in Parliament the constituents would not know what was happening, and I am sure they would not read the *Hansard* debates. The press serves a most useful purpose in the Government of the country, and Parliament should give it all reasonable conveniences. It is to the interest of the country to do so.

242. *To the Chairman.*—The fate of the provisional Parliament House when it is no longer required for parliamentary purposes must be governed by the financial circumstances at the time. If the country were exceedingly prosperous Parliament might decide that the old building was not in harmony with the new monumental structure, and dispense with it in order to attain the final objective of the designer as soon as possible. But if the building be required for administrative offices I do not think it will clash with the carrying out of the plan of the governmental area. The design is simple and unobtrusive. I have no doubt that the provisional building could be adapted for use as modern administrative offices without incurring undue expense.

The witness withdrew.

Dr. James Frederick Watson, Editor of *Historical Records of Australia*, sworn and examined.

243. *To the Chairman.*—Since 1913 I have been engaged in editing the *Historical Records of Australia*, and the papers I have had to deal with during that period have been of dates anterior to 1838; but in the course of that work I have noted the condition of the records of many of the subsequent periods, not only in Commonwealth Departments, but in the State Government Departments in New South Wales, Victoria, and Tasmania. In preparing the papers for the volumes that are being published I found that, as they were of ancient date and very few people have had occasion to use them, many were in great disorder. I am very much afraid that the papers that have accumulated during the time the Commonwealth has been in existence will be found in a similar condition. In 1902, Sir Edmund Barton was Prime Minister and Minister for External Affairs. He was very interested

in the preservation of historical records, and commissioned the late Mr. F. M. Bladen, who was on a visit to England, to inquire into and report upon the systems of keeping the archives in the different capitals of Europe. Mr. Bladen submitted a very valuable report, in which he pointed out that all the nations of Europe had appreciated the necessity for preserving their archives for practical as well as historical purposes. I may give a specific example of the state of some of the records belonging to the Commonwealth. The late Hon. Phillip Gidney King presented to the Commonwealth the whole of the manuscripts belonging to his father, Governor King. They were extremely valuable, and included the journal of the voyage of the sloop *Norfolk* around Tasmania when it was first proved to be an island, all the papers in connexion with the visit of Baudin, the French explorer, and all the papers in connexion with the administration of the colony of New South Wales from 1800 to 1806, and many long-hand despatches and private letters. These papers cannot be traced. Their monetary value at the present time would be, approximately, £4,000. I think that if Bass' journal were put up for auction in open market, it would realize between £500 and £600. I reported the loss of the papers to my committee, and they approached the late Prime Minister, and the Premier of New South Wales, as Mr. F. M. Bladen had had something to do with the transfer. General searches were ordered in the Government Departments, and no trace of the missing documents could be found. I mention this as an instance of how important documents can go astray. It is almost impossible at any date to say what documents will be of value at some future period. I may mention the claim of a citizen of the United States of America against the Government of New Zealand for the recovery of £2,000,000. Mr. Justice Salmon had to visit England in connexion with that case. Some of the documents preserved in the Supreme Court at Sydney, and which no one had examined until Mr. Tarrant and I searched them, were of value in elucidating that case. Here is another instance of the necessity for the preservation of documents. The Colonial Sugar Refining Company was divided into two companies—the Fiji company, and the Australian company with its head-quarters in Sydney. A question arose as to whether trustees having power to invest in securities in the Australian colonies had power to hold shares in the Fiji company. The interpretation of the word "Fiji" depended partly upon records in the Registrar-General's office and the Supreme Court. The matter was referred to Mr. Robert Smith, and he said that Fiji was an Australian colony, but the records did not show it; and a most extraordinary feature is that there are extant two Orders in Council, one appointing the High Commissioner, which excluded Fiji, and another in connexion with King Thakombau, which included Fiji as an Australian colony. These documents affected the decision in regard to a large sum of money. It might be thought that the records in regard to the convicts of early days are of no value. Yet not long ago the possession of an entailed estate was at issue: the direct line had died out, and it was necessary to trace back the collateral lines of the family. One member of the family had been a ne'er-do-well who had been deported. By means of the convict records it was proved that this convict left no descendants. I suggest the immediate establishment of an organized office such as Sir Edmund Barton proposed in 1902. Similar steps have been taken by the Canadian and South African Dominion Governments, and they employ clerks in London to copy records relating to the Dominions and transmit them to the record offices at Ottawa and Cape Town. A record office becomes a clearing house for records. In departmental administration it is the practice to send forward many papers with a B.C. minute. A document leaves one file and is placed on another. Two or three Depart-

ments may be involved. Each Department may complete its own file, but none is complete for future reference. By compiling the records in an organized office, everything is collated for historical or record purposes or for precedents. If that were done immediately, it would simplify the administrative details at Canberra. When the Justice Department of New South Wales required more room for papers in regard to common law titles of land, it built a fireproof building adjacent to St. Mary's Cathedral and transferred the records there; the facings of the buildings were added at a later date. When files are no longer required by Departments they should be transferred to the archives. The value of the records of each Department depends upon the Department itself, more especially in State administration. The files of records in the Education Department have probably little value after eighteen months. In the Common Law titles to land all files from the very beginning are valuable. Each Department could fix a period beyond which its records are no longer of immediate practical use, and some of the records have been destroyed. Others are still preserved, and they cause congestion, occupying space that is required in the Department for current papers. If they were transferred to a records office no congestion need occur in any of the Government Departments. The Records Department could take over in 1924, say, the records of the Prime Minister's Department, and during the ensuing twelve months collate and index them. In the following year it might take over the records of the Treasury, and a year later the records of the Department of External Affairs. The whole of the Government records could be divided into five groups, and at the end of every five years could be transferred from the Departments to the Records Office. The result would be to limit the records space in each Department to a certain compass. Practically all papers that pass through a Government Department should find their way into a Record Office. In 1852, the first petition for the federation of the Australian States came from the town of Wollongong, which at that time had a population of probably 300 or 350 people. Mention of the petition is to be found in the *Votes and Proceedings of the New South Wales Parliament*, but unfortunately the signatures are not recorded. I tried to ascertain the signatures, but was informed the petition had been destroyed. Of course, in the middle of the last century, Federation was not of very great importance, but that first petition in favour of Federation is of very great historical interest to-day. In England and in other countries, the keeper of the archives has the responsibility of deciding, with the advice of the heads of Departments from which the records came, what papers shall be destroyed. By the system I am suggesting, all papers that have more than a transient value would be collated and card-indexed. There is a practical necessity for that system. In regard to common law titles, for instance, Tasmania has a system whereby every individual who has any transaction with land is indexed on a card, and on one side of a vertical line is shown the mortgagor, and on the other side mortgagee. In half-an-hour one can be fully informed as to any transaction. In New South Wales, there is an enormous number of indices to search, and the process is slow and difficult. If a Commonwealth Archives Department were established before the documents became too numerous, it would be of immense importance in future, and would save records' space in other Departments. In England, the British Museum has become very congested, and has had to store all newspapers in a building in one of the suburbs. All papers that are applied for are brought to the Museum from the suburb in a large van every Monday. The Archives Office should be located on the outskirts of Canberra, and should be fireproof. It would be of advantage to establish the office at once before any further destruction of records occurs. The staff would comprise a

keeper of the archives, three clerks, and a messenger. There would be a room for public search, and the archives themselves would be in a room like a book-stack—a strongroom with presses down the middle and alley ways. There would be slight risk from dust, damp, and vermin, but the atmospheric conditions in Canberra are not likely to affect paper very much. The Hobart Government buildings are on the top of an old convict building, and a number of cells and cellars have been converted into strongrooms. The Tasmanian Government have initiated a system of centralizing its records. I have been in that building for a week at a time, when the weather was wet and moist, and no damage at all is done to the records. Although Australia is only a young country, having been first settled in 1788, it has already set an example to the rest of the world by adopting the Torrens' title, the secret ballot, and the Hare Spence system of voting. Yet, if one had to search against them at the present time, he would find it very difficult to discover their origin.

(Taken at Melbourne.)

SATURDAY, 28TH APRIL, 1923.

Mr. GREGORY, Chairman;

Senator Plain	Mr. Jackson
Mr. Blakeley	Mr. Mathews.
Mr. Cook	

Kenneth Binns, Assistant Parliamentary Librarian, and Librarian in charge of Australian Section, Commonwealth Parliament, recalled and further examined.

244. *To the Chairman.*—I think the library accommodation could be satisfactorily re-arranged so as to remove the cataloguing room from the centre of the reading room. If the cataloguing room were transferred to the room now allocated to the Ministerial party it would then be directly accessible to the librarian and assistant librarian, which would be a distinct advantage. According to the draft plan, both those controlling officers would have to cross the corridor in order to supervise the work in the cataloguing room, which will contain a majority of the officers of the library. I do not think we can reduce the area of accommodation in the reading room and newspaper room. Already the plan gives us less accommodation than we have in the present building, which members will agree is inadequate. The size of the main reading room in the present Parliament House is 44 feet 6 inches by 42 feet. In addition there are north and south wings, each 42 feet x 23 ft. 6 in. The reading room shown on the draft plan measures 56 feet by 46 feet, and there is also a newspaper and periodical room 56 feet by 28 feet, but the two combined do not give as much accommodation as the library has at the present time. Any limitation of the accommodation is undesirable. Rather should we increase the accommodation in the newspaper reading room. That could be done by transferring the cataloguing and receiving room, but they must be quite handy to the librarian and assistant librarian. It would be an advantage if the reading room and the newspaper room were made one instead of being divided by the cataloguing and receiving rooms. This might be done by transferring the reading room to the southern end, thus securing a more cheerful and bright reading room, which is very desirable, because members will spend a good deal of their time there. It will not be necessary for members to visit the upstairs accommodation of the library. The passenger lift and the two book lifts are intended for the use of officers of the library. There will be no need for members personally to search for books in the stacks upstairs, unless they should desire to consult a large section of books. The whole of the books will be so handy to the reading room that

any volume that is required can be obtained by the attendant in half-a-minute. A small winding staircase is shown in the plan, and it should be retained. Members should be allowed to go to the shelves when necessary, because very often a member is not quite sure what book he requires, but would like to glance over all the books on the subject in which he is interested. Book cases about 6 feet in height will also be placed both round the reading room, and also to form alcoves. These will contain reference works for the use of members. If the cataloguing room were transferred to another floor the difficulties of supervising the staff and the general working of the library would be greatly increased. The librarian and assistant librarian must be able to supervise or inspect the work of any officer at any time, and it very frequently occurs that one or other has to work in collaboration with a junior officer. The card catalogue in which all the books are recorded should be as adjacent to the reading room as possible, and should be in the room used by the cataloguers, because their work necessitates frequent reference to the cards. The plan provides a basement for newspapers, and we shall have officers employed there. The chief objection to the provision of office accommodation for cataloguers in a semi-basement would be the separation of the librarian, assistant librarian, and the officer in the reading room from the cataloguers, and the catalogue itself. The placing of the catalogue on a floor above or below the reading room would be a very bad arrangement, because whenever an attendant had need to look up the works on any subject, he would have to travel to another floor to consult the catalogue. The cabinets which contain the cards of the library catalogue at present occupy a space more than 40 feet in length. The catalogue is continually growing. We cannot raise the cabinets any higher because they must be limited to the height at which an officer can conveniently consult the cards. Therefore any further extension must be lengthwise. Of course, the catalogue cannot grow beyond the contents of the library, but it can be made more detailed. The usefulness of a library is determined by the efficiency of its catalogue, which is a guide to the contents of the library, and should be accessible to members as well as to officers of the library. Very frequently members independently, or with the assistance of an officer, consult the cards of the catalogue. We hope to have a duplicate catalogue before we transfer to Canberra, because it will be essential to have one in Canberra and one in Melbourne during the process of removing the books. To place the catalogue cabinets along the walls of the reading room and do the actual work of cataloguing in other rooms would be a bad arrangement. The officers would be continually passing from the reading room to the cataloguing room in the performance of their duties, and this constant procession would disturb the quiet of the reading room. We shall have to accommodate in the basement the officers employed in filing newspapers and binding. We hope to have a national library building in addition to the parliamentary library. At Canberra, we shall have to meet the requirements of Government Departments to a much greater extent than we do now, although officers from the Departments are continually working in the present library. If we are not given more accommodation than is provided in the draft plan the library will not be able to continue that phase of its usefulness, as well as meet the requirements of residents and students. The library might also be made available to anybody at Canberra who has need of its services. At first I had hoped that it could be arranged to erect a modern book-stack, with accommodation for departmental officers just outside the building, but Colonel Owen objected to this on the ground that it would interfere with the general architectural beauty of the building, and suggested that it would be better for us to apply for one of the buildings

in the departmental block. I accepted his suggestion as a very satisfactory way out of the difficulty. Already the national as distinct from the parliamentary section of our library has a large number of volumes, and is growing rapidly. It will grow more rapidly when we go to Canberra. Under the Copyright Act, we receive a copy of every book or pamphlet published in Australia. I do not approve of the provision of strong rooms in connexion with the library. Things kept in a strong room are buried. Valuable and interesting books or relics, such as the Captain Cook manuscripts, should be on exhibition. The library accommodation in the provisional Parliament House will not be fire-proof, but a small detached building could be provided to store the volumes of the National section and also the Petherick collection, which according to the deed of acceptance, must be kept separate. That collection is not of much assistance to members engaged in the usual work of Parliament, but is of very great assistance to the student of Australian history. It has always been the intention of the Library Committee to have some accommodation other than that provided in the parliamentary building. Unfortunately the new Library Committee has not been able to meet, otherwise representations on this subject would have been made by it to this Committee. It is the hope of the Library Committee, however, to establish at Canberra a National Library similar to the National Library of Congress at Washington, even though it be housed for some time in a merely temporary building. If supplementary accommodation of that kind is not to be provided, the draft plan of the parliamentary library accommodation must be recast, and greater space provided. Government officers are frequently using the parliamentary library for departmental purposes. Major Piesse, of the Prime Minister's Department, visits the library at least twice a week. It is his duty to keep in touch with National and International developments in the Pacific, and all new publications relating to the Pacific are consulted by him. At various times, officers of the Meteorological Department have been engaged for months in transcribing some of our early records. Officers from the Attorney-General's Department come to consult the law reports; officers of the Prime Minister's Department frequently come to the library to consult the parliamentary papers of Great Britain, the dependencies, and those of foreign countries. All the year round there are as many departmental officers engaged in research work in the library as there are members of Parliament using the accommodation, but we keep them as far as possible from the rooms used by members. A gentleman engaged in writing a history of Australian literature has been working in the Petherick collection for months. Honour students in the Adelaide and Melbourne Universities use this library for research in connexion with their studies. If an extra building were provided the archives could be kept as part of the national collection, and the parliamentary library could be reserved for purely parliamentary purposes. In speaking of archives, I refer to not only official papers and documents, but to all publications or documents which contain original historical material. I repeat that I am opposed to the use of a strong room for storing valuable exhibits. The casket containing the freedom of the City of London which Mr. Deakin gave to the library is kept in the strong room for the sole reason that we have no proper facilities for exhibiting it. Moreover, I do not think a strong room can be made so secure that damage might not occur. The strong room in the existing building was flooded recently, and a number of most valuable books were seriously injured, and if a fire occurred in the building a strong room in the centre of the block could not completely protect the valuable records stored in it. A library does not greatly fear losing valuable documents by theft. It is most unlikely that a document like *Cook's Journal* would be stolen because it is known

all over the world that the Commonwealth Library is the owner, and the thief would be unable to dispose of it, or even to show it to any one.

245. *To Mr. Mathews.*—It is essential to have the national section of our library at Canberra, but not for the work of Parliament. We cannot leave the collection in Melbourne, because the Victorian State Parliament will be returning to this building. Moreover, we could not leave half our staff in Melbourne, and take the other half to Canberra. Where the collection is the staff must be, but we have not made any provision in the parliamentary library to accommodate the national collection.

246. *To Mr. Blakeley.*—I do not like the idea of putting officers' rooms in the reading room. In the newspapers room there is a good deal of noise caused by the turning over of papers, and a considerable traffic to and from the room, because the consulting of the papers by a member is usually for a brief period only. I agree that the position of the cataloguing and receiving rooms, as shown on the draft plan, is not good, inasmuch as they are separated from the rooms of the librarian and the assistant librarian. If the cataloguing room were placed where the Ministerial party room is shown on the plan, it would be under the constant supervision of the librarian and assistant librarian. The reading room and the newspaper room should not contain any officers of the library except the attendants. Cataloguing means the recording of all books in the library and setting out upon cards the contents of those books. We are not up to date with the cataloguing of the whole of the library; portion of the library is only partially catalogued. All additions to the library are catalogued when they are received. The cataloguing staff has always been inadequate. At present, I am the only trained cataloguer on the staff. I have three assistants. In the Sydney Public Library there are 22 officers engaged in cataloguing, and in the Mitchell section there are nine.

247. *To Mr. Cook.*—I do not favour the design of the Mitchell Library, in Sydney, but the fittings are distinctly modern and good. I would recommend that the fittings in the library at Canberra be similar to those in the Mitchell Library. I have no fear of dampness in the library at Canberra, except in the basement, where newspapers will be kept, but the architects feel confident that the basement will be damp-proof. It is most undesirable to store books below the level of the ground, but dampness can be prevented by the free circulation of fresh air.

248. *To Mr. Blakeley.*—I see no objection to the basement now allotted to a library store and bindery being extended to the full length of the wings. There would be no great necessity for general storage other than for newspapers if we had a separate building for the National Library and archives. If a separate building is not to be provided, I should urge the Library Committee to request that the draft plans be entirely recast with a view to providing further accommodation for the parliamentary library.

(Taken at Melbourne.)

TUESDAY, 1st MAY, 1923.

Present:

Mr. GREGORY, Chairman;	
Senator Plain	Mr. Jackson
Mr. Blakeley	Mr. Mathews.
Mr. Cook	

Thomas Hill, Chief Engineer, Department of Works and Railways, re-called and further examined.

249. *To the Chairman.*—I do not think it will be necessary to provide in the provisional Parliament

House at Canberra a ventilation plant which would serve to prevent very moist atmosphere from entering the chambers. With the design of the building and the method of heating proposed, namely, ordinary hot-water with forced circulation, I do not think any air treatment or ventilation other than the natural is necessary; but we have looked ahead, and if it should be necessary to do so, we could install such a plant without difficulty. I do not advise it at the present time, because I do not think it is necessary. Speaking from a knowledge of Canberra for the past twelve or thirteen years, I think heating will be essential, but that is provided for. Canberra is very cold at times. There will be no danger of creating moisture in the chamber through the use of hot-water pipes. When you are heating a building during cold weather, the heat will have the tendency of reducing the percentage of humidity. There will be no danger of moisture oozing from the pipes except through bad plumbing. In any case, the pipes will not be exposed in the chambers. All that you will see will be the wall radiators and taps, and the radiators will not leak, because they will be of cast iron and impervious to moisture. Where there is a large body of men assembled there is a good chance of gasses descending, instead of ascending, if they have a good chance of cooling. I know that in the Victorian Legislative Assembly an exhaust fan takes the air out of the chamber about 4 inches from the floor level, but we do not propose to do that at Canberra. I rather lean to the idea of extracting the gasses through the roof and introducing fresh air at the floor level, or slightly above the skirting boards. There would be no danger of draught if the air introduced were suitably conditioned or warmed. One of the difficulties in the existing House is that there is not sufficient air introduced into the chamber under the benches on which members are sitting, and too much comes in at the Tobin vents on the walls. Sometimes I think the air introduced into the chamber has not been sufficiently warmed. I am positive there would be no danger of draughts being created through bringing air into the chamber at a low level so long as it is suitably prepared or warmed. The heating plant in the Melbourne House was installed by us sixteen years ago, but since then we have not had the slightest opportunity of handling it. Others have been called in to effect alterations. The plant installed was to warm and circulate the air, and was based on the knowledge available at the time. It is still capable of rendering good service by modernizing it at small cost. The tower outside in the gardens was built when the House was erected. The old-established plant cleaned the air of some of its dust by a screen on which sprays of water might be played. I understand that the ducts through which the air is delivered into the chamber are by no means clean. I am not defending the existing system, but I would like to put it right. The boiler should be replaced by a more modern one, as large as we could get into the small chamber where it is housed, and then we should fit in forced circulation, to enable the system to be better controlled. The boiler and the pump could be installed at a cost of £250, and this expenditure would increase the efficiency of the plant easily by from 25 to 50 per cent. At present, if it is necessary to warm the chamber, the engineer is obliged to get up steam before he can get any circulation into the radiators. It takes him hours to do this, whereas you really want something that responds quickly. In the Commonwealth offices, immediately the fire is started the water begins to circulate through the radiators, and the heat is felt right away. It is not necessary to wait until the water in the boiler boils. I would also overhaul the duct-system. It is necessary to have these of proper design and with proper bends in order to insure getting properly warmed air into the chamber. At present, as things are, a lot of the heat is wasted in caverns in the

ducts. We reckon that the duct system could be overhauled at a cost of £250. We would also install a rain chamber with receiving tank, with circulating pump and motors, at a cost of £250. The screen with the sprayers in use now was the best known at the time it was installed, but there have been tremendous developments in these matters. The rain chamber with a receiving tank and a circulating pump we suggest is in use at the Collingwood Automatic Exchange, where the air is well washed. It is necessary to save the water. At present, that which is blown on the screen is lost, but with a pump you can use it over and over again and get a greater cooling effect. Thus for an expenditure of £250 you could get over the humidity, and for a total cost of £750 we could lay down improved conditions, always provided that the system of control and supervision lay with the Works and Railways Department; otherwise we would accept no responsibility. In regard to supervision, we would simply see that the man in charge was visited, say, once a week; and, when a man knows that he is being watched, he does his work properly. The best plant is of no use unless it is properly controlled. At Canberra we do not propose to bring in the ventilation at a low or a high level. We propose to trust to the natural conditions there, which are altogether different from those here, and to the heating system of wall radiators; but if such a system were ultimately required the air would probably be introduced at a low level under pressure, and be exhausted from the top by a vacuum. Once you have contaminated air, it rises, and should not be allowed to come down again, as it would do if it were exhausted by a fan at the bottom of the chamber. Gasses will sink with a cold temperature, but not with the ordinary temperature in the chamber. CO₂ will rise while it is warm, but if chilled at the ceiling will descend again unless it can escape through an outlet. By exhausting the air from the floor you tend to induce it to descend from the top of the chamber to the bottom. We do not propose to introduce any air at the present time; but, if it be found necessary to do so at a later stage, we shall bring it into the chamber underneath the benches where members are sitting, and by means of ducts on the walls. We shall easily be able to get underneath the chambers at Canberra. That matter will all be thought out before the building is proceeded with. In regard to the existing chamber, the whole of the air could be got out every ten minutes if necessary. The only chance the Department have had was when we stepped in and raised the temperature without any difficulty to 63 degrees Fabr. I would propose to overhaul the duct system so that no dust could get in. Any modern system would make provision for doing that.

250. *To Mr. Mathews.*—There will be no difficulty in making the portion of the building which will be slightly below the level of the gardens quite damp-proof. The Commonwealth offices in Melbourne are surrounded by springs, and the same condition applies at the General Post Office in Spencer-street; but we have not the slightest trouble. It is not at all a difficult matter to keep a building dry with the ordinary asphaltum damp course.

251. *To the Chairman.*—There will be natural ventilation to the sub-basements. The Department favours a system of vacuum cleaning through pipes. The dust is received at the bottom of the pipes and washed out into the sewers. We do not even attempt to burn it. The advantage is that the dust is not handled at all, and does not come back again. The vacuum-cleaning plant in operation in the existing Parliament House is altogether too small. It might be suitable for domestic purposes, but really what is required for the purpose of cleaning the dust out of the big carpets and off the walls is a 2 horse-power motor cleaner.

(Taken at Melbourne.)

WEDNESDAY, 2ND. MAY, 1923.

Present:

Mr. GREGORY, Chairman;	
Senator Plain	Mr. Jackson
Mr. Blakeley	Mr. Mathews.
Mr. Cook	

Dr. Edward Sheldon Cunningham, Editor of the *Argus*, sworn and examined.

252. *To the Chairman.*—I have not come prepared to say what increase in the number of members of the Federal Parliament will take place within the next twenty-five years or the period within which it is suggested that the proposed provisional Parliament House will serve the purpose for which it is to be erected, but I can give an off-hand opinion for what it may be worth. The tendency in all federal institutions is against a large number of members. The spirit and principle of the Federation is that the Federal Legislature should take a broad national view of politics, and should not concern itself greatly with matters of merely local importance. It seems to me looking ahead, and also looking back on my experience, that a material increase in the number of the members of the Federal Parliament is not likely to occur within, say, the next generation. A considerable increase in the population as a result of the immigration policy and the development of the New States movement will undoubtedly tend to an increase in the number of the members of the Parliament, but I still do not think that the number will be increased to a very considerable extent, because the federal principle is the governing principle of the Federation. If a number of new States are formed, and the constitution remains unaltered, the membership of the Senate will, of course, be very much increased if as at present there are six senators from every State. As the proportion of members of the Senate to the members of the House of Representatives is governed by the Constitution that would involve a very considerable increase also in the number of the members of the House of Representatives. But before new States are established it seems to me that the Constitution will require to be fundamentally amended, and I am therefore inclined to consider as an off-hand opinion that there will not be a marked increase in the number of members of the House of Representatives. In view of the developments suggested it is possible that the number might be increased from 75 or 76 as at present to 100 in the next twenty-five years. I should not like to commit myself to a prophecy of a greater increase in the membership, in view of the Federal principle. I have given some consideration to the proposal that members in addressing the Chamber should speak from a rostrum. I saw the rostrum in use on one occasion in the Chamber of Deputies in Paris, and I should say that in my view it is quite foreign to British ideas. In no other Legislature with which I have been connected have I ever seen such disorder and turmoil as prevailed during the sitting of the French Chamber of Deputies which I attended. The subject under discussion was not one of very great importance, but it seemed to me that a speaker going into the rostrum became at once a target for interjections, jokes, and insinuations from nearly every member of the Legislature. Limiting myself to the point of view of securing orderly legislation, I think the adoption of the rostrum would have an adverse effect. I have had but the one experience of the system, and that is undoubtedly the impression which it made upon me. The establishment of a rostrum from which place only members should speak would have a tendency, I think, to create a house of "spell-binders," to use an American expression. A man would not

ascend the rostrum unless he had what he thought was a very full mind of which he must relieve himself. The result would be that he would probably regard himself, as a clergyman in a pulpit, privileged to say all he had to say, and at any length, whether the House was agreeable or not. That a member of Parliament should be placed in such a position is not my idea of debate and deliberation. Again, there is a practical difficulty in the way. You would not have a member every time he desired to speak going into the rostrum. If he wished merely to make a personal explanation he would rise in his place to do so. Then, during the Committee stage on a Bill, members discussing the verbal construction of a clause would not desire to go into the rostrum to say what they had to say, but would prefer to make their proposals across the table. It would be necessary to have the two systems working side by side, and in my opinion the result would be that the rostrum would be deserted, and members would prefer to speak from their places. I think that the rostrum is not desirable in a British Legislature, however suitable it may be in the Legislatures of other countries. I plead guilty to being very old-fashioned. I served for twenty years in the gallery of the Legislative Assembly of Victoria, and no desks were permitted in that chamber. If I may be allowed to say so, I think that as a result the proceedings in the House and debates were more conducive to a reasonable and prompt despatch of business than are the conditions we see now in the House of Representatives where members are furnished with desks. I do not desire that you should attach too much value to the opinion I express on this matter, and I therefore repeat my admission that I am possibly old-fashioned in my ideas. I have been in the Ottawa House, where members are supplied with desks as they are in all the State Parliament Houses which I visited in the United States of America, but the historic example is the House of Commons, and they have no desks there. I think the proper principle to adopt is that the work which would be done at a desk in the chamber is work which should be done outside. I presume that it would largely consist of the correspondence of members, and in other places as in the Victorian Parliament that work is done by members in their own rooms.

253. *To Mr. Blakeley.*—It is doubtful whether a member can conduct his correspondence and at the same time listen to a debate. I question whether having desks in the chamber is conducive to a larger attendance of members. I think the difficulty of keeping a House is just as great as before the desks were supplied.

254. *To Mr. Mathews.*—I question whether having desks in the chamber is conducive to the successful carrying on of parliamentary work. In my opinion, in a deliberative assembly it would be wise to have no desks. I have some knowledge of the work which members of Parliament have to perform, and I am personally of opinion that they do far too much work. In my judgment they are harassed and persuaded to do work which frankly I think they ought not to be asked to do. They are where they are to make the laws and look after the administration of the country, and not to deal with details. This, however, does not alter fundamentally my view that after all the object of having a Parliament is to secure deliberation on public affairs, and I question whether that can be effectively secured if some members are during debate writing at their desks within the chamber. I do not know whether there is anything else I have to say on these questions, and I should have hesitated to bother you with my views on them if you had not asked me to do so.

255. *To the Chairman.*—I consider that 9 feet would be a reasonable elevation for a reporter's gallery. The gallery in the present House of Representatives is quite

unsuitable. For many years, in the Victorian Parliament, the *Hansard* reporters occupied the two centre seats in the gallery, but they were subsequently brought to the table on the floor of the chamber. Obviously the reason for that was that they might hear better. The difficulty in hearing from the gallery naturally applied with equal force in the case of the representatives of the newspapers. This condemns a high reporters' gallery, which I believed was copied here from the House of Commons plan. It is better for many reasons that the reporters' gallery should be as near the floor as possible, not merely that the reporters may hear better. After all, there is a good deal of human nature in reporters. I was one myself for very many years, and I know that when things get slack, there is a tendency to relax and loll about. A stranger entering the chamber is not likely to be favorably impressed if he sees one reporter leaning one way, and another leaning another way. If the reporters' gallery is nearer the floor of the chamber, a reporter will feel under a greater obligation to be brisk and attentive, and to appear as if he were on business. From that point of view the nearer the reporters' gallery is to the floor of the chamber the better. If you are to have a rostrum, it will be necessary to have the reporters' gallery so placed that the reporters will face the rostrum. It would never do to have them behind the rostrum. If a man speaks with his back to you, it is impossible for you to hear him, and in such circumstances the effort to do so would subject the reporters to a strain which I do not think ought to be imposed upon them. Wherever you have the rostrum the reporters' gallery should face it. If you do not have a rostrum, and members speak from their places on either side of the chamber, or below the gangway, the best position for the reporters is in a raised gallery behind the Speaker's chair. I think that in a gallery 8 feet or 9 feet above the level of the floor, reporters would hear better than they would placed on a level with the speaker. I have some ideas as to the average number of pressmen who would be employed at Canberra. I speak entirely from the point of view of Victoria. I do not pretend to speak for the other States. I think that interest in the proceedings of the Federal Parliament, when it is established at Canberra, will ultimately wane. I do not think there will be a demand on the part of readers for as long reports as are given now, and goodness knows they are short enough now. We shall reach a stage when Melbourne and Victoria will, in regard to Parliament, be pretty much in the same position as Sydney is now. I think the tendency here will be to have shorter reports, and, looking ahead, I expect that the desires of Melbourne and Victorian readers will be met by letters from the capital as they are met in the United States by letters from Washington. If we carry on on the existing basis, I would say that it would be necessary to provide, roughly, for about twelve men from Melbourne, fourteen from Sydney, and six for the inter-State and country press services. On the existing basis the *Argus* would probably have three reporters recording the proceedings of the Parliament, and one other man, who would, of course, be one of the corps, dealing with the Departments. I assume, although I have no authority to do so, that the *Age* would probably have the same number of representatives. I think the evening newspapers here might have two, at least, which makes up the twelve I have suggested from Melbourne. There are more newspapers in Sydney, and I have added two to the Melbourne requirements to supply them. The inter-State newspapers at present are not represented at all in the Federal Parliament, so far as I know. As you are aware, there are two groups of newspapers in Australia who interchange news within their groups. For instance, we are associated with the *Sydney Morning Herald*, the *Brisbane Courier*, the *Hobart Mercury*, the *South Australian Register*, and

the *West Australian*. With the exception of the *Sydney Morning Herald*, at the present moment, these newspapers get their parliamentary matter through agencies. I think that one gentleman, Mr. Samson, has a kind of roving commission for the *West Australian*. So that the inter-State service would not need to be materially increased unless they thought it desirable, in view of special circumstances, to have their own representatives at Canberra. I have allowed for that in suggesting that the inter-State and country press services would have six representatives. I should say that the minimum number of reporters to be provided for would be thirty-two. In continental cities, having a population even less than that of Sydney or Melbourne, there are a greater number of daily newspapers in circulation, and some allowance should be made for a possible increase in the number of daily newspapers in Australia. It is difficult to estimate what increase would take place within the period for which the provisional Parliament House would serve, but I would say that thirty-two, or about that number, would meet all requirements for that period, because, as I have said, I consider that the tendency would be to reduce reports. It might be found convenient for the *Argus* and the *Sydney Morning Herald*, or the *Age*, and the *Sydney Daily Telegraph* to combine in the production of reports. Matters might arise which might be of special interest to Sydney, but of which we might not require to give a report, and in those cases the report could be varied. As the condition of things which I anticipate developed, the number of our press representatives might be correspondingly reduced, and that would give more accommodation for the representatives of new newspapers. The provision made here for two rooms for the *Argus* was due to the fact that the *Argus* had seven reporters, and each used to write up about two columns a night. Naturally they had to have a large room. If you were to provide one room for each of the important newspapers, that should be ample. There would be only four men in each room. You might do that, or provide rooms for groups of newspapers. The larger the room provided the better having regard to necessary privacy. It is far better that men should work in a large room with plenty of air and good ventilation, even though there should be a larger number working in the room. Privacy is essential. There is a great deal of conversation between members of a reporting staff of a newspaper which it is necessary that members of the staff of another newspaper should not hear. Given privacy as between groups, I do not see why rooms for groups should not be provided. A matter which it seems to me has not so far been dealt with at all adequately is the housing accommodation for journalists. It is all very well to provide them with accommodation and facilities for carrying out their parliamentary work, but you have to remember that these men will be away from their homes for several months in the year. It is, in my opinion, an obligation upon the Commonwealth Parliament to see that they will be properly housed. They will not go to Canberra of their own volition. They will go there to do public work, although it is done for private employers. If public interests govern the removal of the Seat of Government to Canberra, that involves the Government in an obligation to see that proper living accommodation is provided for the people who must go there. I think that members of the Parliament may be trusted to look after themselves in the matter, but I am pleading now for the inarticulate journalist, on whose behalf something ought to be said. I wish to impress on the Committee that proper housing accommodation should be provided for representatives of the press; whether it is to be adjacent to the Parliament House or not is a matter for subsequent consideration, but it should be provided, and if it is provided I do not see why the reporters should not dine

in their own quarters. Why could not the Government erect cottages and charge rent for them? Bad as that policy may be, I do not see how in the circumstances it can be avoided. You are opening up quite a new venture, and you could not expect the proprietors of the newspapers to build cottages for their representatives at Canberra. Just as you propose to provide housing accommodation for officers of the Parliament, I say that you should provide similar accommodation for journalists who must be in attendance on Parliament. The reporters, in common with the officials of Parliament, will go to Canberra to carry out their ordinary duties. As a matter of commercial concern we would much prefer that the Parliament should remain in Melbourne. The Federal Parliament, for reasons sufficient to itself, has decided to remove to a place where there is no accommodation at present. Accommodation must be provided for press representatives as well as for other persons, and I am convinced that it is the duty of the Parliament to provide that accommodation, charging, of course, the necessary rental for it. If the housing accommodation provided for reporters is not too far from the Parliament House, I think the reporters might have their meals in their own quarters. It is not sufficient to provide that they may obtain an occasional meal at Parliament House, and when it is suggested that they should obtain other meals where they live, that raises the very point I wish to impress on the Committee, and that is the obligation of the Parliament to provide housing accommodation for them, which should be adjacent to the Parliament House. I think it is wise at the same time to make provision in the House for a dining-room for members of the press. I consider the provision proposed for a telegraph receiving office in Parliament House, with connexion by pneumatic tubes to the post office at Canberra, is satisfactory, but I should say that one wire to Sydney and to Melbourne for the press would be quite inadequate. This, however, is a matter which must subsequently be decided by practical experience. Another matter which I think has not so far been dealt with has reference to the spare time of the journalist. When these men are at home they engage in the ordinary recreations of young men, and provision should be made for reasonable recreation and exercise for them in Canberra. I am aware that employers at the present time help in many ways to make things pleasant for their employes, but I have not heard of any employer who provides tennis courts, bowling greens, or cricket pitches for his employes. You are going to provide these things for members of the Parliament and the parliamentary staff, and I want to put in a claim for the journalists. The Press Association might assist in the matter. Why should not facilities be provided for the journalist to have a game of billiards if he desires to do so? Another matter of interest is that the press representatives should have access to the library. Surely they are not to be starved intellectually and to have no access to a book of reference or study unless they bring it with them? I should like to emphasize the importance of this matter. The question of intercourse between members of the Parliament and representatives of the press has been raised in previous proceedings of the Committee. We know that members of Parliament like the public to feel that they are absolutely independent of the newspapers, and do not have anything to do with them, but, quite between ourselves, we also know that they are of very great use to each other. The press representatives should, within reason, be able to meet members of the Parliament within the precincts of Parliament House. The last thing I would suggest is that there should be any invasion of the reasonable privacy of members. To say, on the other hand, that a reporter should be limited to a certain number of square feet, and should not be allowed to go a pace beyond a certain boundary to speak to a member of Parliament is quite wrong. Given reason-

able regulations for the conduct of Parliament, not merely within the legislative chambers, but, generally speaking, in the building, there should be as much freedom as possible for reporters to mingle with the members. I quite agree with the view that conduct of press representatives which is obnoxious to members should be suppressed. I can speak only of conditions existing when I was in active work here, and we had no difficulty in this matter. We had a committee of the gallery, of which for twelve years I was chairman. I was in direct touch with the Clerk of the House, and any question that arose with regard to press facilities or abuse of facilities was immediately referred to me by the Clerk, and was settled at once. There was very seldom any occasion for such a reference. Some members may be inclined to give a little more liberty to reporters than others, and their action may involve trouble, which ought to be avoided. Within reasonable limits, I think the Committee should advise that reporters and members of the Parliament should have freedom of intercourse. I recommend control by a committee, subject to the Speaker and President, and such a committee would discipline any member of the reporting staff who might overstep the mark.

256. *To Mr. Jackson.*—I do not think that it is likely that the London press will be directly represented at Canberra. I think that their requirements will be met by agencies. It never occurred to me before, but I think with you that it is possible that Canberra as the Seat of Government will become a centre to which unattached journalists will gravitate, and it may be necessary to make provision for them. They might combine general writing with parliamentary agency work.

257. *To Mr. Blakeley.*—On the subject of the establishment of a rostrum, I agree that there is a difference in the characteristics of the Australian and the Frenchman. One race is more phlegmatic than the other, but I still think the tendency would be to greater disorder with a rostrum than without it. I think that a man speaking from a rostrum is calculated to create, rather than to allay, disorder. There are occasions, of course, even in the best regulated Parliaments, when the Speaker has some difficulty in keeping order; but with a rostrum I think the Speaker's difficulties would be increased. If you are to have a separate room for each newspaper, four would be required for Melbourne, six for Sydney, and probably three for the Inter-State and country press services. If a group system were adopted you might have larger rooms, and only four or five would be necessary. I think the proposal to provide additional accommodation for press representatives by a covered gangway across the flat roof connecting the House of Representatives and the Senate chambers, and the provision of rooms on a second story of the wings would be satisfactory. There is no reason why the reporters' rooms should be close up against the chamber. I have had experience in only two Parliaments, those of Victoria and Tasmania. No dining rooms are provided in the Tasmanian Parliament House. Such provision has always been made here. At one time the only reporting staff that dined at Parliament House was the *Argus* staff. We had a little room in the middle of the gallery. Our staff now dines outside. I understand that, in the present Victorian Parliament House, tables for the press are provided in the public dining-room. I favour provision being made for a room in which, in their slack time, pressmen could meet to have a game of billiards or cards. I do not think they should bear the cost of construction, but I believe that the maintenance of such accommodation should be a charge on the newspapers. I think that such accommodation should be provided for pressmen, but I do not suggest that they should have it for nothing. In the allotting of the rooms provided for the press I think that there should, in the first instance, be a free consultation between the press representatives, and if they are unable to agree upon allot-

ment of the rooms the matter should be referred to the House Committee of Parliament. I do not like the idea of deciding the matter by lot, because, in that way, the representatives of the newspaper doing the least work might get the best room. I do not think that a *Crédit Foncier* system should be adopted to enable pressmen to build houses for their own accommodation at Canberra, because, during the parliamentary recess, there will be only one representative of an important newspaper living at Canberra. There must be one permanent representative at least for departmental work, but when Parliament is in recess the other representatives will not be kept there.

258. *To Mr. Cook.*—I regard an elevated gallery as the best provision for reporters. There should be a marked division between members and reporters when the Houses are sitting, and the best way would be to have a slightly elevated gallery on each side of the Speaker's chair. As to the height of the gallery I would not care to commit myself definitely, but I think that 8 or 9 feet should be the extreme elevation. Six feet would be a good elevation. There should be no traffic under the gallery. That would be most disconcerting. I am of opinion that representatives of the press should be provided with housing accommodation, for which a reasonable rent should be paid, and only during the time that the accommodation was occupied. The tendency will be, as in New Zealand, for short sessions. Members of the Parliament will be only too glad to get away from Canberra as quickly as they can. The sessions will be comparatively short, and, perhaps, not more than three months in a year. You could not expect the newspapers to pay rent for accommodation for nine months without any return. I believe that provision should be made for 32 representatives of the press, and, as I have said, the room accommodation to be provided should be five or six rooms if the group system is adopted, while, if the separate system is adopted, there should be twelve or thirteen rooms provided. I can offer no opinion on what is likely to be the population of Canberra ten years after Parliament has commenced to meet there. I cannot imagine any one wanting to go there.

259. *To Mr. Jackson.*—I have been there.

260. *To Mr. Cook.*—The leading journals must have their own representatives at the Seat of Government, and they could not depend upon pressmen who, with the growth of population, might be in permanent residence there.

The witness withdrew.

Raymond Austin, Journalist, Chief of Staff of the *Age* newspaper, sworn and examined.

261. *To the Chairman.*—I have not seen the plans of the proposed provisional Parliament House at Canberra. I should not care to express an opinion as to the probable increase in the number of members of the Federal Parliament within the next twenty-five or fifty years. Unless the whole parliamentary system were altered I do not see why there should be any increase. The development of the New States movement would lead to an increase in the membership, but until one could form an opinion of the extent of that development it is difficult to speculate as to the increase in the membership of the Parliament which it will involve. It might be necessary to make provision for an increase in the number of members of the House of Representatives from 76 to 100 within the next twenty years. I have had no experience of members speaking from a rostrum. My experience has been limited to the New South Wales and Victorian Parliaments. Present indications are that the number of newspapers will increase, but on the basis of existing conditions I should say that it will be necessary to make provision for between 30 and 40 pressmen at Canberra when the Seat of Government is removed to that place. Developments here

within the last few months strengthen the impression that within the next 25 years there will be a considerable increase in the number of daily newspapers published in Australia. Everything depends on the growth of population, and if our population doubled it would in my opinion be necessary to provide at least one-third more accommodation for reporters at Canberra than is necessary under existing conditions. The *Age* newspaper will probably send four representatives, one departmental man, one to report the proceedings of the Senate, and two at least for the House of Representatives. The *Age* would require to have two seats in the gallery of the House of Representatives. The man in charge frequently sits alongside the man taking a turn to give him directions. The man taking a turn is not always an experienced man. He may require some guidance, and the leader of the gallery staff frequently sits at the side of a reporter telling him what to take and what to leave out. He may also desire to sit in the gallery to secure material for parliamentary notes he may be expected to write. Provided that the occupant of the back seat could hear, I would see no objection to one seat being provided behind the other. The best position for a reporter's gallery would be not more than 9 feet above the floor of the chamber and behind the Speaker's chair. Because of its elevation from the floor the reporters' gallery in the present House of Representatives is simply hopeless. It is a wonder to me that there has not been much more misreporting than there has been. The gallery should have an elevation of not more than 9 feet 6 inches from the floor of the chamber, and it would be better if it were a little lower. All my experience goes to show that behind the Speaker's chair is the best place for a reporters' gallery. The side galleries in the House of Representatives here are all right if a member is speaking from the opposite side, but is very difficult to hear a member speaking just underneath those galleries. With a gallery behind the Speaker's chair there might be some difficulty in hearing the Speaker's rulings. That would depend largely on the Speaker. We have had Speakers in the House of Representatives whom it has been absolutely impossible to hear from the present press gallery. I think that the representatives of the different newspapers should be provided with separate rooms. A comparatively small room sufficient to accommodate four or five men would be ample. The main point is privacy. A separate room for a leader-writer is not necessary. A room 12 feet by 14 feet would, I think, be adequate. If each of the leading newspapers were provided with a room of that dimension that would suffice. It will probably assist the Committee if I read for you the following report which I made for the proprietors of the *Age* on the requirements necessary for the press at Canberra. I am authorized to put it before you as their considered opinion of what is necessary:—

RE PRESS ACCOMMODATION AT CANBERRA.

The most important requirement is that the plans for the new parliamentary buildings at Canberra shall provide separate rooms for the leading newspapers. The size and furnishings of these rooms depend upon the strength of the staffs likely to be employed by the various offices during the session. I have since been informed, as I have indicated, that the *Age* will probably send at least four representatives to Canberra. A common room, even if sufficiently large—and the present proposal is ridiculously inadequate—would not suffice. Members of the Committee should be reminded that newspaper staffs are not like *Hansard*—all working together with a common purpose. Privacy is essential, and particularly privacy from rival newspapers. During the sessions members will practically be cut off from their constituencies. The only means they will have of communication with their constituents will be through the newspapers circulating in their electorates. Many objects crop up for public discussion which cannot at the moment be debated in Parliament. Supposing the editor of the *Age* desired to obtain the opinion of a leading Victorian member on some topic of public concern which cannot be discussed in Parliament. Will this member have to be asked into a common room, where newspaper representatives from the whole Commonwealth are herded together to be interviewed? Such a practice would destroy the value of the

opinion from the stand-point of the newspaper, and would mean that members of Parliament would practically be excluded from discussions of public matters in the columns of the press.

The rooms allotted to each office should be so conveniently located to the seats occupied by the representatives of that paper in the gallery that prompt and easy communication is possible. The elevated protruding side galleries have serious disadvantages. Some members of either the Government or the Opposition would be underneath the gallery, and their speeches would most likely be inaudible. This is frequently the case in the present House of Representatives. If the lay-out of the new House is the same as the present chamber, with Opposition benches facing the Government, the best place for the gallery is behind the Speaker's chair and raised slightly, but not to the extent of an entire floor. If the rostrum method is adopted, objection to the side galleries would disappear. The gallery behind the Speaker's chair in the present House is altogether too narrow and too high. It should be possible to have a double row of reporting seats, with space to move about freely behind.

Means of communication is a question to be determined by the various officers. If direct telephones or telegraphs are installed, small separate rooms will be necessary. If all the messages are sent through the post office, a system of pneumatic tubes leading from a central point in the building to the telegraph office would be a safe and speedy means of despatching wires.

Dining accommodation for journalists is obviously necessary. Presumably the hostel will be a considerable distance from Parliament House, and at the outset, at any rate, there is not likely to be any privately-conducted hotels or restaurants within easy distance. This is a necessity which is recognised in every House of Parliament in Australia, except the present Federal Parliament.

The lay-out of the press rooms should include provision for adequate lavatory accommodation, conveniently placed.

Senator Givens contends that all lobbies and passages should be closed to pressmen. It is essential, for the convenience of both journalists and members, that some portions of the House should be open to accredited representatives of newspapers. It is one man's work to interview Ministers each day. As Ministers are not likely to elect to come around to the press rooms, the position would be intolerable unless these accredited representatives had the right to go to the Ministers' rooms. At Canberra, even more than at Melbourne, it will be of mutual benefit to newspapers and members to keep closely in touch, and an order prohibiting pressmen from frequenting any part of the House except the press galleries would be irritating and unnecessary.

A small matter which would help members, officials, and pressmen considerably, would be the extension of the internal telephone system to the press rooms.

It has been suggested that, as press accommodation is to be provided in the main administration offices, it is not necessary to provide any facilities other than those required for actual note taking at Parliament House. Rooms half-a-mile or thereabouts from Parliament House will be quite useless to the Parliamentary staff, which must be on hand constantly, and must write up reports within easy reach of the gallery. It would be far better to have a common room at the Commonwealth Offices and separate rooms at Parliament House.

It has always been the practice to appoint a committee for the control of press representatives in Parliament. That has always worked very well.

262. *To Mr. Blakeley.*—I do not know that we have any claim to be provided with a club room at Parliament House. That is a matter entirely for the House Committee. If it thought fit to make such provision I am sure that it would be greatly appreciated by pressmen. I am chiefly concerned about facilities for carrying out our parliamentary work. I am sure that representatives of the press would be very grateful if the House Committee endeavoured to make the lot of pressmen as pleasant as possible, but I do not think that we have any claim for special consideration of this kind. When I first came here pressmen enjoyed many privileges in connexion with this Parliament. They had with others the use of the parliamentary gardens, the bowling green, and the tennis court. We played with members and against members. I freely admit that one or two of the press representatives abused those privileges, and that the House Committee was justified to some extent in withdrawing them. My complaint in the matter has always been that they did not penalize the known offender, but penalized the whole press representation. I venture the opinion that there were only one or two offenders who are, I am sure, known to the members of the Committee. It has been a grievance amongst us that those who know how to conduct themselves have been denied

privileges which they previously enjoyed because of the misbehaviour of only one or two. If anything of the kind happened at Canberra, and a representative of the *Age* were responsible, the proprietary would promptly recall such a man. The reputation of our representation would be at stake, and we would take any steps necessary to see that our name was kept clean.

263. *To Mr. Jackson.*—I am confident that the proprietors of the newspaper represented by a man who offended would dismiss him. They would have no sympathy with a man who misconducted himself.

264. *To the Chairman.*—I do not suggest that responsibility in the matter should be transferred from the press committee to the House Committee of Parliament. What I suggest is that, in the case of anything occurring to which exception might be taken, the House Committee should bring the matter under the notice of the press committee, and if that committee did not act, the House Committee would know what to do.

265. *To Mr. Cook.*—I consider that the press reporters in Parliament should be provided with a slightly raised gallery behind the Speaker's chair.

The witness withdrew.

Edgar Becher, Supervising Engineer, Central Office, Postmaster-General's Department, sworn and examined.

266. *To the Chairman.*—Air-conditioning plants are essential for the proper maintenance of automatic exchanges in places where the relative humidity exceeds 70 per cent. There is not a proper air-conditioning plant at Geelong, and in the wet weather the exchange staff there have the greatest difficulty in keeping the automatic plant operating. The insulation resistance falls so low that the subscribers are unable to raise the exchange when they lift their telephone receivers off the hooks. I attribute the trouble to the absence of an air-conditioning plant, and not to any fault in the automatic exchange equipment. The whole of my information on this subject has been gained in actual experience in the Commonwealth, and I do not know how they manage without air-conditioning plants for automatic exchanges in other parts of the world. Probably in those places, where they do not have such elaborate plants as we are obliged to maintain, the relative humidity is higher at low temperatures. If such were the case in Australia, we could get over the difficulty very easily, because all we would then require would be heating plants to raise the temperature of the atmosphere and so reduce the relative humidity. Unfortunately, however, in most of the instances I have come across in Australia, the relative humidity is higher at maximum temperatures, and consequently it is necessary, not only to have a heating plant, but also to install a refrigerating plant. It is that which adds to the capital cost and also the operating cost of our automatic exchanges. At the Collingwood Exchange the atmosphere is taken into the switch-room through an air duct which is approximately 8 feet or 9 feet above the gable of one of the small rooms adjacent to the main building. The duct is hooded, so that as far as practicable dust and dirt are excluded. At the foot of the ducts, inside the building, is a sirocco fan, the size of which has been determined by the quantity of air to be treated in the building. The outside air is, per medium of the fan, converged into a chamber containing a number of sprays, so fitted that on turning on a tap the water is sprayed in the shape of misty rain. The installation has been arranged so that we can have either one spray or two opposing sprays operating. The purpose of the tank with its sprays is to wash all solid particles out of the atmosphere. From the tank the air passes through a series of eliminators or baffle plates—metal plates of a peculiar shape—and the moisture-laden air

passing through them is buffeted about to such an extent that much of the moisture is eliminated from it. Depending upon the condition of the external atmosphere as indicated by dry and wet bulb thermometers, we have to treat the air before it passes into the room, either to warm it or to cool it; and facilities are provided for doing either. In order to warm the air, we have installed what is known as the Ideal boiler, which can be set going very quickly. In fact, I believe that hot water can be obtained within ten minutes. At any rate, it does its work very efficiently, and it is a very simple matter to look after it. In order to cool the atmosphere we use an ammonia compressor, which by means of a series of coils cools the atmosphere passing from the main duct into the exchange room. The atmosphere thus cleaned and either cooled or warmed reaches the main exchange building through the main discharge duct into the chamber. In the case of the Collingwood Exchange, this is almost at the top of the ceiling, about 15 feet from the floor level. Intake registers are placed at approximately equal distances along the north wall, and the air is discharged from them at a velocity that is not disturbing to the employees. There is no draught to disturb the men working in the room. As we please we can allow the treated air to filter out through various devices, such as cracks in the doors, and so forth, or we can exhaust it. In the cooler months of the year it is not necessary to have the exhaust system running, because at such times the atmosphere does not get so vitiated as it does when the temperature is high. We find it necessary to run the exhaust plant during the hotter months of the year, especially when there may be a large staff working in the room. The vitiated atmosphere is extracted through registers located on the ground level on the south side of the building. The object of this arrangement is to cover the whole of the cubic contents of the room. When atmosphere is sent in and taken out at the one level, you treat that portion of the room only, and nothing above it. If air is brought into a room at the bottom and exhausted at the top, the same result is obtained, the whole cubic content may be conditioned, but it requires a much more expensive plant to force atmosphere up. If the air is brought in from the floor level, the men employed in a room are liable to catch colds. Even in an ordinary house people prefer to lower the top window to ventilate a room. I should always bring in air at the top and take it out at the floor level. If I were recommending a plant for the ventilation of a parliamentary chamber, I would introduce the air at a height much above the height of members; otherwise it would be difficult to regulate the flow of air into the chambers without causing distress to the occupants of the room. A system of introducing air into a chamber at a member's feet might be perfect so far as efficiency is concerned, but not from a comfort point of view. One winter's evening I was in a theatre in Melbourne where such a plant is installed and was in operation. It absolutely chilled me to the bone. I would not recommend that air treatment be admitted into a chamber except at the highest possible level. There are very few persons who know anything about this subject. I have not come across any one outside Government Departments who has had any experience of it. It is a question which is exceedingly difficult to handle. There is no literature dealing with it, and, in consequence, we are simply feeling our way in regard to it. For the proposed chamber at Canberra I would arrange the ventilation at the top, but it must be borne in mind that an air-conditioning plant should not be operated in a chamber where the windows are open. For hygienic purposes it is useless to reckon on any height above 10 feet. At least, that is advice given by the Department of Works and Railways to me when I have been calculating on the cubical contents of a building so as to afford comfort to the staff in telephone exchanges. My

advice to the Chief Electrical Engineer is that the Collingwood plant is entirely satisfactory. My purpose now is to see whether I can economize and make improvements in small details, but the Collingwood air-conditioning plant is the last word on such plants as we have in operation. It is very compact, and it takes up a very small space. We have had experiments in regard to the efficiency of the air-conditioning plant. Under the direction of Mr. Hunt, the Meteorologist, tests were taken last week, and it was found that, with the air-conditioning plant running, there were 17,000 dust particles per cubic centimeter in the exchange, whereas in the line inspectors' room, a small chamber adjacent to the plant, where the atmosphere is not treated, the number of dust particles was 36,500 per cubic centimeters, and outside, in the ordinary atmosphere, the dust particles were 130,000 per cubic centimeter. There were twice as many dust particles in a room which was not treated, and eight times as many in the ordinary atmosphere. Under Dr. Cumpston's direction an officer also conducted tests for organisms. In the main switch room, where the air was treated, there were 1,050 aerobic organisms per cubic centimeter. If placed on an element which would give them more vitality these would amount to 2,000. The respective figures for the line inspectors' office were 1,400 and 3,500; and for the external air they were 5,000 and 7,800. These figures indicate that dust has got into the exchange, but the trouble is due to the fact that we have not had any suitable protection for the main entrance. On a windy day the dust comes straight up the street, and getting around a little pocket at the front door, blows straight under it. We have just found this out, and I have instructed the exchange foreman mechanic to ask for a screen to be built in front of that door so that the screen must be closed before the door itself can be opened. In fact, I am suggesting that method of double doors in all our new buildings. It should reduce the possibility of dust entering the exchange. The Collingwood plant has been running since the 20th October, 1922, and has been under close supervision ever since. A full record of results has been kept. On the 9th December, 1922, a little after 8 o'clock in the morning, when the outside humidity was 85 per cent. the inside humidity was 80 per cent. By 11 o'clock, three hours after the air-conditioning plant had been set in operation, the humidity inside the chamber was 70 per cent., whereas outside it was 86 per cent., showing that, in a very short space of time, we can absolutely control the atmosphere inside the exchange. On the 30th October, 1922, the relative humidity outside the exchange was 85 per cent. at 8 o'clock in the morning. Inside the exchange it was 95 per cent. After the plant had been running from 8 a.m. to 9.30 a.m. the relative humidity inside was 70 per cent. as against 75 per cent. outside. At 10 a.m. the relative humidity inside was 68 per cent., whereas it was 72 per cent. outside. At 11 a.m. the figures were 67 per cent. inside, and 82 per cent. outside. On the 24th January, 1923, the plant was running from 8 a.m. to 5 p.m., and the minimum relative humidity in the exchange was 62 per cent., while the maximum was 67 per cent. Between the same hours the relative humidity outside ranged from 49 per cent. to a maximum of 90 per cent. These figures show that the plant is exceedingly satisfactory in keeping down the humidity in the chamber.

267. *To Mr. Jackson.*—I have kept closely in touch with the foreman of the Collingwood Exchange. He was in the Geelong Exchange from its inception, and we brought him to Collingwood, not only because he was a reliable officer, but also because he was experienced in the working of automatic exchanges. He has worked at such exchanges now under two different sets of conditions. The heating plant was not installed at Geelong when he was there. We had then only a small

vacuum plant of very little value for the purpose for which it was intended. He has told me on many occasions that he has no worry at all at Collingwood. All that he has to do is to attend to the maintenance adjustments in connexion with the automatic equipment, and carry them out regularly, whereas at Geelong it was a nightmare to him to keep the automatic equipment up to normal conditions in bad weather or when the humidity was high. In fact, he told me that he had to resort to closing the windows and lighting radiators in various portions of the equipment at Geelong when the humidity was high, and when the weather was wet. Of course, in such circumstances the atmosphere in the room became vitiated and distressful to the occupants of the room, and as a matter of fact, as soon as the foreman went outside the staff would throw open the windows and destroy all his good work so far as control of the humidity was concerned.

268. *To the Chairman.*—The air-conditioning plant at Collingwood has cost £4,000, and at the present rates the cost of running it is £11 a week. Immediately on taking it over I sent a note of advice to the State Engineer, Melbourne, asking him to experiment with the plant and ascertain the shortest time it would need to be in operation each day. The bulk of the cost of running the plant is the cost of electricity, and we contemplate negotiating with the Melbourne Electric Supply Company to get a better rate for such a large quantity of power as we require. I hope to be able to reduce the maintenance cost by at least 50 per cent. No extra staff is required to keep it running. It only occupies a man's time for about ten minutes an hour. On the 24th May, 1918, the Deputy Postmaster, Sydney advised that the State Engineer had reported to him that to date, approximately, 1,400 meters had been changed at Mosman, and that it was necessary to consider the question of replacing or repairing those which had been removed. He went into the economics of repairing them or getting new coils. His difficulty was that, if he was to repair them, he had no spares. Consequently, the Department had to buy 1,000 new coils at a cost of £275 for the material alone. That trouble has been going on in dribs and drabs, and we have been obliged to replace meters in many other exchanges. It was due, in the case of Mosman, to the moisture in the building. On another occasion when I was in Sydney, inquiring into the effect of high humidity in automatic exchanges, I ascertained that the cables on one of the primary line switch units in the Mosman Exchange had to be opened up; that is to say, the lacing had to be cut away and the whole thing opened up, and radiators had to be placed in front of the cables to dry them out, and raise the insulation resistance. I subsequently saw the exchange foreman mechanic and asked him why he had not laced up the cables again, but he advised me that the low insulation resistance trouble kept recurring each time he laced up the cables. On the same occasion I made inquiries at the Vaucluse Exchange and at the time men were actually engaged replacing contact banks which had proved faulty owing to low insulation resistance, which was due to the humidity conditions in the exchange. On present-day prices the value of an automatic exchange plant would be between £60,000 and £80,000, but that merely covers the initial expenditure. Once we install an exchange we have to keep pace with development. The value of the Collingwood exchange at its ultimate capacity will be between £150,000 and £200,000, not taking into consideration the cables outside, the subscribers' lines, and instruments. An air-conditioning plant costing £4,000 will take care of the full automatic plant of the increased value I have mentioned. The more we exert every effort to keep the exchange running at its highest efficiency the more revenue we are in a position to earn from subscribers connected to the exchange concerned. I am thoroughly in accord with the practice of installing air-conditioning

plants in all exchanges where the humidity is over 70 per cent. Of course, if manufacturers can come along and provide an automatic plant that does not require air conditioning, I would not be an advocate of installing air-conditioning plants. Now that we have Collingwood almost to perfection I am setting out immediately to inquire as to how we can reduce capital and running costs.

269. *To Mr. Blakeley.*—Much of the moisture in the air is extracted by the baffle plates or eliminators, but we do not rely entirely on that method. We also use temperature. The baffle plates are used not only to remove all superfluous moisture, but also to make sure that we get out all the solid dust particles, because the plates are at various angles, and have water flowing down them, and the particles of dust which hit the plates are carried by the water down the plates into a sump. We could arrange the cooling coils to strike the air immediately it leaves the baffle plates. Cold is necessary to bring about precipitation, and in the winter, after we cool the air, we heat it again. That is to say we moisten the air, and then cool it or heat it at certain times of the year. It is entirely dependent on the condition of the atmosphere. We try to keep the humidity in the exchange below 70 per cent., which is the danger mark. I have submitted a series of charts to the Committee, and one indicates that the humidity in the chamber was extremely high on a Monday morning after the plant had been idle from midday on Saturday. It is difficult to say how long the automatic appliances will stand moisture. A fault in wire due to low insulation resistance may not show up for a considerable time. You may put in a wire to-day, and it may be three years before the fault due to low insulation resistance may show up. On the other hand it may show up in a few weeks. The request I have made to the State engineer will enable me to be in a position to determine that very point. I have asked him to find out how often we need to run the plant at Collingwood. We can only ascertain that by actual experience. We could take samples of insulated wire and subject them to a frequent test.

270. *To Senator Plain.*—It is not possible to remedy the defects at Geelong with the present heating plant there, but that plant could form portion of an air conditioning plant such as we have installed at Collingwood. For instance, the registers already in Geelong could be made use of if we decided to install an air-conditioning plant there. The heating plant has only been put in during the last couple of years. We thought it would suffice, but as a matter of fact I have been concentrating all my experiments in metropolitan areas where I could actually see what was going on. As the heating plant and the vacuum plant are already installed at Geelong, it would probably not take more than £2,000 to complete the full equipment of an air-conditioning plant such as we have at Collingwood. In all modern buildings, especially where workers are confined, it is the practice to install ventilating plants. In climates such as we have in Victoria it is the practice to install heating plants. It is also usual to put in vacuum cleaning plants. You cannot clean out big buildings thoroughly without them. All we would need to add to those plants which are installed in all modern buildings is an ammonia compressor, and I think the cost of that fitted up at Collingwood was £1,000. Therefore, the cost of the plant you would put into a modern building to ventilate and clean it would only be increased by 25 per cent.

271. *To the Chairman.*—The system I advocate for the ventilation of public halls is exactly on the lines of those proposed for the ventilation of the Melbourne Town Hall, under which the air after going through certain processes enters the chamber through the ceiling, and passes out at about the floor level.

(Taken at Melbourne.)

THURSDAY, 3RD MAY, 1923.

Present:

Mr. GREGORY, Chairman;	
Senator Plain	Mr. Cook
Mr. Blakeley	Mr. Jackson.

James Richard Collins, Secretary, Commonwealth Treasury, sworn and examined.

272. *To the Chairman.*—My objection to the central heating system for the administrative offices does not apply to the chambers and halls in the Parliament House. You could scarcely have open fireplaces in the chambers, but the rooms for Ministers and members should be heated by fires. Any additional expenditure incurred in providing separate rooms at Parliament House for the heads of Departments would be money well spent. I have frequently been called to Parliament House, and have been kept waiting an hour or two doing nothing because there is no accommodation for me. I do not mean to say that I would go to the House knowing that I would have to wait for an hour or two, but I sometimes have gone expecting to get through my business within a few minutes, and have been kept there expecting every minute to have an opportunity of doing my business. The same experience has befallen all the officials who have had business to transact at Parliament House. I have frequently seen half-a-dozen senior officers there doing nothing but waiting. It would be very economical to supply a room for the permanent head of each Department. There are seven or eight Departments, and, during the session, the chief officer would find it advantageous to be carrying on his work practically alongside of his Minister. It would be a great convenience to the Minister, and there would be a saving of time to the head of the Department. I suggest that, adjoining each Minister's room, another room about 12 feet x 14 feet be provided for the departmental head. From my own experience, I know how exceedingly important it is that the Minister and his permanent head should be closely associated during office hours, even when the Minister is in attendance upon his parliamentary duties. A single room for all the officers would be of great advantage, but it would not be so useful as separate rooms. A single room would have to be so large that I do not think much saving of space would be effected. I suggest that the provision of separate rooms would result in a saving which, in a very little while, would more than cover the cost of the extra accommodation. It would be better to have the rooms adjoining the Minister's rooms, but, if that were impossible, nearly all the economy could be obtained by having them, perhaps, one or two minutes' walk away.

273. *To Mr. Jackson.*—In the event of not being able to provide separate rooms for each departmental head a couple of fair-sized rooms would be serviceable, though not as serviceable as separate rooms. My idea is that the head of the Department shall carry on his work at Parliament House while Parliament is sitting.

274. *To the Chairman.*—I have seen the proposed plan for the Parliament building, and I am struck by the fact that the accommodation proposed for officers who are permitted to enter the chamber is practically the same as that which exists in the present Parliament House. The officers look upon the accommodation behind the Speaker's chair as very objectionable. It is objectionable to Ministers and members because the officers get in their way, and it is objectionable to the officers because of the lack of air. I have often gone away from Parliament House with a headache after spending a couple of hours there, and I am a healthy man. The air behind the Speaker's chair is just abominable. You sit there in a confined space, and

you get even worse air than members have. I have sometimes deliberately left my post to sit in the gallery to avoid that very bad spot, but I have been called back by the Minister after a minute or two. If you cannot give us accommodation similar to that which is provided in the Senate chamber at present, you should increase the space behind the Speaker's chair to at least 7 feet. There should be a wider passage way for the members, and the officials could then be accommodated at a table behind the gangway. That might mean an enlargement of the chamber, but it would be a good point because more air would be provided. Better provision is essential if you are going to consider the health of the members and the staff. Another matter comes to my mind. It does not fall within my province at all, but I have a view as to the proper accommodation for a legislative body. It is that the chambers should be located in a wing of the main building so that there would be windows on three sides, opening direct to the open air. The windows could then be used to provide perfect ventilation according to the direction of the wind. You could obtain perfect light, and on sunny days a little sunshine would brighten up what is usually a very gloomy chamber. I know that the present design is according to convention. I have never seen a legislative chamber into which light and air could be directly admitted, but if my proposal could be adopted, it would lead to an improvement in the health and comfort of members of Parliament. Some may object that sounds would penetrate the legislative chamber from outside. In a place like Canberra considerations of that nature would not apply. There need be no fear that the debates would be heard outside. If, at any time, it was considered desirable to exclude strangers from the gallery—and this would only be on rare occasions—steps could easily be taken to see that there were no eavesdroppers outside the building. Members of Parliament should not be enclosed in a building more or less resembling a place of confinement. They should have an opportunity while they are deliberating of looking out beyond the four walls of their chamber. They should be able to look through the windows. The conditions would certainly be more pleasant. I advocate all work being undertaken under the most agreeable surroundings. I do not believe in idleness, but I am sure that the hardest and best work can be done under congenial conditions. I have seen the Queensland legislative chamber, where members can walk out on the verandahs, and that is certainly a great advantage as compared with the legislative chambers in the southern States. No special arrangements need be made to give public officers access to the parliamentary library. Officers pursuing any special studies might be afforded facilities, but I do not advocate throwing the library open to officers generally. Those requiring access to the library could ask for permission, and it could be given when there were reasons to justify that course. If officers were allowed the use of the library for private purposes the privilege would soon extend to the general public. So long as arrangements were made for officials to obtain meals at a general refreshment room while Parliament was sitting there would be no need to accommodate them at the parliamentary refreshment room. I take it that the dining room attached to the administrative offices would be available only for luncheons. If officers were brought to Parliament House in the evening they would either have to go home for their meals or be accommodated at Parliament House. It would be desirable to make small provision for officers in the parliamentary refreshment room, but those who could go to their homes would probably do so. A subject the Committee might like to consider is the allocation of a site for banking premises. Members of Parliament, officials, and visitors will require the convenience of a bank. There is already a branch of the Commonwealth Bank

at Canberra. When the staffs are transferred from Melbourne they will require banking conveniences close to the public offices, and members will want those conveniences close to Parliament House. Banking is not a Government function, and there are reasons why the Commonwealth Bank should not be allocated in a governmental building. I suggest that provision be made in a spot quite handy to Parliament House, the public offices, and the hostels. I think we ought to make provision for our own Government Bank. All the Commonwealth business will be done at the Commonwealth Bank. It is a matter of policy upon which I hesitate to speak too much, but I think we might well give some privilege to our own Bank to enable it to have a branch close to the Government buildings. All I ask is that you keep in view the provision of a site. I think I am safe in saying that the management of the Commonwealth Bank would readily establish a branch in an allocation such as I have indicated.

The witness withdrew.

Kingsley Anketell Henderson, Architect, sworn and examined.

275. *To the Chairman.*—I am the senior Victorian representative of the Federal Council of Australian Institute of Architects, and have just retired after two years' presidency of the Victorian Institute. I understand this Committee is taking evidence in regard to the provisional Parliament House and hostel and the administrative buildings to be built at Canberra. It is impossible to criticise the details of the planning of the various buildings without a detailed study of the plans and requirements. A destructive criticism could be given at short notice, but the constructive criticism which is required is a longer job. I want to address you for a few minutes on the manner in which the profession thinks the building programme, of which this project is part, should be approached. I can speak on behalf of the profession, because I have been in practice for nineteen years. I had led our institute in this matter, and I have travelled and seen Washington, the capital of the United States of America. I am an Australian born, and I want to see the Australian architects, who have built the Australian cities and towns, have an opportunity of taking part in the work of designing and erecting their national capital in the establishment of which I am a firm believer. You will agree with me that if an object can be achieved with an æsthetic excellence, and harmony and general beauty at the same time, as against a heterogeneous collection of buildings it is better to have the former; and the considered opinion of the profession is that there is only one way in which this desired object can be achieved, which is by carrying to a conclusion the architectural competition launched in 1914, withdrawn by the Government, and relaunched in 1916, and again withdrawn by the Government. If the competition is completed and adjudged the architectural style of the dominating architectural structure will be settled for all time, and all buildings now contemplated there, however small, would be designed in architectural harmony with the future dominating memorial edifice. We feel strongly that if a provisional Parliament House be put in a temporary position, which position is an interference with the plan of the city lay-out, this provisional building will be invested in course of years with sentiment and glamour and historical association which will render its ultimate removal a very difficult matter. Canberra must be more than a collection of individual buildings designed hurriedly one at a time, each for its own purpose, in order to rush the Legislature there in the shortest possible time. To serve its purpose, Canberra must be a dignified legislative home for the nation, a home which holds the records of its departed statesmen, a museum of its war achievements, and a museum containing the

best of its arts and sciences and literature, with dignified administrative buildings and ideal housing conditions for its inhabitants. Washington impressed me in just this way after the rush and hurry and contrasting magnificence and squalor of the commercial centres of America. We feel this desirable result will be obtained by completing the competition. There are several reasons why this competition should be carried out. In the first place, the architectural style of the dominating building will be settled, and the master mind which conceived the design will be available to direct the æsthetic side of the whole project. In the second place, the expenditure of £250,000 on provisional buildings will be ultimately saved to the nation. Instead of which should be built something based on the fundamentals of the winning plan, to be façaded and collonaded and domed at a later date. Such a course would give Australians the pride of finishing their permanent legislative hall instead of the natural diffidence there will be to scrap the provisional buildings, which, as years go on, would grow richer in sentiment and historical associations. Thirdly, if they do this, they will keep faith with the architects all over the world who, in 1914, started on this project, and started again in 1916, and who now are seriously seeking redress from your Government. The Royal Institute of British Architects has urged us to take such action, and is asking Canada and the African Institute for support. Considerable financial support has already been promised. In the fourth-place, the old adage "Well begun is half done" would be given practical effect to. In regard to reason 3, I want you, gentlemen, to know the difficulties of our profession. I have just told you the feeling of competitors who were engaged in the work of the competition No. 1, which was withdrawn by the Government. We are now offered a second competition for homes for the professional staff. If this competition is satisfactory, we are told there will be further competitions for a national war museum and national library; and this would certainly be followed by competitions for the Capitol building, the national gallery, and the general community museums. All these buildings would be designed without any guidance as to the architectural style of the central dominating structure. Without such guidance we architects feel that the city of the future will be a place to shun, whereas the opportunity now exists to make it the most beautiful city in the world. I do not want you to think that these views are being put before you for the first time. As soon as the Federal Council received the first report of the Advisory Board in respect of the erection of a provisional Canberra, we put these views before the Hon. Mr. Foster, about January of last year. We then made an offer that the architects of Australia would provide an additional member of the Advisory Board in an honorary capacity to represent these views, but our offer was not accepted. The two architects on the Board at present cannot be said to represent the views of the architects, as they were not selected, or recommended, or appointed by the architects, and no regular consultation has taken place between them and our Federal Council. I know there is an answer to what I have said, and the answer is that these buildings are not permanent. I know they are not permanent, and that they are called provisional. If they were temporary buildings, such as those at the San Francisco Exhibition, all wooden erections with plaster covers and protected against conflagration by sprinklers, I would not urge the completion of the competition now, because their maximum life would be 30 or 40 years, by which time our war debt should be extinguished and we should be ready to do the job properly. However, they are provisional buildings, which indicate a life of 100 to 125 years. In 100 years our population may be 50,000,000; our descendants may have fought another war on our own soil, and they may have developed a national pride of which we know nothing to-day. If such be the case,

and Canberra is built on the lines suggested, I feel that under these circumstances our descendants would have a burning sense of shame that we had wrought so poorly for them at their national home. I think that what I have just said epitomizes the opinion of the architects of Australia. It is based on discussions we had at the annual conference of the Federal Council, in Sydney, last February, and also on the work we had done in the preceding two years in endeavouring to place our views before the then Ministers. I think it would be perfectly fair to competitors all over the world if they were asked for designs to be lodged within six months, so that within twelve months it would be possible to call for tenders for a portion of the building. If that were done the Government would have the design settled for the greatest building of Australia, with which the other buildings could be made to harmonize. In my opinion, it would be possible to construct at moderate cost the nucleus of the monumental building so as to give reasonable facilities for the business of Parliament. Such a project would involve what I may term building the structural skeleton or carcass, undecorated architecturally, outside. That skeleton could be subdivided in a somewhat similar manner to that followed in the subdivision of the Exhibition Building, in Melbourne, for the use of the State Parliament. As to the cost which my suggestion would involve, it must be something in the nature of a guess. A parliamentary building is something that an architect handles only once in a lifetime. However, I should say that something satisfactory could be done, provided the building did not have crypts and basements, which I think in modern times are useless, for an outlay in the neighbourhood of £350,000 or £400,000. That portion could be erected within three years.

276. *To Mr. Mathews.*—The building would be composed of brick and concrete.

277. *To the Chairman.*—My Institute did not make application to have representation on the Advisory Board that was appointed. My memory is not very fresh in regard to the details of that time, but I do not think we knew we were to be represented until after the Board had been appointed. I certainly think that, in carrying out a work of this character, the Institutes should be represented on the Board. I have not been at Canberra, but I have seen the contours of the country. As to what should be the dominating feature from an architectural point of view, my idea is that the Capitol need not necessarily be an extremely large building, though it should be an extremely beautiful one. In that building would be housed the historical records of Australia, the portraits and memoirs of our great statesmen, and so forth, and this Capitol would be what we may call the focal point—the centre of the city. Parliament House should not necessarily dominate the city. It would be, in my opinion, more easy to design the Capitol in harmony with the parliamentary building than *vice versa*. I should say that the provisional Parliament House, if erected, would be there for the next hundred years, and, as I have said, in that time it would create such associations as to make it difficult to have it removed. It is hard, of course, to look into the future, but I think such a feeling would be raised. I am strongly of opinion that the design of the Parliament House should be settled before any of the other administrative buildings are erected. The parliamentary building will undoubtedly be one of some classic design. From the days of Rome, one might say, all monumental buildings have been built in some classical style which has no relation at all to fashion. There are just as great architects in the world to-day, from the point of view of design, as there will be in 50 or 100 years time; you will get nothing better in the way of design by waiting. The first thing is to settle the architectural character of the dominating building, so that it may always be before those who may subsequently have

to design the other buildings. That is to insure that all the buildings shall be in harmony, and we have to look very far ahead. Even if the permanent buildings were not erected for 50 years yet, I would still have its architectural character settled now. It would be possible, then, to build a beautiful city in the future just as economically as we could provide a heterogeneous collection of buildings with no architectural relationship one to another. The City of Washington contains the Capitol and the Congressional Library, the Senate and House of Representatives buildings, and all are in architectural harmony; even the railway terminal, a beautiful building, blends with all the others. I think we could do as well, or even better, here if we first settled the architectural type of the dominating building, for there is no doubt that the Capitol dominates Washington. I do not merely say that outside architects have some right, but I say that they have every right to compete in the case of these buildings. Architects have built the cities of Australia, and they should be permitted to submit designs for the national Capitol—that is the strong feeling we have in regard to the matter. It is only common justice that Australian architects should have an opportunity to design the buildings for their national home. It is to me an amazing point of view for a Government to take that such a project should be departmentalized. The parliamentary home should be in brick and concrete, and the colonnades, façades, and so forth could be put on when the country has got clear of the war debt. This would give Australia something which they would not have to pull down. As I say, I think that if a competition were promoted now, the Government ought to be able to build this nucleus within three years, and that it would cost about the sum I have mentioned. The competition opened in 1914 was re-opened in 1916; and then withdrawn. The names of the competitors throughout the world are registered at the Department, and these men could be communicated with very quickly by cable through their institutes. I may say that I have no personal axe to grind, because I am not a registered competitor; I am speaking on behalf of the profession. The only Parliament House outside of Australia that I have seen is that at Washington. If a temporary building on the lines of the San Francisco exhibition building were erected the cost would probably be 40 per cent. less as compared with that of a provisional building. The engineering services would be practically the same, but the timber and fibrous plaster building would cost less than the amount I have mentioned. As to the design of the proposed Parliament House, a better building could be erected of a temporary nature of timber and fibrous plaster—a more monumental or æsthetic looking structure. The proposed building is treated outside, as simply as any building could be treated—there is no extravagance shown—and the same remark applies to the provisional administrative group. In view of the aeroplane, we architects, in designing monumental buildings in the future, will have to be more careful in our roof treatment, though I do not think that any great percentage of the population will view their cities from aeroplanes. The design of the old Parliament House at Ottawa is the traditional British design. In the design of the Washington Chambers, the theory of the scheme is that the person addressing the House is nearest the greatest number of people, whereas at Canberra, according to the design, the speaker is very near certain members and very distant from others. The Washington scheme can be seen in miniature in the Melbourne City Council Chamber. It is hard for me to say which design I would recommend for a deliberative assembly, my experience being confined to the strangers' gallery. As to affording easy ingress and egress for members to and from their seats without disturbing other members, I see that the design at Ottawa provides desks at which two members can sit; and that is the very design of the Melbourne Stock Exchange

—an aisle for every two seats. I would not care to make a recommendation on the point. I would not say, off-hand, that if at Canberra the press galleries extended 5 ft. 6 in. into the building they will have any effect on the acoustic properties, because acoustics, of all subjects of scientific inquiry, is known least about. Some buildings will give a beautiful sound when empty, and others when full, although each building may be of precisely similar design. In the Auditorium at Chicago, if there are not enough people to fill the top gallery, the gallery is turned up by means of levers, and the exposed under-side is padded so that the sound from the stage is not thrown back. I should not like to give a haphazard opinion in regard to the press galleries, unless I had time to study the matter thoroughly. I am at present dealing with designs for the Melbourne new Stock Exchange, in regard to which, of course, acoustics is an important point; precisely the same problem has to be dealt with. As to ventilation I, myself, prefer to feed fresh air of the required temperature into the building through as many points as possible at floor level; I would not have a few big feeders, but a great number of small ones, so as to avoid draughts. I think if the air is brought in at a height of 8 feet there is a chance of cold air falling on those in the room. It will be interesting to see how the plan which has been adopted at the Melbourne Town Hall of bringing air in at the roof and taking it out at the floor, will work. If, in the case of the Federal Parliament House in Melbourne, the cold air pumped in near the floor causes cold draughts on the legs of members it is possible that there is an over supply.

278. *To Mr. Blakeley.*—As to how long it would take, under the suggestion I have made, to have the data sent out and the plans returned and adjudicated on from competing countries, I may say that every competitor has the data now, and the name of every competitor is with the Department. There are, of course, in Australia, architects who have qualified since, principally returned soldiers, but data could be distributed to them within a week. In the case of other countries the data would have to be printed from copies there and distributed to competitors. I should say that in, at the outside, eight months from the circulation of the data all the designs could be lodged in Australia; then there would be three months for the adjudicating and bringing the successful competitor here; and six months would be required for the preparation of plans, specifications, and quantities for the construction of what I call the carcass building—seventeen months altogether must elapse before tenders could be called. As to whether it would not be extremely difficult to provide the accommodation while restraining oneself from ornamentation, I can only say that it is a matter of the ingenuity of the architect handling the proposal, and I place no limit on the ingenuity of architects. There is simply a great structural skeleton which has to be subdivided to the best advantage. It will not be quite so comfortable as the proposed provisional building. There would be no great difficulty in the transformation from the carcass to an ornamental building. Some of the internal transformation work might have to be done while Parliament was sitting, but I do not think that the total area of the monumental building would be erected at first. Supposing in 30 years it was decided to increase the area the Government could build and finish two wings, as at Washington, and occupy them then, the finishing work to be done to the portion vacated. That is done in much of the architectural work in Australia to-day. The architects have already been approached with regard to competing for the designs for cottages and other buildings mentioned, and the conditions are now in the hands of the President of the Federal Council of the Institutes of Architects.

279. *To the Chairman.*—Those conditions deal with only 40 or 50 cottages, I think, three types.

280. *To Mr. Blakeley.*—It is an attractive competition, but, of course, the greater the number, and the greater the value, the more attractive it is. The architects, as a whole, have never met the Advisory Board. I do not admit that there is any friction between the architects of Australia and the Department. I am asked what our attitude is in regard to competing for these cottages while the larger competition remains unsettled, and I say that we are at this moment giving the matter the greatest consideration. It would not do for us to turn round and say that we will have nothing more to do with the matter because a previous Government gave the architects of the world a rotten deal. In such a matter as this our members have to trust the Federal Council. It is a difficult position, seeing that we are affiliated with the Home Institute, which takes a very firm stand. I am not familiar with the conditions as to when the winning design for the Parliament House was to be put into operation, but up to about two years ago the usual condition was that, on payment of the prize money, the designs became the property of the Government. I do not think that that is the case in the present instance; and, indeed, it would not be right if it were. To make the position fair the winner should be employed in order, as I said previously, that the master-mind, which conceived the design, should be available to direct the æsthetic side of the whole project; he should control the design of all subsidiary buildings so that they might be in harmony with the central building.

281. *To Mr. Cook.*—The Federal Council of the Australian Institutes offered to provide a representative in an honorary capacity on the Advisory Board. I do not say that the present Government are committing a breach of agreement in not calling for competitive designs now for the permanent structure, or even for the provisional structure. It is past Governments which, I think, have done wrong in asking architects to prepare designs on two occasions and then recalling the invitation without discussing with them in any way the subject of paying compensation for the work done. Would the present Government launch a competition for the provisional Parliament House, cause the architects of Australia to work for two and a half or three months preparing designs, and then suddenly say, "It is all off"? The present Government would not do that for a moment, but that is what a previous Government did. The opinion of architects generally is that, not only our associations here, but the associations of the world have been badly treated in this regard. There is no architectural difficulty in competing the skeleton building without interfering with the sittings of Parliament. My estimate of £350,000 to £400,000 is what we call a "sight" estimate, but I do not think the cost would prove greater. I have made no detailed study of the departmental plan for Parliament House on which I could base any valuable constructive criticism. I think that to commence with the permanent structure now would be more economical than to build a provisional House; the Government might have to spend £150,000 more on the former, but, then, that building would not have to be scrapped. From a city-planning point of view I think a provisional building would be an interference with the city as laid out; and if it is built I think it ought to be pulled down when it is vacated. I am not familiar with the historical facts of the building at Washington, but I do know that the building of it was a very good job. As to the building of cottages at the Federal Capital there would be, perhaps, three, four, or five types for which plans and specifications would be prepared. Then tenders could be invited from the builders of Australia in order to ascertain the most advantageous number to build at once from an economical point of view. They could

be asked what price they required for the building of 20, 40 or 60 cottages of each type. The amount of plant and organization that the size of the contract warrants a builder in putting in, affects the price of the job. I am an architect and not a builder, but what I am suggesting now is what I would advise a client to do under similar circumstances—that is, ask tenderers for alternative quotations. I have no opinion of concrete cottages, but prefer bricks every time. I would not favour wooden buildings at Canberra.

282. *To the Chairman.*—Although an important witness may have said that the idea of building the nucleus or skeleton of Parliament House is impracticable, I myself, regard it as eminently practical; at any rate, I do not think any practising architect, with his wits about him, would turn such a commission down on that ground. Without making any reflection on the design for the provisional building, it is designed to give accommodation as economically as possible; but to have a building of this type at the foot of your permanent monumental building would be dreadful. Once your monumental building is erected the provisional building should absolutely go. To keep it there would be like putting our central railway station at the foot of the Washington Capitol. In the event of the monumental Parliament House being erected sooner than anticipated, the money expended on a provisional building would be lost.

(Taken at Melbourne.)

FRIDAY, 4TH MAY, 1923.

Present:

Mr. GREGORY, Chairman;	
Senator Plain	Mr. Cook
Mr. Blakeley	Mr. Mathews.

John Smith Murdoch, Chief Architect, Department of Works and Railways, recalled and further examined.

283. *To the Chairman.*—In giving evidence on a previous occasion, I put in a schedule dealing with the accommodation in the building according to the plan submitted. In that schedule, particulars were given as to how the building might be enlarged in various stages. I did not venture to estimate what the extensions might cost, and I have been asked to furnish the Committee with that information. The Committee will remember that there were three methods of extending the building at such times as those extensions might be required. One method was to erect the two extra pavilions indicated on the ground plan, flanking the kitchen. These pavilions would provide 4,550 super. feet, and the Department estimates that they would cost about £11,050. It would not mean a large expenditure in connexion with excavation, because the excavations necessary would be made in any case. The second means of extension—and the Committee will remember that I said that this means of extension, if adopted, would have to be adopted at the beginning of the work—was to put a lower floor under the east and west ranges of rooms at the sides of the Library. These would afford a space of 4,275 super. feet, and we estimate the cost would be about £2,880. We assume that the flooring would be 4 feet or 5 feet under the level of the garden. That accommodation would be just as good as that in other parts of the building, the only difference being that you would look out at the grass bank of the garden instead of looking over space. The ventilation would be just as good as in any other part of the building. The next method of extension suggested was extra stories on the central pavilions east and west of the building. That would be particularly necessary if the Committee agrees to the suggestion that largely increased

space for the press will have to be provided. It will also provide further Committee accommodation. The effect of having those two extra stories would be to provide 10,600 super. feet, at a cost of about £7,700. It will be necessary to join these two new floors up with the front part of the House, to enable the press to get to their galleries and rooms without going on to the floor itself. Those connexions would be something in the nature of a covered way, and would probably cost about £1,000. The total extension of the building by these three methods would amount to about 19,425 super. feet, and the cost of the extensions would be about £22,630. The engineering services involved would amount to £3,370, bringing the total to £26,000. That, added to the estimated £174,000, curiously enough, just brings the total for the building to the round figure of £200,000. Deducting the amount for the two southern pavilions, you would reduce the total by about £12,000. I have prepared figures showing the estimated cost, without the additions I have just mentioned, of a framed building plastered and weatherboarded. Because of the relatively small cost of the tiles, we have assumed that if a framed building is to be put up the tile construction will be adhered to. Apart from the engineering services, we consider that, compared with brick, there would be a lowering of the price by about 18 per cent. On that assumption, we have reduced the estimate to £148,090, made up as follows:—

Preliminary estimate of cost if building is to be constructed framed with sound-proof partitions, but to drawings as submitted to Committee, deduct 18 per cent. from building construction estimate of	£137,600
18 per cent. off £137,600—£24,760	24,760
	£112,840
Add engineering services—	
Cooking	£3,000
Vacuum cleaning	2,500
Other services	22,700
	£28,200
	£141,040
Add 5 per cent. contingencies	7,050
	£148,090
Total for framed building to drawings submitted, including all services	£148,090

284. *To Mr. Blakeley.*—The extra basement accommodation would mean extending the small piece of basement now introduced on each side, up to and including the space under the lavatories provided for members on each side. The extension would be brought up to the main building. If it is decided that the development of Parliament House will be such as to make necessary the provision of that extra accommodation, it will have to be included now; it could not be left to the future.

285. *To Mr. Mathews.*—Portion of the two outer wings are sunk also for the keeping of the records of the House. All the records of Parliament, dating back some years, will be readily available there if they are required. That portion of the building will be just as popular with officers as any other. Members of the Committee need not apprehend that there will be any ill-effect to the people who work there. Personally, I would as soon work there as anywhere else.

286. *To the Chairman.*—To arrive at that estimate of £148,090, we took the quantity of an assumed area of wall and found that the building work might be reduced by 18 per cent. The building will be made as sound-proof as possible. The only method of doing that is to fill in between the studs with sawdust, and that is not a very expensive thing to do. The linings and ceilings would be of lath and plaster, which would assist in making the buildings sound-proof. For many years the New Zealand House of Representatives was a wooden building. The Department had unofficial information that the Committee thought that a temporarily constructed building with less accommodation

than that shown on the plan might be adopted, so we prepared the following estimate of costs:—

Preliminary estimate of cost if building is to be reduced in size by the following:—	
By omitting kitchen and dining rooms ...	£28,250
Reduced library accommodation ...	12,175
Omitting four committee rooms ...	2,685
Reduced size of legislative chambers and reception hall ...	6,420
	£49,530
Add 5 per cent. (being the proportion of the provision for contingencies) ...	2,500
	£52,030
Total reductions—	
On building ...	£52,030
Cooking plant ...	3,000
Vacuum plant ...	2,500
25 per cent. off other engineering services, say ...	5,500
	£63,030
Preliminary estimate of brick building reduced in size and omitting cooking and vacuum plants	
... Say ...	£110,970
	£111,000

I do not quite see how a scheme of that sort would be tolerated by members of Parliament, even for five or six years. Then a further estimate was prepared, providing for the same reduction in the case of timber construction. It is as follows:—

Preliminary estimate of cost if building is to be reduced in size and constructed framed building (at a reduced cost of 18 per cent. as compared with brick):—	
Cost of brick building ...	£137,600
By omitting kitchen and dining rooms ...	£28,250
By reducing library accommodation ...	12,175
By omitting four committee rooms ...	2,685
By reduced size of legislative chambers and reception hall ...	6,420
	£49,530
Estimated cost of reduced brick building ...	£88,070
Deduct 18 per cent. ...	15,840
	£72,230
Estimated cost of reduced and framed building ...	£72,230
Add reduced engineering services (£22,700, less 25 per cent.), omitting cooking and vacuum ...	17,020
	£89,250
Add 5 per cent. ...	4,470
	£93,720
Estimate of framed building to reduced size, including all engineering services, except cooking and vacuum, say ...	£94,000

287. *To Mr. Mathews.*—There would be a large recoverable value in that building, probably 20 per cent. or more. The reduction in the library accommodation means having a single story. The reduction in size of the legislative chambers and reception hall would make them conform to the present *personnel* of Parliament.

288. *To the Chairman.*—I would not recommend the erection of such a temporary building. It seems that Parliament cannot meet at Canberra, with adequate accommodation, under an expenditure of £148,000 for Parliament House alone. That is a very large sum of money for a building which it is contemplated will have to be removed in ten years; I consider that the Government would do better by putting up such a building as would afford reasonable facilities for legislative work to be carried on for at least 30 years. On the whole, the most economical course for the Government to adopt would be to put up such a building as is provided for on the plans. If Parliament decided to put up a temporary building, I would advocate its erection on some other site than that which is proposed. If the official buildings at Canberra are going to be developed in accordance with Mr. Griffin's plan, this provisional building will be right in the middle of the future permanent buildings, within a very short distance of the permanent Parliament House itself, which would probably take eight or ten years to build. Those building operations would interfere with the work of Parliament, which would be done much better if removed alto-

gether from this proposed site. I quite realize the force of the arguments put forward in favour of this site by the Advisory Committee, the chief being that it would enjoy the advantage to be derived from any expenditure on beautifying the avenue from the official centre; but, notwithstanding that, for the reasons I have stated, and also because of the comparatively inferior outlook from this site, I think that another site might be selected which would give greater satisfaction. There is a site close to the administrative offices—a knoll—overlooking the river, to the west of the axis of the avenue between the Capitol and Ainslie, which would make a first-rate site for the temporary House. It would, of course, require some preparation, but probably not more than the site now in contemplation. It has been said that on this knoll Parliament House would not be placed symmetrically with the future permanent buildings of the group. If the temporary building were the birth-place of the National Parliament, probably there would be a sentimental feeling attaching to it which would constitute an objection to its removal later. I quite recognise the force of sentiment in a matter of that sort. I consider that this building which we are now considering is likely to be obsolete within a century or so. Even if it remained there for that time, I do not think, from the point of view of its symmetrical relationship with the permanent buildings, it is likely to become an eyesore. If the administrative offices were erected on a site opposite Parliament House—assuming that that building were erected on the knoll—the effect would be such as to obviate objection from the point of view of want of symmetry. In such a case they would form a balanced group on each side of the avenue. The administrative offices might not be so prominent as Parliament House, but that could be obviated by making the administrative buildings of two stories. That would be an economical thing to do, and it would make for convenient working. It would leave the whole of the permanent building scheme of Canberra to develop by itself, without having wedged into it a temporary building. It is not a good idea to erect a building with its back in the cutting in the hill. I am not impressed with the argument that it would be likely to afford shelter. I think that, if the site were on that hill, the people could not fail to be pleased with it; any inconvenience arising from exposure would be almost entirely removed by the fact that it would be a big building within which it would be possible to avoid exposure. I cannot imagine that knoll disappearing during the life of this building, though it eventually would under Mr. Griffin's scheme. The Advisory Committee has given its advice on the assumption that the plan—which in very many ways is magnificent in conception—should be carried out literally. I do not think the question of changing the site of the permanent House to Kurrajong has been brought under the notice of the Government or of the Advisory Committee officially. There are objections to it. You are met with the difficulty that you could not group many of the Government Departments round it. I think you could quite conveniently group as many as are intimately connected with legislation quite near to it in such a way as to support the appearance of the future permanent building. By cutting down Kurrajong Hill 20 feet, a magnificent level site could be created. The Government would be able to proceed with the permanent buildings at any time when it might be felt that it would be convenient to the finances of the country. The provisional building need not continue to be used as Parliament House; I should say it would make the nucleus of a very fine University building. It would be moderately suitable also for Government offices. In the life of a developing place like Canberra a building such as that in 100 years' time would be useful for many purposes. I consider that it will be more out of harmony with the

future permanent buildings if it is placed on the site which is now proposed below Camp Hill than it will be if placed on the knoll, where its capacity for utilization for other purposes would be enhanced. It is feasible to start the nucleus of a monumental Parliament House instead of building this provisional structure, but I think the cost would be more than the £400,000 which has been suggested. By the time all preliminaries connected with the competition were carried out, instead of looking to the possibility of having this building in something like three years the scheme would not materialize under about five years. The work would be very heavy; there would be a good deal of under building and thick walls, involving the use of large masses of concrete. I have a great deal of sympathy with the point of view of the practising architects, more especially as they were promised that these permanent buildings would be the subject of competitions. These are to be the national buildings of the country, and it is only right that the country should try and obtain the finest architectural imagination existing in its citizens. The unfortunate position has arisen, owing to the war, that the Government do not appear to think that it would be economical or feasible at present to proceed with these large permanent buildings. I do not know how to get over that difficulty except by having a competition for the temporary buildings as a sort of solatium for the architects. I think that a complete and thorough determination should be made in regard to the site of the future Parliament House. It would be a good thing to ask the Government to consider whether, having regard to the scheme of the lay-out at Canberra, it might not be well to depart from the idea of having the Capitol or national museum removed from Kurrajong, and to have Parliament House put there. It would be quite practicable to build the nucleus of a permanent Parliament House; it has been done many times before in other places. My own idea is that it should not be done. Legislation would be interfered with considerably by the future operations in completing the building. Imagine Parliament sitting at Canberra in a building on which 300 men were hammering and chiselling, cranes were going, and engines working! I do not think Parliament would tolerate it. It would simply stop the work. To carry on the work only when Parliament was not sitting would extend it considerably. If we had very hard times in Australia it would hasten the erection of the permanent buildings, because of the necessity there would be for providing relief work. It is very difficult to get labour now; we could not have selected a worse time to proceed with a large quantity of building at Canberra. In building a monumental House of Parliament it would be absolutely necessary to have crypts or basements. The erection of a building such as is proposed need not be considered as interfering with the advisability of proceeding with the permanent building as early as possible, because this building is of such a nature that it could be used for a very long time to come in an expanding place like Canberra, as long as it was physically capable of standing up. There would be no loss in connexion with it. That would be one ground on which I would advocate a change of site. Considering the number of cottages which will have to be erected I favour the idea of having a competition. Such a competition would enlist the enthusiasm of a vast body of young architects. It would be a good thing for the Government also, because if the Government architectural officers continue designing cottages which are to be required at Canberra, it will mean that the imagination of that group of officers will become exhausted. By introducing the imagination of the young architects outside I think we will be doing a great deal of good. A competition in regard to cottages would be far more valuable to the Government than would be one for a provisional building like this,

which is of a technical nature, and has bound up in it the views of a whole lot of Government people. There will probably be 300 cottages. If competitions were arranged in groups of thirty I think they would be very acceptable. There would be quite a fine commission for any architect on that number, which would run into a cost of something like £30,000 or £40,000. I consider that the reception hall of the proposed House should have four openings, each about 34 feet wide, with columns at the corners. That would give good architectural effect. That design would be suitable even though it was not desired to hang pictures in the hall. It would add dignity to the chamber, without creating any obstruction. I am afraid the acoustic properties would not be very good in such a hall. It would be possible to have the press in a gallery not more than 9 feet or 9 ft. 6 in. above the floor of the chamber over the Speaker's head; but I think the dignity of the institution would be detracted from by having men scribbling just over the Speaker's head. It would be quite a convenient arrangement for the press, but æsthetically it has its disadvantages. After all, there is a great deal in the impression which is made on a visitor to Parliament. One of the first things which a visitor from overseas does is to visit Parliament, and I think he gauges the tone of the country from what he sees. The press could be placed conveniently on the sides of the chamber, at about the level mentioned; that is where provision has been made for them. There would be no difficulty in their having access to their rooms without coming on to the members' floor, and they would be able to enter their galleries from the Queen's Hall. One side of the gallery might be sufficient to accommodate the number of pressmen who will require accommodation, but experience has shown that they like to change occasionally from one side of the House to the other. We have galleries in the House of Representatives for 105 persons—sixty upstairs and forty-five downstairs. I think it would be a very fine thing to have the press accommodation extended along the sides of the building for only two-thirds of the way, and to place the remainder of the gallery at the disposal of distinguished strangers. The press would get to those galleries by the stairs from the reception hall below, and also from the second floors of the central flanking wings if the upper stories of those are ever put on. That could be easily arranged. I have some diagrams of the Washington House, and I notice that the position of Speaker and President is entirely different to what it is in our House. I am in favour of having dual benches, with a desk for each member. I have seen the style which was adopted in Ottawa, and I do not like it. It would be quite easy to make the seats so that members could get outside without going into the centre of the chamber. Members sitting on the side benches could get down to the cross gangway and out of the chamber without going into the centre of the chamber.

289. *To Mr. Cook.*—It would not affect the plan of the building to proceed with the erection of the permanent structure; but I think it would be unthinkable to have building operations conducted for ten or twelve years while Parliament was sitting. You could not possibly secure the same amount of convenience as this proposed temporary building would provide. I do not think the erection of this building should be regarded as a proceeding standing in the way of going on with a permanent Parliament House within the next ten years, if necessary. This building, if located suitably, is going to be put to the fullest use; I do not think that the Government is going to lose anything by it. I think that the building of a permanent Parliament House should be carried out as one operation. The problem before the body which is advising the Government in regard to this matter is how to get to Canberra as quickly as possible and at the

least possible cost. I think that the political opinion of Australia is such that, if we do not get there as quickly as possible, we are going to interfere with the quality of Australian legislation. There is a strong feeling about getting there quickly, and in the interests of the country that feeling will have to be regarded. Considering the opinion and temper of the people of Australia with regard to this subject, I think the mandate is sound.

290. *To Mr. Blakeley.*—The recoverable value of a timber-framed building would be about 20 per cent., and that of a brick building not more than perhaps 7½ per cent. Brick buildings would cost about 18 per cent. more than wooden buildings for administrative offices. A man standing in a semi-basement room, such as I have described, would be able to see only the bank outside; he would, of course, be able to see the sky always. I do not think the erection of a provisional Parliament House on the knoll would interfere with the general plan, because of the consequent erection of a number of other buildings in that particular quarter. The administrative buildings would occupy sites which would be well removed from the permanent development. Once the provisional house was established there would be a steady development, possibly on permanent lines. It would be a very good thing to get plans for the permanent structure, but, unless you indicate that there is a reasonable prospect of an architect being intrusted with the carrying out of the work, you are not going to obtain the best brains in the community; the architects will not enter for the sake of getting a premium; what they want is the work to be carried out. My opinion, expressed in writing to the Government a good many years ago, is that the competition for these plans should include a comprehensive lay-out for everything, and a design for everything. I suggest that the whole of the plans should be prepared, and certain buildings—such as the Library and probably the beginning of the National Museum—be gone on with. That would mean that the successful competitor would derive the remuneration consequent on our proceeding with that work. I do not think any delay would be caused by re-opening the question of the site. A good deal of correspondence has taken place on the question of restricting the competition to Australians. After the war broke out it was proposed that, instead of having a world-wide competition, it should be restricted to Australians. I would be inclined to restrict the competition to British countries. Possibly complications might arise by reason of the fact that we already had called for competitive designs internationally; that matter would have to be very carefully considered. I do not regard seriously the threat of British architects to take action against the Commonwealth Government for breach of contract. Legal opinion is to the effect that they have no claim except a moral one.

291. *To the Chairman.*—I do not think any disability would be experienced by relying on steam heating exclusively. In America and Canada, during a considerable portion of the year, the thermometer is below zero, and the hot-water-radiating system can be manipulated in such a way as to make people quite comfortable. I cannot recollect having seen in America an open fire, except in one private house, where, in addition to having the open fireplace, they had the radiator. Only one or two of our chief offices have electric radiators installed. It would be not in conformity with modern ideas to provide fireplaces in a building such as this which is proposed for Canberra. In every modern Parliament House that I know of they depend entirely on the radiators. In the American hotels, in which women and children are affected, they seldom use fireplaces. Hot-water heating is capable of thorough regulation.

The witness withdrew.

Henry Ambrose Hunt, Commonwealth Meteorologist, sworn and examined.

292. *To the Chairman.*—The mean temperature at Canberra is not unlike that at Melbourne. It is 56.1 degrees at Canberra and 58.4 degrees at Melbourne. The mean maximum temperature of the two places is about the same, but the mean minimum temperature is 5 degrees lower at Canberra. The nights are very much colder than Melbourne. The extreme minimum temperature at Canberra is 18 degrees, whereas in Melbourne it is 27 degrees. On the other hand, whereas the maximum temperature in Melbourne on a hot summer's day is as high as 111 degrees, the highest temperature reported at Canberra does not exceed 102.6 degrees, and the average temperature there during the summer months is only 68.5 degrees. Wooden houses would be suitable for a climate such as there is at Canberra. The mean percentage of humidity at Canberra at 9 o'clock in the morning is 70, a little higher than in Melbourne, where it is 68. The humidity in the House of Representatives, Melbourne, is probably due to the heat exuding from members themselves, and may possibly be due to want of air circulation. I have been perspiring in my office, but have felt quite cool on going out into the open on a hot north wind day. It would not be healthy to work in any climate or in any conditions where the humidity is over 75 per cent. Physical exercise is absolutely dangerous in a place like Broome when the humidity there is sometimes 92 per cent. A reasonable humidity is anything under 70 per cent. At Melbourne the relative humidity must be higher than 70 per cent. when it rains. The conditions applying to the chamber of the House of Representatives, at Melbourne, would not apply to a chamber at Canberra, because, during the greater part of the day and night, there is less moisture at the latter place than is the case in Melbourne. The provision for ventilation of the chamber by windows should make conditions at the Canberra House better, but I am not an authority on matters of ventilation. Wind records have been taken on Kurrajong Hill and Camp Hill, and show that there is very little difference between the two spots. As a matter of fact, on the average, there is a difference of only two-thirds of a mile in favour of the higher station. The velocity of the wind at Canberra is between 100 and 120 miles a day less than it is in Melbourne. The records show 217 miles a day in Melbourne and 94 miles a day at Canberra. Sydney shows a record of about 500 miles a month more than Melbourne. Wind velocities are greater nearer the coast than they are inland. Of course, Canberra would be subject to violent wind squalls, but their visitations are haphazard. All inland towns are subject to them.

293. *To Mr. Mathews.*—The percentage of humidity in Sydney is 72 as against 68 in Melbourne. Humidity figures are somewhat deceptive. Much depends upon the vapour contents of the atmosphere. Sydney has a higher temperature and vapour content than Melbourne has. The only comparison you can rely upon is the relative humidity, which is arrived at by the difference in temperature between the dry and the wet bulb, and the relative content of moisture at the differences in temperature. Sydney is a much more unbearable place to live in than is Melbourne, for the reason that, although it has a slightly higher temperature, its vapour content is greater than that in Melbourne. Canberra compares very favorably with Sydney. Its humidity is slightly higher than that of Melbourne, but not to any appreciable extent. The observations are taken at 9 o'clock in the morning, at which time there would probably be a good deal of fog or dew in the valley at Canberra. From January to April the prevailing wind at Canberra is from the south-east. In Melbourne a south-east wind may be regarded as a cool wind; but it comes off the sea, whereas at Canberra it comes over the plains. The

prevailing wind in Melbourne during the summer may be from the south, but it blows during the hottest part of the year. During the other months of the year, at Canberra, the prevailing wind is from the west and north-west. Humidity rises in the winter, but it is not oppressive, because the temperature is falling at the same time. In fact, during the winter, the humidity would tend to make the conditions more bearable. An absence of moisture with a cold westerly wind would be more liable to make the place cold than would be the case with a high humidity. As a matter of fact, the humidity in the air would really be beneficial during the colder part of the year. I should say that the climate at Canberra would be healthier than that of Melbourne or Sydney.

294. *To Mr. Blakeley.*—We have taken observations throughout the 24 hours, and we find that the mean very closely corresponds with the reading taken at 9 a.m.

295. *To Senator Plain.*—The wind velocity records on Camp Hill and Kurrajong Hill have only been taken for one month. But records have been taken at the Administrator's quarters showing that, for eight years past, the average hourly velocity of the wind for the twelve months is as follows:—January, 5.1 miles; February, 4.6 miles; March, 4.1 miles; April, 3.2 miles; May, 3.2 miles; June, 3.4 miles; July, 3.3 miles; August, 3.2 miles; September, 3.8 miles; October, 4.2 miles; November, 4.7 miles; and December, 4.5 miles.

296. *To the Chairman.*—The average rainfall at Canberra for nine years is 22.37 inches. The average rainfall at Queanbeyan for 52 years is 22.51 inches.

297. *To Mr. Mathews.*—We have a meteorological station at Canberra. It was intended to carry out upper air research with a view to determining the normal drift and rate of current at heights by means of captive balloons and kites carrying recording instruments. There is a good revolving house with a winch in it, but we have not been able to use it. The outbreak of war suspended operations.

(Taken at Melbourne.)

TUESDAY, 15TH MAY, 1923.

Present:

Mr. GREGORY, Chairman;	
Senator Newland,	Mr. Cook,
Senator Plain,	Mr. Jackson,
Mr. Blakeley,	Mr. Mathews.

Sir Robert Randolph Garran, M.A., K.C.M.G., Solicitor-General and Secretary, Attorney-General's Department, sworn and examined.

298. *To the Chairman.*—It is rather difficult to forecast what the number of members of the House of Representatives will be in twenty-five years' time; it depends altogether on what the policy may be with regard to the basis of representation. Possibly the population may be doubled in that time, but it does not follow that the number of members of the House of Representatives would increase proportionately. Provision for 100 members ought to be ample. My opinion is that the Federal Parliament ought not to grow too large, and 100 members should be regarded as the maximum number for many years to come. If the New States movement develops there will be a greater number of States represented, but they would be smaller States, and there should not necessarily be a serious increase in the number of members of Parliament. The proposal that speeches should be delivered from a rostrum is rather reminiscent of the Chamber of Deputies, Paris, and, I should think, is more suited to oratorical display than to debate for the transaction of parliamentary business as we understand it. The basic principle in our parliamentary system is that

the Parliament should comprise a body of men met around a table for the discussion of various matters, though in its development the body has become large and the table small.

299. *To Mr. Jackson.*—A rostrum would tend towards holding back a nervous speaker. If you put a man into a pulpit to deliver an address it tends to the delivery of set orations by the party orator.

300. *To the Chairman.*—It is very necessary that a room should be provided for the Parliamentary Draftsman. The accommodation at present is very inadequate. For the last twenty years I have had a great deal of experience, working sometimes all night. An immense amount of drafting work has to be done when the House is in Committee, and a tremendous amount of the draftsman's time is occupied in waiting for something to happen in the House. If he were properly accommodated he could employ his time profitably. I think the draftsman should be provided with a room moderately close to the chamber in which he could work under suitable conditions. I should prefer that room to be placed near the House of Representatives, where most of the work is done; although the Parliamentary Draftsman has to be in attendance at, and do work for, both chambers. Very seldom has he to do any work in Parliament House when Parliament is not sitting.

301. *To Mr. Mathews.*—I suggest that provision be made in both chambers for the attendance of the draftsman and other officers close to the Minister, so that the Minister can readily communicate with them without having to walk a considerable distance.

302. *To the Chairman.*—During the debate on a Bill, especially when in Committee, questions often arise relating to the draftsmanship on which the Minister desires to consult either the draftsman or a departmental officer. The present Senate arrangement is very convenient. In the House of Representatives, if the Minister wants to speak to his secretary, he has to walk behind Mr. Speaker's chair, and if the secretary wants to speak to the Minister he has to attract the Minister's attention in a more or less conspicuous manner. A good deal of difficulty occurs sometimes in bringing under the notice of the Minister something which he ought to know, especially when a Bill is going through Committee. The space behind Mr. Speaker's chair at present is extremely limited. In the Legislative Assembly of New South Wales there are two or three rows of seats alongside the Speaker's chair, in which heads of Departments can sit. It would be better if a couple of seats were placed behind the end Ministerial chair, railed off from the chamber, and, if possible, approachable by a different door than the chamber door, so that there would be no question of turning out those officers whenever a division was taken. It would not be a passage way into the House, but merely a little alsatia within the precincts of the chamber. Three seats would be ample—one for the draftsman, one for the head of the Department, and one for the expert on the particular Bill under discussion. The draftsman's room should be within a reasonable distance of the chamber. At present when the draftsman is out of the chamber nobody knows where to look for him. It would be desirable to have a common room for heads of Departments who were required to be in attendance at the House. The design of our Parliament Houses in Australia is based upon the old system, when the hours of sitting were comparatively short. The Minister did his work in his office before going to Parliament, and went to Parliament simply to deal with legislative matters. With the longer sitting hours it is necessary for a Minister to transact a good deal of business with the head of his Department at Parliament House, necessitating the attendance of heads of Departments at Parliament House on very many occasions. It would save the time of the heads very much if there were a common

room in which they could each have a chair and a desk. It is very difficult to say whether the Parliament will sit as long in Canberra as it now does in Melbourne. I have no reason for believing that the sessions will be very greatly shortened. I think a separate room should be provided for the secretary to the representatives of the Government in the Senate. At present there is a room at the back of the chamber, but it is a kind of common room which is used by everybody. The officer to whom I have referred has a good deal of drafting work to do, and he has to work up for the representatives of the Government all the Bills which go to the Senate. Members and Ministers constantly consult him, and he ought to have a room adjacent to the Senate chamber which is not a common room for all visitors.

303. *To Mr. Mathews.*—There is not at present any similar provision on the House of Representatives side.

304. *To Senator Newland.*—I suggest that accommodation for officials should be provided in connexion with both Houses.

305. *To Mr. Mathews.*—It is always convenient to have a few chairs behind the Speaker's chair. In the New South Wales Parliament they have behind the Speaker's chair about three rows of benches with room for perhaps fifteen distinguished visitors. I have worked in most of the Parliament Houses in Australia, and I think the facilities for business in them are in inverse proportion to their architectural pretensions. In Sydney there are no architectural pretensions; whenever they want any particular accommodation they put it there. I did not notice that this accommodation at the back of the Speaker's chair in Sydney was responsible for any noise.

306. *To Senator Newland.*—The only way to obviate the necessity for a Minister turning his back on the chamber whilst speaking to an officer would be to have the officer sitting beside him. I used to think it would not be a bad plan to allow the heads of Departments to sit down beside the Minister, just as the chief of the *Hansard* staff is allowed to do. It might be an improvement on the present arrangement if the officer's seat were on the same level as that of the Minister. It undoubtedly is advisable for the *Hansard* staff to be on the floor of the chamber, where they can hear everything that is going on. It would be a very great disadvantage to them if they were kept off the floor. It would depend a great deal on the position of the gallery and on the acoustic properties of the chamber whether they would be able to hear better from a gallery than from the floor of the House. I should think it would be very difficult to get a place from which they could hear better than they can from the Table itself. Of course the member speaking may then sometimes be behind them; but to be in a place from which they could observe the whole chamber they would have to be a good distance from the majority of the speakers. All the important speeches, the set speeches, are delivered at or not far from the table, and the reporter is fairly central to them. Quite possibly a very good position might be found for the *Hansard* reporters elsewhere, but I do not know of any place at which they could be so well accommodated as they are on the floor of the House. I do not think they would be as well placed if they were in a gallery in a position similar to the press gallery in the House of Representatives. The *Hansard* staff is a very expert staff, and the desire being to have the utmost accuracy, it seems to me that that can be better obtained in their present position than from a gallery.

307. *To Mr. Mathews.*—There are officers of my Department who are kept fully employed in the Parliament building whether Parliament is sitting or not in drafting and other work. It would not be necessary for them to work here when Parliament is not in session if we had accommodation

for them elsewhere. When the House is not sitting it might be a convenience sometimes to have them at the office of the Department; but we are quite crowded out there, and have no place in which to put them. They have their own official papers and reference works here, and even if we had accommodation for them elsewhere it probably would be more convenient for them to work here. The drafting of amendments for members is not an official part of the duty of the Secretary to the Representatives of the Government in the Senate, but as a matter of courtesy it is always done, subject to the consent of the Attorney-General. It might be of some assistance to have a telephone installed between the Minister and the Parliamentary Draftsman or the head of the Department, but that means of communication has its disadvantages; you cannot have bells ringing in the chamber.

308. *To Mr. Jackson.*—I think the tendency will be for the constituencies to become smaller in area but larger in population. Assuming that the Constitution is not radically altered from a federal to a unitary system, I should think about 100 members would be sufficient for the Federal Chamber. The tendency must be for the federal power to increase to a considerable extent. There are certain powers now which are divided in a very unsatisfactory way, and I can see no logical solution but to increase the federal power considerably. Although the legislative power will increase the administrative work, the work involved in the personal relations between members and their constituents is not likely to increase very much.

(Taken at Melbourne.)

WEDNESDAY, 16TH MAY, 1923.

Present:

Mr. GREGORY, Chairman;	
Senator Newland	Mr. Cook
Senator Plain	Mr. Jackson
Mr. Blakeley	Mr. Mathews.

David Barker Walker, Journalist, Southern Press Agency, sworn and examined.

309. *To the Chairman.*—The Southern Press Agency represents in the Commonwealth Parliament Reuters and the following daily newspapers:—Adelaide *Advertiser*, Adelaide *Register*, Perth *Daily News*, Broken Hill *Truth*, Ballarat *Echo*, Grafton *Examiner*, Lismore *Star*, Tamworth *Leader*, Wagga *Advertiser*, Albury *Mail*, Brisbane *Courier*, Port Pirie *Reporter*, Launceston *Examiner*, Bathurst *Advocate*, and Newcastle *Herald*. The agency also represents journals published at Benalla, Bairnsdale, Sale, Horsham, Colac, Camperdown, Portland, Port Fairy, Casterton, Warracknabeal, and other towns. The Provincial Daily Press Agency, which is run by the daily papers at Bendigo, Geelong, and Mildura, also operates in the gallery of Parliament House. In addition to the representatives of the daily newspapers, I should think that there would be about four or five journalists engaged in the same class of work as myself for whom accommodation would be required in the parliamentary galleries at Canberra. My agency represents big daily newspapers which, so far as their own cities are concerned, are equally as important as is the *Age* or the *Argus* at Melbourne. I should imagine that when the Commonwealth Parliament House is within reasonable reach of such places as Grafton, Lismore, Newcastle, or Tamworth, the journals published daily in those important centres will, in all probability, have their own representatives at Canberra. I can foresee quite a lessening of my list of journals. At the commencement of Federation I represented one of the largest Sydney newspapers. I have represented Sydney papers in the Commonwealth parliamentary galleries until last session, but with the growth of competition

and also with the importance of the work looming larger in the editorial and managerial eye these morning dailies have placed their own men in the gallery. I should think that the same thing would occur in respect of some of the more important country dailies. As a matter of fact, even now some of my New South Wales clients are making arrangements with me for an increased service. They think that the Commonwealth Parliament should get more attention from them than they have been giving it in the past. By the time Parliament is sitting at Canberra they may want to be specially represented in the gallery there, in which case it will be necessary for much more provision to be made than is the case now. Most decidedly the tendency is to increase the prominence given to Federal politics, and I should think that this will be even more noticeable when Parliament sits at Canberra. I know that Dr. Cunningham considers that the reports of proceedings will be lessened when Parliament is removed to Canberra, but he is speaking from the *Argus* and Melbourne point of view. I am speaking from the point of view of a very much larger area. From my own experience I know that the interest of the provincial daily press in the Commonwealth parliamentary proceedings is increasing every session. Fifteen years ago my contract was to supply the *Brisbane Courier* with not more than 500 words daily. It was to be merely a sketch of what had taken place during a sitting. However, it was soon found to be impossible to have such a limit, and I was obliged to transgress on many occasions. Now I have to send 3,000 or 4,000 words to the same newspaper, and, if necessary, am obliged to keep going all night. Much bigger reports are being sent to newspapers outside Melbourne or Sydney than one would imagine. Very often they are longer than the reports which are published in the Melbourne daily papers. Provision will have to be made at Canberra for four or five press agencies, but I want to impress on the Committee the fact that the number of journals with direct representatives in the gallery is sure to increase. I have had very little experience of reporting parliamentary proceedings except from the gallery, but I believe that I made a mistake when I had the opportunity of moving from the higher gallery to one of the lower side galleries. I stayed in my old position in the upper gallery, although the position is most inconvenient. As a matter of fact, when there is anything of importance to be reported we are obliged to come down to the lower gallery. For one thing a lower gallery is much more convenient to members who want to hand memorandums to pressmen. I should think that a gallery about 9 ft. 6 in. high would be all right. In fact, I would prefer it to a position actually on the floor of the chamber. Reporters get accustomed to members' voices. The existing gallery in the House of Representatives is too high. If it is proposed to place the press reporters in a gallery it should be behind the Speaker, but not above him. It is very inconvenient to have a gallery just above the Speaker, especially if there is a canopy above his chair which serves to deaden all he says so far as the occupants of the gallery are concerned. I would not care to report from a side gallery such as there is in the Senate chamber. One is never sure of anything that is said on the side of the chamber just below the reporters' desks. A gallery at the end of the chamber enables the reporter to face the various members who are speaking. It is difficult to follow what a member is saying when one is behind him, especially when he may drop his voice at a ticklish point or when there may be a roar of interjections. There should be separate writing-rooms for the pressmen. There might be one common room for freelance journalists, but I should not think there is any likelihood of there being many of them. In ordinary circumstances those who write parliamentary

sketches are attached to individual papers, whose rooms they could use. There is nothing to prevent two or three agencies being grouped together in one room. There should not be one room for five reporters representing one agency, otherwise the rooms would have to be a lot of little cubby holes. There ought, in any circumstances, to be sufficient accommodation for writing up. The Press Committee has been found to be very useful. Among ourselves we have at times expressed very strong opinions in regard to breaches of privileges. We have never reported anything of the sort to the Speaker. He has generally reported them to us. I am sure that if any pressman infringed his privileges and made himself distasteful the Press Committee would be prepared to take action. There should be a Press Committee to take control of the press rooms, always with the proviso that the Committee should report to the Speaker anything they disapprove of in the case of their own members. A few years ago there was serious trouble in this regard. Certain members of Parliament took what we thought was the wrong course of action in the House, but at the same time there were grounds for the complaint; and the Speaker of the day had to deal with it. We felt very strongly the conduct of some of our men. A dining-room should be provided in Parliament House at Canberra in which pressmen should be able to have meals while the House is sitting. At Canberra they will not be able to go across the street and get a meal. There should be a properly equipped telegraph office in the building. Pneumatic tubes have not proved to be a success for telegraphic business. I am speaking now with 40 years' experience. I know that the tubes have not proved to be a success in Melbourne. All of our press messages are manifolded with carbons. Messages are screwed up very tightly to be sent through the tube from the Stock Exchange to the Elizabeth-street Post Office, and when they are unrolled the carbon copies are so smeared and smudged that the operators have the greatest difficulty in transmitting the messages. Of course, my remarks apply only to press messages, so many of which are written in pencil. I have had recent trouble in this regard. A message of about 700 words written in the Arbitration Court was brought to my office in the Stock Exchange building. It was lodged in the post-office in that building, and sent by pneumatic tube to the operating room in Elizabeth-street for despatch to Adelaide and Perth evening papers. Two hours after it was marked as having been lodged a boy came to me with it, and said that the operators wanted a legible message. He said that they could not read it. I was very angry. It was then 4.30 p.m., and it was necessary for me to sit down and make a brief summary of the message in order to get it away in time to catch the evening editions of the papers in Adelaide and Perth. Incidentally the Department suffered a loss in revenue. I made a complaint to the Postmaster-General. The Department's explanation was that they could not read the message after it had passed through the pneumatic tube. Through being screwed up tightly and being crinkled, it became, as they said, undecipherable, but I could read it all right. On the strength of that particular message they are now worrying me about my illegible writing. On that occasion it was not a manifolded message, and was not written by me. I do not know that it is essential that all messages should be screwed up into one bundle and sent through the tube together. It is all a matter of bad management in the office. However, I should say that, provided the administration is good, a pneumatic tube from Parliament House to the Post Office should afford facilities to pressmen, so long as the office is not too far away from where the reporters are working. There are frequent occasions on which a slight conversation will obviate a great deal of trouble. We have endless

trouble on race-courses where the reporters' rooms are too far away from the telegraph offices. A minute's conversation is worth a quire of writing. Direct telegraphic and telephonic communication will be required not only between Canberra and Melbourne and Sydney, but also between Canberra and such places as Newcastle, Grafton, and Tamworth. If the business for these latter places has to go to Sydney it will never reach the newspapers in proper time. One of our greatest troubles is the distribution of messages. There is not much difficulty in Melbourne, but the distribution beyond Sydney is difficult. Sometimes messages do not reach their destination. Mr. Thompson, the member for New England, is complaining about this very matter. The Grafton paper has had trouble in this regard. A message I sent containing Dr. Pages' speech did not get to Lismore at all, and although it was lodged early enough arrived very late at Grafton. I think it would be a great mistake to have members speaking from a rostrum. If there should happen to be a vain man in Parliament it would tend to increase his vanity and make him think he was the particular man whose words the whole country was waiting to hear. I think a rostrum would lead to a great waste of time; in any case it would be rough on the pressmen who would be required to boil down speeches to a reasonable extent for telegraphic messages.

310. *To Senator Newland.*—I frequently find it difficult to hear in the gallery. It is much easier to hear in the lower side galleries. In regard to the high side gallery in the Senate chamber, it is not difficult to hear a member speaking from the other side of the chamber, but when a member on our side speaks we have frequently to ask one another, "What did he say?" The railed off space in the Senate gallery was used years ago by *Hansard*. In the days when the State Parliament occupied this building the chief *Hansard* reporter and his staff sat in the Assembly gallery in the position where the *Argus* reporters now work. If there was the faintest whisper at the other end of the gallery where I was sitting we would hear a "hush" come from the chief *Hansard* reporter. The talking that now goes on among pressmen in the gallery would not have been tolerated then for a moment. I know that the chief *Hansard* reporter made representations, and got away from that position. He found that he could not report members' speeches as he thought they ought to be reported. Each morning daily newspaper is likely to want a separate room at Canberra. It would not be a bad idea to distribute the rooms on a geographical basis. I would not say that there should be so many for each State, as a group of reporters might represent many States. For instance, I represent three times as many Inter-State papers as do the special representatives of Inter-State journals, who occupy the Inter-State press room in the present Parliament House. I think that the twelve rooms proposed to be allotted to pressmen should be sufficient, but the question is how to distribute them. The basis of distribution could not be arrived at by ballot. If you allotted a vote to every paper my agency would swamp the others. There are now seven rooms for the pressmen working in the Commonwealth Parliament House.

311. *To Mr. Cook.*—I could not say how many reporters would be working in the Canberra House within the first twelve months. At least 40 men, including leader-writers and those doing sketches all represent Sydney morning papers. It would be better to let the pressmen run their own club. The two press clubs which, in my experience have been run by the Government, have proved to be failures. They were exceedingly pleasant, but did not carry out the purpose for which they were intended. One of those clubs was formed when the present King visited Australia. I have not known of one to be run in connexion with Parliament.

312. *To Mr. Blakeley.*—It would not be a bad idea to have a room available for the pressmen as a common room, but I do not think it is necessary to have one.

313. *To Mr. Jackson.*—Country journals do not send men to Melbourne because of the expense, but I think they will send representatives to Canberra. I say this from my experience. Papers which a few years ago complained if they had a message of 100 words of parliamentary proceedings now want at least 1,000 words, and want to know why they do not get the longer messages if they are not sent. They are all making arrangements to pay for longer messages.

(Taken at Melbourne.)

THURSDAY, 17TH MAY, 1923.

Present:

Mr. GREGORY, Chairman;	
Senator Newland	Mr. Cook
Senator Plain	Mr. Jackson
Mr. Blakeley	Mr. Mathews.

Justinian Oxenham, Secretary Postmaster-General's Department, sworn and examined.

314. *To the Chairman.*—I have not heard of anything definite having been decided as to the provision of pneumatic tubes between the proposed administrative offices and the Parliament House. Our engineers have been in consultation with Colonel Owen on this and other matters. I take it that Canberra will be connected directly by telegraph and telephone with Sydney and Melbourne. It would be too soon yet to take steps in the direction of the actual erection of lines. I presume that the lines will be ready by the time Parliament is there. I refer to the lines that will carry the estimated traffic between Canberra and Sydney and between Canberra and Melbourne. There will possibly be lines between Canberra and Goulburn, and other important country centres, where the volume of business justifies the service. The *Argus*, *Age*, and *Sun* newspapers have the use of our telegraph lines at present, after a certain hour at night. There is an operator in the *Argus* office, and another in the *Sydney Morning Herald* office, and messages are sent backwards and forwards by a direct line. The same position obtains with regard to the Melbourne *Age* and the Sydney *Daily Telegraph*. We shall make whatever provision is considered necessary for linking up Canberra by telegraph with other centres. A special line to Canberra would give telegraphic communication with all the capital cities, and telephonic communication would probably be established also. I know that Colonel Owen and our engineers have been in consultation on the matter for some time. I should think such a service would be essential. It will depend, of course, on the population, and the amount of business at the new Federal capital. The requirements of the place are hardly known yet. Probably the Works and Railways Department have made an estimate of them. Our Department is still watching the matter, and any action required of us will be taken in good time. I have never heard of the mutilation of a message during its passage through pneumatic tubes. The crushing of messages would not necessarily mutilate them. In one case the representative of a country newspaper made a complaint that a message had been rendered illegible, but I was assured by the manager that the illegibility was due to the writing, and that all the operators complained of this person's writing. Pneumatic tubes are in use all over the world, and I have never heard the objection raised against them that the messages become illegible. The main objection to the use of these tubes is their cost, but where the volume of business justifies their employment the expenditure is warranted. I do

not think the crumpling of messages would make them undecipherable. We have only had one complaint so far as I remember.

315. *To Senator Newland.*—Direct communication from Melbourne and Sydney to Canberra would certainly be necessary, and the best method of arranging it is a matter for the engineers to decide. I am not necessarily contemplating a separate line for Canberra alone. We might have to run an additional wire that would serve other places as well. It is a matter of considering the circuits that are available. I cannot say whether the existing lines would carry the large volume of business that Canberra is likely to create without studying the existing circuits. Messages may be very seriously delayed at present because of interruptions by storms. These delays are not necessarily due to the insufficiency of the existing lines.

316. *To Mr. Mathews.*—So far as I am aware, the pneumatic tubes in use at present at the post-office have given good service. I have heard no complaint about their getting out of order. There may have been cases where packets have jammed, but these have not occurred to any extent. I believe the tubes were in use in Victoria prior to Federation. Although I understand that some trouble has been experienced with the larger tubes such as are used for carrying mails, the small tubes employed in telegraph work are quite successful.

317. *To the Chairman.*—It is very desirable that heads of Departments should be located as close to Parliament House as possible. Some provision should be made at the House for the accommodation of secretaries to Departments, when they have business to transact with Ministers within the precincts of Parliament. One large room would be useful if no more could be provided. Frequently officials are required to attend the House at short notice, and the nearer the offices are situated to Parliament House the better.

The witness withdrew.

Sir John Emanuel Mackey, K.B., Speaker of the Legislative Assembly of Victoria, sworn and examined.

318. *To the Chairman.*—I have just glanced at the ground plan of the proposal referred to the Committee. I would certainly approve of provision being made for a few small rooms near the entrance to the building in which members might interview constituents and other strangers. In my own experience I found it exceedingly awkward to have to interview constituents and other strangers anxious to see me in the main hall of our building. There are sometimes important questions to be discussed, and it is very awkward to have to discuss them in the midst of a number of people. It is essential that strangers should not pass along the corridors occupied by members, and rooms in which they might be interviewed should be provided near to the entrance to the building. I would approve of doing away with the corridors proposed around the main hall provided for in the plan. Yours is a National Parliament, and you should have a fine building worthy of the Commonwealth, not only as to its exterior appearance, but also as to the interior. The first impression of visitors should be a fine impression. I think there should be a large hall provided into which visitors might come to meet members before they enter the chamber. On occasions there may be a great number of visitors to Parliament House, and many may be unable to see immediately the members whom they have come to see. The members may not at the time be in the building, or they may be interviewing other visitors. The increase in the number of the members of the Parliament depends upon the Constitution. At present, the number of members of the House of Representatives is limited by the number of members of the Senate and the equality of representation there. I

think there will be an increase in the number of the members of the House of Representatives, not so much because of increasing population, but because the population will be more widely distributed than at present. I think the present constituencies for the House of Representatives are too large; and, as a consequence, members are not thoroughly in touch with their constituents, or their constituents with them. That is a distinct disadvantage. You can pay too high a price for a small Parliament. The smaller the Parliament is, the more valuable the individual vote, and that is not a good thing. I anticipate that in the course of the next 25 years the population of Australia will have increased from 50 to 100 per cent., and will be more widely distributed than at present. I expect you may have from 110 to 120 members in the House of Representatives, and provision for that number would, I think, be ample for the next 25 years. In view of the anticipated increase in the number of members of the House, it would be better that the Speaker's chair should be in the centre of the length of the building rather than in the centre of the width of it, otherwise some members would be too far away from the Speaker. With regard to provision for desks, I think that you must have single desks or continue the present system of long lounges. In my view, double desks are out of the question. I would not consider them at all. You must give each member a separate desk or retain substantially the present system. The member sitting beside another at a double desk might be a very estimable man, but still a man the other would not welcome. That difficulty would be avoided if you had single desks or if you had desks which would accommodate half-a-dozen members. Desks would be a great convenience to members in connexion with their correspondence. I do not think that having desks within the chamber would interfere to any extent with the deliberative character of the House. Members under the existing system here do not attend to any debate unless it is worth attending to. That is the common experience. If a member is delivering an interesting speech, interesting because of its form or its matter, members will attend to it. If desks were provided for members, they would be more continuously in the chamber. I have never seen any necessity for the establishment of a rostrum in a legislative chamber, or for any departure from our present system in this regard. During my parliamentary experience, which now extends over twenty years, I have listened to good, bad, and indifferent speakers. I have heard some of the finest speakers of Australia, great orators like Mr. Deakin, Mr. Watt, Mr. Hughes, Mr. Shiels, who was at one time Premier of Victoria, Mr. Duncan Gillies, and other very fine speakers. I never found that they were at any disadvantage in speaking from the floor of the chamber. I think that they would prefer to speak from the floor. I have never found that indifferent speakers, as regards form, though perhaps excellent as regards matter, have been at the slightest disadvantage in speaking from the floor. I have seen members occasionally move a little from their place in the chamber when speaking; but I think there is little to complain of in the present system. I am only surmising, but I think the establishment of a rostrum would lend itself to greater flights of oratory than we have at present. I believe that Parliaments generally, and certainly our Australian Parliaments, are becoming more and more regarded as business bodies. Save on very exceptional occasions, a Parliament chamber is not the place for great flights of oratory. In my experience, the man who is best attended to is the man who is regarded as an authority or expert on the subject with which he is dealing. He will be listened to attentively even though he may not be an orator. The man who gets the ear of the House is not always the fine speaker, but the man who has a real contribution to make to the debate, and he requires no rostrum. The galleries for the press in the

present House of Representatives are much too high above the floor. In the Victorian Parliament the *Hansard* staff are accommodated at the table on the floor of the chamber. There is only one man at the table at a time, and the practice adopted causes no trouble at all. I never heard any member make any observation against it. I see no disadvantage in placing the *Hansard* reporters on the floor of the chamber. I believe reporters for the press could hear effectively and well in any reasonable chamber if accommodated in a gallery 9 ft. 6 in. above the floor of the chamber. I see no objection to provision being made for them in such a gallery behind the Speaker's chair. You will inevitably have in Canberra a large staff of reporters for the press. As Australia increases in importance, the interest in the work of the Commonwealth Parliament will become more emphasized, and the big newspapers will require to have their own representatives there. We provide transcription rooms for press reporters in the Victorian Parliament House. There is a press committee with a chairman, from whom representations come to the Speaker; and, if the Speaker wishes to make representations regarding the press, he communicates with the chairman of the press committee. The practice has worked very well with us. We provide dining accommodation for members of the press. We screen off a portion of the strangers' dining-room for them. The representation of the press, I anticipate, will be much more numerous at the Federal Parliament when established in Canberra, and they should be provided with a dining-room to themselves. They should be given some privacy. In our House, under existing conditions, their conversations can be overheard by the general public in the strangers' room. The corridors in our House are supposed to be confined to members, and they are practically confined to them. The members of the press do not frequent them. Occasionally, a leading pressman on some important occasion may be seen there, but that is very rare indeed, and is quite excusable. Our rooms for the press are completely apart from the corridors reserved for members. We have no trouble with the press. Sometimes a young and enthusiastic member of the press may trespass, but a word to the chairman of the press committee puts a stop to anything of the kind. I approve of the proposal for a corridor outside the chamber and opening on to the sunken garden shown in the plan. Members should be encouraged to go out into the fresh air. No matter what the system of ventilation of the chamber is, members who remain in it for very long periods do so at a disadvantage to their health. Our experience is that members do not go out into the fresh air often enough. The provision suggested would be a good thing for both the health and comfort of members. In the matter of ventilation, pressmen tell me that our House is a paradise compared to the Federal Parliament House. The most effective part of our system of ventilation is the provision made for exit of foul air. We have a system of floor ventilation. The exits are all just above the floor, behind the Speaker's chair, and under the front seats all round the chamber. The foul air is pumped outside through these exits. If you go outside you may note the quality of the air that is being pumped out. We have what are known as the Tobin ventilators, for admitting fresh air into the chamber, but we have been told by an expert that they hardly admit any at all, and that most of our fresh air comes through the corridors, or from what is called the Queen's Hall. Some is introduced from above when the weather permits of the upper windows being opened. We have not a good system of ventilation, though I believe it is much better than the system adopted in this building. The exit system we have, I believe, is first class, but our difficulty is in connexion with the admission of fresh cool air. Our House Committee has taken up the matter, and Mr. Arthur Merrin, the Chief Mining Inspector of Victoria, has been looking into the ven-

tilation of our chamber. I suppose that there is no finer expert in this matter in Australia. He has told us that he can suggest no improvement on the system of floor ventilation, but that the Tobin ventilators for the admission of fresh air are not working at all. What he suggests is a small motor, which would pump air into the chamber through the present Tobin ventilators, which are 2 feet or 3 feet above the back seats in the chamber. Mr. Merrin guarantees that his system will effectively supply fresh air. Under his system the air would not pass through water, because in summer time that would become intolerable owing to the humidity. He advises passing it over pipes, which in summer will contain ice or cold water. The air will be made cold in that way, but will not be in contact with the water. I do not know of any proposal to take the dust out of the air before its admission to the chamber. We have never had any difficulty in that regard. At present, we have practically no provision for the pumping of fresh air into the chamber, because the Tobin ventilators do not work.

319. *To Mr. Jackson.*—Mr. Merrin guarantees that under his system the new air admitted to the chamber will be fresh and cool. He proposes a simple system which is estimated to cost about £500.

320. *To Mr. Robert Cook.*—If I were a member of the Federal Parliament, I should prefer to start with the permanent structure. I think members of the Parliament at present in the country are entitled to the benefits of the provision made by the permanent structure. It should not be left entirely to the advantage of posterity. This is the course which was followed in the United States of America. It is very hard to predict the future, but I have seen no indications that there will be more than three large parties in politics, as there are at present. The only reason why I should have any doubts about the immediate commencement of the permanent structure is because I doubt whether the Federal Parliament will remain at Canberra. I think that, in the interests of Australia, the Federal Parliament should sit in a great city. Under the Constitution the Parliament should meet in New South Wales, and therefore, in my opinion, should sit in Sydney, or its immediate environs. It is essential, in my view, that members of Parliament should be brought into contact with the public. In a great city they can discuss effectively with the public what is going on. In a place like Canberra, I think you will be at a tremendous disadvantage, because you will have no effective personal criticism of legislation or administration. At first, at least, and perhaps continuously, the position of affairs will be analogous to that at Washington. Canberra will be an official city of public servants who, necessarily almost, must affect to approve of what is being done. Public servants cannot effectively criticise Ministers or parliamentarians, or their proposed legislation.

321. *To Mr. Jackson.*—I am not suggesting that the press will be silent, but at Canberra you will not be in touch with the press to nearly the same extent as you are in Melbourne, or would be, if the Parliament were in Sydney.

322. *To Mr. Mathews.*—That might not be a drawback, but it will be a very great drawback indeed if you are not in touch with the citizens of some large city. I have read of Washington that that is one of the disadvantages of the establishment of the American capital there. It is quite plain that it must be of great advantage to members of a Parliament to come into contact with the people in the street, and to hear independent expressions of opinion upon their work; this they will not get from residents of Canberra.

323. *To Mr. Cook.*—I was not a member of the Victorian Parliament when it had authority to deal with Tariff matters, but I know what human nature is. When men can make fortunes, or large sums of money, by changes in legislation, they are bound to seek to exercise influence. It will depend altogether on the

members of the Parliament what weight that influence carries. It must have some weight, because if members hear only one side put effectively and continuously, they are inevitably bound to attach more importance to it than to the other side, which is not put so effectively or continuously. I think that the meeting of Parliament at Canberra will tend to intensify rather than lessen this evil. What is everybody's business is nobody's business. The members of the general public will not go to Canberra to counteract attempted influence by special interests. If Parliament met in a large city there would be some check by the public upon the exercise of influence on behalf of special interests. I think that the influence of the press generally is for good. It would be a miracle if it were not of disadvantage at some time, but I should be very sorry to do away with the influence of the press. I would not favour the construction of the provisional building with a view to its use for other purposes later on. I think you should confine your attention to the requirements of Parliament. That should be the predominant, if not the exclusive, idea in dealing with the proposal. Whilst there should not be extravagance there should be nothing niggardly in the expenditure upon a building for the National Parliament. If the comfort of Ministers, members, pressmen, and others who must be about the place, is consulted, that will tend to good work. Our dining-room does not pay. It is impossible for a parliamentary dining-room to pay its way. In the case of the Federal Parliament, you have five or six months of vacation in the year, and the controller of the parliamentary dining-rooms does not know how many to provide for. He may have to provide for only 20 or 30, or for 100. A party meeting may be called for a particular day, and he must be prepared to meet all requirements. In the nature of things, a parliamentary dining-room cannot be a financial success. I know that our dining-rooms show a substantial loss, but I cannot say just now what the loss amounts to.

324. *To Mr. Mathews.*—A reproduction of the long corridor in the Victorian Parliament House would be of great advantage to members of the Federal Parliament. I would recommend the construction of such a corridor. No members of the public are allowed to loiter in our long corridor. Sometimes a member of the public may pass through, but he must always be accompanied by a member of the Parliament, but even that is not encouraged. Members of the press do not enter it except on very rare occasions. They do not seek to intrude there. In that corridor members are practically in their own club. They know that their fellow members will keep their confidences, and there is no outsider present to repeat what they may say. I have expressed my approval of the corridor suggested by the chairman to be constructed outside the House of Representatives chamber, and opening on to the garden. In a private home, which I visited recently, somewhat similar provision was made. There was a long corridor in which there were some very fine pictures, and outside that a garden in which visitors might stroll. There is one further observation I should like to make on my own initiative, and it is that we find it a very great advantage to have the rooms used by the President, the Speaker, Ministers, members, and the clerks of both Houses, on the ground floor. We came over here temporarily some fifteen or sixteen years ago, and we found this building in that regard at a great disadvantage compared with our own. If you are going to have a two-story building your library, President's and Speaker's rooms, Ministers' rooms, and members' rooms should be on the ground floor.

325. *To the Chairman.*—The Clerks of the Houses should be provided with rooms on the ground floor, and not far away from the chamber. The records room should also be close to the chamber, because

members cannot wait for papers. It should, I think, be on the ground floor. I have not had an opportunity to examine the plans of the proposed provisional building at Canberra minutely, but it would be better to have the reading room and newspaper room together. I would not approve of any of the space being occupied for cataloguing rooms adjacent to the library. It seems to me rather an anomaly to break up the space provided for the library and reading room in order to provide for cataloguing rooms, as proposed by the plan. We have in our chamber a railed-off space at the side of the Speaker's chair, on the floor of the chamber, for the accommodation of a Minister's secretary, a head of a Department, or expert, whom Ministers may desire to consult when dealing with important matters. It would be a wise arrangement to provide a desk near Ministers for this purpose. I was a Minister in the Victorian Parliament for some years, and I found the arrangement there a great advantage, and I know that present Ministers would not like to give it up. We have electric radiators for heating our building. I have not had any experience of the heating of a large chamber with hot water. A fire is great company, and I think it would be wise to make provision for fires in addition to the other heating arrangements made. In view of the severity of the climate of Canberra during certain periods of the year, I think that fires would be found very desirable. When I am told that fires are becoming unknown for the heating of buildings in America, I can only say that if they make their heating by hot water effective with their low temperatures there, it should be possible to make it effective with the comparatively higher temperatures at Canberra.

(Taken at Melbourne.)

FRIDAY, 18TH MAY, 1923.

Present:

Mr. GREGORY, Chairman;	
Senator Plain	Mr. Cook
Senator Newland	Mr. Jackson
Mr. Blakeley	Mr. Mathews.

John Smith Murdoch, Chief Architect, Department of Works and Railways, recalled, and further examined.

326. *To the Chairman.*—Parliament has not adopted the site recommended by the Advisory Committee for the provisional Parliament House, at Canberra, at the foot of Camp Hill, nor is Cabinet tied to that recommendation. I think that Parliament and the Government expect the Public Works Committee to advise them as to whether the site recommended is a good one, and whether the proposal generally is a sound one. If the Committee do not consider that they are good or sound, they have the alternative of making some suggestion which, in their opinion, is superior. Neither the Government nor Parliament is tied, I take it, until it has been fortified by the advice of the Committee. The desire of the Advisory Committee, and, to some extent, it is a laudable one, is to have the provisional Parliament House right on the axis of the main avenue which they imagine will be, in some degree, beautified within the next five or ten years. With the beautification under the Griffin scheme going on, Parliament House, on the site they have suggested, will enjoy the beauty created by the effects to be produced in the avenue. That is, I believe, the real reason for the suggestion that the building should be erected at the foot of Camp Hill. Putting it there would interfere with the Griffin plan, but the Advisory Committee view it in the light of a temporary building. It may last for 100 years, but that, in the life of Canberra, would merely be a temporary period, and, in the evolution of

the city over many generations, it would not be considered as really interfering with the Griffin plan. On the other hand, it would, on the site suggested, be rather in the way if there should be any chance of Mr. Griffin's plans in regard to location of permanent buildings being proceeded with at an early date. It certainly occupies a site which Mr. Griffin shows on his plan as vacant land, but it happens to be right in the middle of the future permanent buildings he has outlined, and which, in any evolution of Canberra, would, according to his plan, be among the first to be erected. In that respect, therefore, the position at the foot of Camp Hill would be rather unfortunate. If Parliament House were erected on another site within the official area it would interfere with the beauty of the landscape as viewed from Camp Hill—at least that is the opinion of the Advisory Committee—and I concede that there are points in favour of such an argument; but, in my opinion, a temporary Parliament House on a site I have already suggested to the Committee as being suitable would not cause any serious detriment to the appearance of the group. I refer to a site close by the river where Parliament House would have the effect of being removed from the operations connected with the building of the permanent structures of the city, and yet be at no inconvenient distance from them. The construction of these buildings will take years and years. As Australia grows the group of offices must be extended, and it is only natural to expect that building operations on that spot will be practically continuous. So far as the Griffin plan is concerned the mandate from the Government is that it is the accepted plan. Of course, that mandate can only be observed in the spirit. There are places here and there where immaterial departures from it must be made, as Mr. Griffin would be the first to admit, but its great broad principles are being observed. In fact, our operations should go as far as possible in maintaining the integrity of the Griffin plan. If the Public Works Committee recommended the erection of a provisional Parliament House on the site suggested by the Advisory Committee, it would be, so far as the location of buildings is concerned, violating the plan adopted by Parliament and the Government, but it would not be an interference with the lay-out of streets. It would merely interfere with the integrity of Mr. Griffin's plan in respect to the location of buildings. The effect of adopting the Knoll site by the river for a provisional Parliament House would not interfere with the evolution of Mr. Griffin's plan for possibly two or three centuries. It would only be a temporary building. I think that when the permanent evolution of Mr. Griffin's plan commences in respect to the Government offices near Camp Hill, and by the time the Government buildings stretch down to the river or lake, which, under the plan in question, may be in existence in days to come, and the Knoll site is required for the purposes of the Griffin plan, the life of the temporary Parliament House will have long previously expired, the buildings will have been removed, and they will not be in the way of operations. A Parliament House on the Knoll site would be removed just a convenient distance from the site of the location of the main building operations as to enable members to take an interest in those operations, and yet not to be disturbed by them. If a permanent Parliament House were erected on some other site at a later date the temporary house on the Knoll would be more likely to be suitable for other purposes than would a temporary Parliament House on the site recommended by the Advisory Committee at the foot of Camp Hill. The latter's future use would be confined to purely Government purposes, because it would be right in the centre of the Government group of buildings. But the former building, after being vacated by Parliament, could for the remainder of its life be used as the starting point of a university, or for a museum, library, technical college,

or some other similar purpose. It would be far enough removed from the distinctly Government group to prevent interference of the one with the other. I do not like the site recommended by the Advisory Committee because it involves the placing of Parliament House partly in a cutting into the side of Camp Hill, thereby restricting the outlook, and because its use during its life would not be so universal; that is to say, it would need to be occupied as a purely Government building. If the provisional Parliament House were erected on the site recommended by the Advisory Committee it would need to be removed at the end of its economic life, and the site might be occupied for some other purpose, or left vacant. The level of the top of the Knoll is 1,885 feet above sea level. If we cut the hill down by 15 feet it would create a level plateau on which to put a building 630 feet by 500 feet, quite ample for a provisional Parliament House. If the avenue from Kurrajong to Ainslie, which passes this site, is cut down to the 1,861 feet level, as recommended by Mr. Griffin, there will be a slope down from the 1,870-ft. level on the Knoll to the level of the avenue. Opposite the Knoll site, and on the eastern side of the avenue, by utilizing the spoil from the Knoll, a site could be created for temporary office buildings, laid out on an east and west axis, with the provisional Parliament building on the Knoll, always of course, observing Mr. Griffin's plan of building sites and roads. This will create a considerable area on which to put provisional departmental offices of wood and iron, and thus on the same site you will have a Parliament House at the 1,870 feet, the main avenue passing down from Kurrajong from Ainslie, at the 1,860-foot level, at which level the site for the provisional departmental buildings will begin, and you can utilize the spoil taken off the hill to fill in the depression on the site where I suggest that the temporary departmental offices may be erected. Then there will be a drop of 15 feet in 1,000 feet, which will not be noticeable, and at the same time will be good for purposes of drainage. It will be necessary to remove 150,000 cubic yards of earth, which at 2s. a yard, should cost about £15,000. That is the amount involved in earthworks by building the provisional Parliament House on the Knoll, and creating a site for temporary offices opposite the Knoll on the eastern side of the avenue towards Ainslie. The earthworks required for building on the site recommended by the Advisory Committee at the foot of Camp Hill should cost between £3,000 and £4,000. The earth to be removed from the top of the Knoll will be used for raising the site on the other side of the avenue in order to bring it to a suitable level for departmental offices. Of course, this will all be in the direction of evolving Mr. Griffin's plan for the lay-out of the city. However, in this connexion, let me point out that this question of earthworks opens up a rather serious position from the building point of view. Since I have given evidence to the Committee on this subject, and have read in the press the evidence given before the Committee by various witnesses, I have begun to realize that the Committee are not very favorable to timber offices. Should that be so, let me say at once that the filled-in site suggested as being suitable for office purposes would prove to be very unsuitable for any offices other than frame buildings, because of the foundation work involved. We could not build in brick or concrete on newly filled in earth. It all depends upon the amount of rainfall and the class of soil composing the earthworks, but I should say that, on account of the low rainfall at Canberra, it would, perhaps, be 30 or 40 years before you could safely and economically build in brick or concrete on top of filled-in earth. If it be the opinion of the Committee to avoid temporary frame buildings, and recommend brick or concrete offices, the whole aspect of the possibility of using the Knoll site is materially altered. The cost of building temporary offices in brick and concrete would be very great, as

the foundations would be deep. This puts quite a new complexion on the whole problem. If it is the Committee's wish to have these offices in a permanent material the best procedure might, in my opinion, be to regard Kurrajong as the site for the permanent Parliament House, and utilize Camp Hill in the meantime for the provisional Parliament House. It might not be so beautiful as the Knoll site would be, but still the views would be extensive, and, in any case, it is the spot chosen by Mr. Griffin for the permanent Parliament House. I do not think that the location of the future Parliament House on Kurrajong, instead of Camp Hill, would be a very serious violation of the integrity of Mr. Griffin's plan as a town plan. It would be merely a suggestion to transpose the position of one important building. Since I was before the Committee last, I have gone to some little trouble to satisfy myself as to what would be involved in the way of earthworks, by putting the permanent Parliament House on Kurrajong, and I have discovered that for an expenditure that would not be very serious upon earthworks, we could create a site there which would take a Parliament House 400 feet square. This could be done by cutting the hill down 20 feet. A square building of these dimensions would be a very beautiful form indeed for such a House. It could have a terrace 50 feet wide, and a road 100 feet wide around the terrace, and could also have associated with it, at a level 15 feet lower, four blocks of Government offices each three stories high, and 200 feet by 100 feet. These would flank Parliament House on its four sides. There will be no difficulty in planning a Parliament House on the top of Kurrajong, and it could be done without a great deal of cost, or without serious expenditure on earthworks. In addition to the four Government offices there could be at a slightly lower level two other buildings—one for the accommodation of senators and one for the accommodation of the members of the House of Representatives. Indeed, at this latter level, I think four further office blocks could be sited, without undue expenditure on earth-works. The architectural effect of massing a group of buildings like that at the top of Kurrajong, the focussing point of the city plan, would be magnificent. None of the out-lying buildings would obscure the view of Parliament House. They would appear to support it. I cannot think of any group of structures in any part of the world more majestic in character. The roof of the buildings which I suggest should be made available for senators and the members of the House of Representatives, would be on the level of the terrace surrounding Parliament House. I can submit to the Committee a sketch of what I propose. It would not be an absolute departure from the Griffin scheme as a town planning scheme. An alteration as regards the location of particular buildings should not affect the integrity of Mr. Griffin's plan. I have suggested the Government offices surrounding Parliament House, because I have often heard it said that a Parliament House at Kurrajong would be too far removed from the administrative offices. But that is not necessarily the case. Offices may be placed as I suggest for Departments which are in close association with Parliament, leaving the other offices not closely associated with Parliament upon the flat country in accordance with Mr. Griffin's plan. Mr. Griffin himself put a group of buildings on Kurrajong. He proposed to place Government House there, a house for the Prime Minister and the Capitol. My scheme as a town planning arrangement does not, I think, affect his materially. The roads giving access to it will be the roads which Mr. Griffin has laid out, and to which no objection can be taken. I suggest that the provisional Parliament House should be erected on Camp Hill, where it could stay for 100 years. It will be a low building, which is what I think is required there, and when Parliament vacates it, it can be used as Government offices. Kurrajong Hill would not prove to be a suitable site for the Governor-General's

residence. For the purpose of entertaining visitors the Governor-General needs a site having level ground. I have never taken seriously the expectation that there is in some quarters that the Commonwealth Parliament will be able to meet at Canberra in three years. It would be a physical impossibility to do so. It is not altogether a question of erecting one building—Parliament House; it is a question of the step by step manner in which the Government proceeds with all its operations. I am not speaking in a critical spirit. This process is probably necessary, seeing that public funds are involved. I should say that the most optimistic expectation in regard to beginning legislative operations at Canberra would be that they could start in five years' time. I do not think that Parliament House could be built within eighteen months after tenders are called. It would be possible to do it in two years. However, it is not only a question of erecting Parliament House. All the other necessary accommodation has to be provided. It is a question of erecting many buildings in which, as I understand the position, the Government expect private enterprise to assist to a large extent. I think a reasonable expectation would be five years.

327. *To Mr. Cook.*—Parliament could get to Canberra in one year if shifts were worked day and night, and if money were no object, but I think that the public all over Australia would be quite satisfied if they could see progress being made in the erection of the Capitol. So long as the people see that the work is in progress, a year here or there should be nothing in the matter of the actual beginning of legislation at Canberra.

328. *To the Chairman.*—I think that a suggestion should be made to the Government that the location of the permanent Parliament House should be removed from Camp Hill to Kurrajong. Mr. Griffin should certainly be consulted. If that were agreed to, Camp Hill could then be utilized for the erection of the provisional Parliament House. I do not suggest going on with the permanent House, perhaps not for twenty or thirty years. The Capitol, I understand, will be a building for the display of archives, and if my suggestion to the Committee to build the permanent Parliament House on Kurrajong, which was to be the site of the Capitol, is accepted, the Capitol could be placed on Camp Hill, and the provisional Parliament House, when vacated, could form the nucleus of that Capitol. I have always expressed the opinion that, owing to Parliament House, on Camp Hill, being so high, persons moving about in the beautiful gardens between Camp Hill and the Lake, would not be able to see the Capitol building on Kurrajong, although it was designed to be the great centre building of Canberra, to which all avenues direct themselves. As the provisional Parliament House would be a one-story building, people would be in a position to see over it from the beauty centre lying between Camp Hill and the Lake. Ten years ago, I advised that, if a permanent Parliament House were built on Camp Hill, it should really be in two halves joined by a grand open order of architecture, so that a vista of the Capitol on Kurrajong might be obtained. The permanent Capitol building would then, under my suggestion, be a single-storied long, low, classical structure, such as the national gallery on the Mound in Edinburgh. It could be about 25 feet high, of severely classical type, and suitable as a museum. If you want a multi-story building it should be the permanent Parliament House on Kurrajong Hill, to which all avenues direct themselves. You would, in my opinion, be making most use of Mr. Griffin's beautiful plan by putting the permanent Parliament House on Kurrajong. After all, Canberra will primarily exist for the purpose of legislating for Australia, and in that case the legislative House should be the dominating feature of the place. If the temporary Parliament House is placed on Camp Hill, and

the permanent offices are proceeded with step by step as laid out by Mr. Griffin, and as required, I think it would be advisable to accommodate senators and members of the House of Representatives in portions of these buildings until their own premises on Kurrajong Hill are erected. For instance, the two smallest buildings of the group of permanent offices on Mr. Griffin's plan might be devoted to this purpose. They would be close to the provisional Parliament House. Ultimately they would become departmental offices. Accommodation must, I think, be found for members at Canberra. I do not think that they could carry on their work without having these buildings, in which each member could have a room.

329. *To Mr. Blakeley.*—Parliament could fix a date for meeting at Canberra, but a strike or some other cause might hold up matters. If Parliament decided to meet there in 1927 I do not think it would help towards getting private enterprise to make a move. It might encourage private enterprise to gauge the seriousness of the Government in their intention to evolve Canberra, but when the public see the buildings actually going up they will have a reasonable assurance of the Government's *bona fides* in the matter.

330. *To the Chairman.*—No matter where the provisional Parliament House is erected, the actual building itself would cost about the same, plus whatever earthworks were necessary. The cost of earthworks at the Knoll would probably be £15,000. On the site at the foot of Camp Hill the cost of removing earth would be between £3,000 and £4,000. In order to meet all the demands made by various interests the provisional Parliament House will cost about £200,000, and that estimate is not likely to be departed from to any material extent if the building be erected on any of the sites mentioned.

331. *To Mr. Mathews.*—There would be no difficulty in adapting the accommodation provided on the plan of the provisional Parliament House to the site on the Knoll, or to the Camp Hill site, which I suggest. There might be modifications here and there, but the same accommodation would be preserved. On the latter site the building would be longer and narrower than it would be on the site at the foot of Camp Hill. There would be no difficulty in arranging to allow members to get from the chamber to the sunken garden. The chamber could thus be enlarged, and there would be no difficulty in modifying the plans to provide all the extra conveniences members of the Committee have suggested so far. I do not think that the erection of a provisional Parliament House on the site recommended by the Advisory Committee would spoil the vista shown on Mr. Griffin's plan right down from the permanent Parliament House to the Molonglo. Beautiful gardens would be associated with the building. If Parliament House is erected on the site recommended by the Advisory Committee, and permanent three-story administrative offices are built, in accordance with Mr. Griffin's plan, Parliament House, being a one-story structure, will be taking a subordinate position, whereas a one-story building on Camp Hill would, on account of its elevation, always be the dominant building of the group. The provisional Parliament House on the site recommended by the Advisory Committee, would be on nearly the same level as the permanent public offices which, according to Mr. Griffin's plan, are all to be on the same level. The offices would be about the same distance from the Knoll as from the proposed position of Parliament House. A Parliament House on the Knoll would be 10 feet higher than the temporary offices opposite, which would be built of timber and iron. The best suggestion is to put the future permanent Parliament House on Kurrajong. That would relieve the position so far as Camp Hill is concerned. The Capitol could then be placed on Camp Hill. If the provisional Parliament House were placed on the Knoll, and the permanent offices on the flat, towards Camp Hill, there would be nothing to balance Parliament House.

(Taken at Melbourne.)

TUESDAY, 22ND MAY, 1923.

Present:

Mr. GREGORY, Chairman;

Senator Newland,	Mr. Jackson,
Senator Plain,	Mr. Mathews.
Mr. Cook,	

Walter Burley Griffin, Architect, sworn and examined.

332. *To the Chairman.*—I have not had an opportunity of seeing the draft plans prepared in connexion with the provisional Parliament House and administrative offices at Canberra. In my opinion it would be preferable, from every point of view, to proceed with the erection of the nucleus of the permanent building. It would be possible to erect the nucleus of the permanent building within three years. The Government called a competition in June, 1914, and again in August, 1916, requesting the architects of the world to formulate their plans and register their acquiescence in the arrangements. Sufficient time thus was allowed for the architects practically to complete their plans, so that they would now be available. No plans were received by myself or by the Government; the architects were informed that they would not be received. I do not think that it would take more than a few months to have the plans approved. These architects signed with the Government a contract which was in explicit terms; they have completed their portion, but the Government have not completed theirs. My proposal was that certain of the best known architects of the world should meet and adjudge the competition. That would still be the most expeditious way in which to proceed. There is no necessity to give new-comers an opportunity of competing; but if, as a matter of policy, it was decided to do so, six months would be ample time in which to enable them to draw up their plans. About 210 architects entered for the previous competitions. Allowing for that extra six months, a year ought to be quite sufficient time in which to get ready to start on the building. It is only the nucleus of the building which we are considering, and therefore the working plan only for such portion as would serve as a working habitation for Parliament need be prepared. That would amount to about the same thing as is proposed for this provisional Parliament House. Our programme called for an expenditure of £250,000. You would not get as much for that amount to-day as you would have got in pre-war days. I can see no necessity for an expenditure greater than that; what you would get for it would depend on the design, which would be settled by the adjudicators. You might have to obtain a more economical design now than you would have obtained in 1914 or 1916. The design for the administrative offices would depend largely on the class of building provided for Parliament House. As soon as the plans for the Parliament House were accepted the question should be considered of what was the best method to follow in order to secure corresponding administrative buildings. A promise was made to the architects of Australia in regard to the matter of the Parliament House and any other course would be a deliberate repudiation of a legal and moral obligation. I know for a fact that certain architects have prepared plans. If the Parliament were to erect a provisional building now and delay for some years the calling of plans for the monumental building, it would be a deliberate repudiation of the agreement, which was drawn in very explicit terms with no equivocation and no loopholes. That agreement has never been annulled; it was only postponed on account of the war.

333. *To Mr. Mathews.*—Legally and morally, the Commonwealth is bound to go on with the competition. The successful competitor has the right to be

appointed architect providing the conditions of the contract are met. That does not mean that the Commonwealth is under an obligation to proceed with the erection of the building; there is nothing to prevent its deferring that, as a promise was not, and could not have been made, committing them to that course.

334. *To the Chairman.*—It would be a distinct and radical departure from the original design if a provisional building were erected on the reservoir site, and later the permanent Parliament House on Kurrajong Hill; so radical a departure would it be that it would materially interfere with the whole design. My design provides for the Capitol on Kurrajong Hill, to be utilized for public functions such as the opening of Parliament, memorial or commemorative gatherings, and the like. I do not think it would be purely ornamental by any means. It is the figurative embodiment of the spirit of the Commonwealth. My idea was that at some later period a magnificent building should be erected there.

335. *To Mr. Mathews.*—The Capitol at Washington is used for the sittings of Congress; but that is a differently-planned city, and the Capitol bears a different relation to the city.

336. *To the Chairman.*—The original idea included two houses on the sides of Kurrajong Hill—one for the Governor-General and the other for the Prime Minister. Later, it was considered that there would not be sufficient room to give effect to the idea. It was only a matter of convenience, having nothing to do with the architectural scheme, and I would not press it. To build the provisional building just below Camp Hill would absolutely destroy the whole idea of the Government group, which is the dominating feature of the Federal Capital; it would be like filling a front yard full of outhouses, the walls of which would be the frontages of the buildings facing the yard. It would never be pulled down; history teaches us that such things are not changed, the pressure being too great to allow it.

337. *To Mr. Mathews.*—Sentiment would play some part in preventing its destruction, but the primary reason would be economy. The difference in cost between such a building and a permanent building would be very small.

338. *To the Chairman.*—Fifteen per cent. would more than cover the difference. Assuming that the administrative offices had walls of wood and roofs of iron, the difference then would be about 15 per cent. I would not suggest the alteration of the site to Kurrajong Hill; I would adhere to the original proposal. To build a provisional Parliament House on the knoll on the northern end of the Government group near the river would not be destructive of the plan of the city as the other proposal would. The idea of having a Capitol is not purely an American idea. There is a Capitol at Rome.

339. *To Mr. Mathews.*—The Capitol at Rome is used for two or three different purposes; it is a group of buildings on top of a hill.

340. *To the Chairman.*—I cannot say what would be the appearance of the group of administrative offices if built of one story. According to the departmental plan they would be on such a site that they would destroy the ensemble of the city. Nothing can be done in the direction of proceeding with the building of the permanent Parliament House until the design has been determined. It would not be possible, of course, to erect a provisional building on Camp Hill site and build the permanent Parliament House around it later.

341. *To Senator Newland.*—It should be possible to have Parliament sitting at Canberra in three years' time, including the calling for designs for the permanent structure. There are enormous stocks of timber and bricks at Canberra. I think it would take less than a year to deal with the designs.

The suggestion has been made by the Chairman that it might be considered advisable to obtain additional designs. If those were called within a reasonable limit of time, it ought not to be necessary to have as great an extension as six months. I am a believer in giving every one a chance to submit a design. The proposal to erect a provisional building will shut out all except the official architects. I do not think there is any alternative which will give the architects any chance whatever. The holding of a competition is an honorable undertaking, to which the Commonwealth is bound. To put a provisional building on Camp Hill would defeat the whole idea of the permanent Parliament House; it would make that provisional Parliament House, *de facto*, the permanent Parliament House. It would change the city plan if the permanent Parliament House were erected on Kurrajong Hill. The city is built about an *ensemble* of buildings, each bearing a certain relation to the other. If you take the most important element and shift it to another place, the whole thing is upset completely, and no longer is part of the city plan, and every other feature of the city depending on that is nullified. The same objection would necessarily apply to the building of the Parliament House on the site recommended by the Canberra Committee. I shall submit, in writing, my considered opinion regarding these alternative proposals. I have just as great an objection to having the provisional building placed on the site in front of Camp Hill as to its erection on Camp Hill; in each case it would defeat the possibility of having the permanent Parliament House erected on Camp Hill.

342. *To Mr. Cook.*—I recommend the building of the permanent structure in preference to a temporary or provisional structure.

343. *To the Chairman.*—The refusal of the Government to proceed with the competition for Parliament House when applications were called was a deliberate attempt to repudiate the arrangement which had been made.

344. *To Mr. Cook.*—In my considered opinion which I shall be submitting in writing, I shall state where I would recommend the erection of a provisional building should that be decided on, but we are bound by an agreement, which should be discharged one way or the other; it should not be repudiated by another act. I am emphatically of the opinion that the permanent structure should be on Camp Hill. I consider that to have been one of the earliest decisions, on which everything else was shaped. The nucleus of the permanent structure could be ready two years after the commencement of building. It could then be added to whenever it was thought desirable. The original estimate should be sufficient to erect the nucleus of the permanent structure; in any case, I do not see any reason why it should cost more than a provisional building, as there would not be in it any elements which were not in a provisional building. The only difference would be in the grouping, because more things would then be taken into account than would be the case with a provisional structure. The grouping might easily be accomplished more cheaply with the permanent than with the provisional building, granting that provisional buildings could be erected without interfering with the plan for the permanent buildings; for there is plenty of opportunity to adapt such buildings to the general scheme. To go ahead with the permanent structure, in my opinion, is not only the best, but it is the most economical, procedure. Invariably in my experience, the far-seeing plan is the most economical. The only justification for anything short-sighted is limited capital. We are in an equally good position now to what we may be in twenty-five years' time, to lay out a design of what we require, so no advantage would be gained by further postponement. The erection of the cottages probably could be

carried out just as cheaply at Canberra as in the capital cities; under normal conditions you would get more efficiency out of the work at Canberra. There is a 10 per cent. difference in the climatic factor in favour of Canberra. It would be a wise policy to have as many points of view as possible brought to bear on the problem of reducing the cost of the cottages.

345. *To Mr. Mathews.*—If the provisional building would provide an effective floor space at a cost of £250,000, the nucleus of the permanent building should do so. The subsequent work on the monumental building ought not to interfere with the work in Parliament. The dome on the Federal Capitol at Washington was built during the civil war, which was the most strenuous time the Government ever had. That work extended over a number of years, during most of which time the House was sitting. I do not think it would prove a nuisance at Canberra. Practically all the monumental buildings of Europe were built in that way, and the facilities for building were not as great in past centuries as at present. I would not for a moment consider that to be a serious objection. Kurrajong Hill is eminently adapted to a structure symmetrical from at least four sides, dominating a site which spreads all round it. A Parliament House is a working organization which cannot be manipulated into such a square form without doing violence to the necessities and also to the actual expression of a bicameral Legislature. It is not beyond the capacity or the brains of the architects to design a building of symmetrical architecture for erection on Kurrajong Hill as a Parliament House; still, there is no need to make difficulties for them. Under my scheme the whole hill would be developed from base to top as an architectural ensemble. The Capitol could be used as an historical museum in which all the trophies, all the records relating to the achievements of Australians, would be preserved.

(Taken at Sydney.)

WEDNESDAY, 23RD MAY, 1923.

Present:

Mr. GREGORY (Chairman);	
Senator Foll	Mr. Cook
Senator Newland	Mr. Jackson
Senator Plain	Mr. Mackay.
Mr. Blakeley	

Richard Rollo Carrington, Chief of the Parliamentary Reporting Staff of New South Wales, sworn and examined.

346. *To the Chairman.*—Prior to joining the New South Wales *Hansard* staff, I was connected with the press, and my experience of *Hansard* and general reporting work extends over more than 40 years. The members of my staff are unanimously opposed to being on the floor of the House, believing that the most effective reporting can be done from a gallery behind but slightly to the left of and above the Speaker's chair. We have had no experience of reporting the proceedings of Parliament from a seat on the floor of the House, except that I have sometimes taken notes—during question time—from that position in the Council Chamber. On such occasions I have found the situation most inconvenient. If a member seated behind the reporter asks a question, or happens to interject, the reporter has no time to turn round to see who it is. If he has to do so in order to identify the member it interferes

with his note taking. On the other hand, from a gallery slightly above the Speaker's chair the reporters would command a view of the whole House. The *Hansard* gallery, in the New South Wales Assembly, is to the left of the chair, and just above the Opposition benches. That situation is unsatisfactory, since it does not permit us to see all the members of the Opposition. Sometimes, when a member seated immediately under the gallery interjects, we have to attribute the interjection to "an Honorable Member," because we cannot see him.

347. *To Mr. Jackson.*—It is true that, under the Standing Orders, interjections are disorderly, but if they are replied to we must record them. A Minister who is addressing the House may reply to an interjection, and the point of his reply is lost unless the name of the interjector and the interjection itself are given. Sometimes three or four members of the Opposition interject simultaneously while a member on the Government side is speaking. The reporters in the press gallery can see who the interjectors are, but from our gallery we cannot always do so, and occasionally we have to hazard a guess at their names. It would be serious if, for instance, an interjection which led to the suspension of a member for disorderly conduct were attributed to the wrong man.

348. *To the Chairman.*—The *Hansard* gallery, in the Assembly, is 9 ft. 6 in. above the floor of the House. We find that is too high. Until a year or two ago, it was several feet higher, and had we been consulted when the alteration was made we should have asked that it be placed not more than 7 ft. 6 in. above the chamber floor. Our writing desks are 2 ft. 2 in. high, so that they are 11 ft. 8 in. above the floor of the House. We find that is too high, especially when we are reporting a member who is speaking from the Opposition cross benches. If our gallery were slightly to the left of the Speaker's chair, and not more than 7 ft. 6 in. high, the voice of a member speaking or interjecting from the cross benches would come directly to us. When a member interjects from the Opposition side of the Assembly the reporter who is taking a note will frequently ask me, "Who interjected?" He cannot see the member, and I have to lean over the gallery to try to identify the interjector. Sometimes I cannot see the member's face and can only give the reporter a lead for identification purposes by telling him that it was a member with grey clothes and tan boots, and so forth.

349. *To Mr. Mackay.*—It is not always possible to identify an interjector by his voice. In the Legislative Council the *Hansard* gallery is above the President's chair. It is too high for really effective hearing, but from it we command a view of the whole chamber.

350. *To the Chairman.*—Several members of my staff to whom I have spoken on the subject concur with my view, that in the Parliament House at Canberra the *Hansard* gallery in each chamber should be not more than 7 ft. 6 in. above the floor. If Mr. Speaker's chair were placed on the long side of a rectangular building, a position behind but slightly to the left of it would be an ideal one for this purpose. If, however, the gallery were immediately behind the chair it would be difficult for the reporters to hear Mr. Speaker when he was giving a ruling. We require room for three reporters in the gallery. It is necessary that there should be a desk for the Chief Reporter, who takes a check note; a desk for the reporter actually on duty; and a third desk for the reporter who comes in to relieve him. Our gallery in the Legislative Assembly is about 11 feet long by about 5 feet wide. It is too small. The gallery should be at least 6 feet wide, so as to give ample space for passing, and 12 feet long. We have no difficulty in obtaining quotations, &c. When a member reads extracts we send him a printed form

(Taken at Sydney.)

THURSDAY, 24TH MAY, 1923.

Present:

Mr. GREGORY (Chairman);	
Senator Foll	Mr. Cook
Senator Newland	Mr. Jackson
Senator Plain	Mr. Mackay.
Mr. Blakeley	

George Vincent, Ventilation and Heating Engineer, sworn and examined.

asking that they be supplied to us, and he forwards them to us by a messenger. We should object to be on the floor of the House for the reason, amongst others, that we therefore should be disturbed by members coming to the table for papers, &c., and also by the conversations carried on. Coming to the work of transcribing our notes, I may say that we have three typists for each House. Each typist has a room about 10 feet by 8 feet, and these rooms are so close to the *Hansard* gallery that a reporter can leave the gallery and be at work with his typist in less than half-a-minute. In the rush of a *Hansard* reporter's work, a saving of even half-a-minute per turn is of importance. The transcription rooms should be as close as possible to the gallery. Subject to that condition, I see no objection to their being in that part of the building in which the press is housed. The rooms for the parliamentary reporters should also be close to the gallery. We have, on the Assembly side, one large room, 25 feet by 25 feet, which affords sufficient accommodation for eleven men. It is used by nine reporters, and a small part of it is partitioned off for the second reporter, Mr. Kay, who, when the Council is not sitting, works on the Assembly side. I have a separate room, and also a bedroom up-stairs. We have on another floor a rest-room for the staff. We find such a room very necessary, as we have, perhaps, more all-night sittings than any other Parliament in Australia. I think a small room to which, on such occasions, a reporter could repair and, turning down the light, obtain a little rest, should be provided at Canberra. It would give a man a better chance of obtaining a rest than he would have if he had to share a big room with a number of others. I think the principle of a rostrum for second-reading speeches and debates on important motions would prove satisfactory. I do not think it would lead, as has been suggested, to theatrical displays, or unduly long speeches. I rather favour the principle.

351. *To Senator Newland.*—With a roster of four a reporter has 45 minutes in which to transcribe a quarter-of-an-hour's turn. In that time he can generally complete his dictation, and may sometimes be able to revise his copy before he has again to go into the gallery. If he happens to get a very full turn, however, he is unable to do that, and his work accumulates. I have known a reporter to be at work for a couple of hours after the House has risen. He must have all his copy in the hands of the printer before he leaves. *Hansard* work is "rush" work, and I repeat that, in order to save time, the transcription rooms should be as close as possible to the gallery. It is absolutely necessary that each reporter should have a room in which to dictate his turn to a typist. Two men could not simultaneously dictate their turns in the same room. A large general room, in which the reporting staff can revise their copy, read proofs, and prepare their index, is necessary, as they have frequently to consult. Even from a gallery behind and a little above Mr. Speaker, it would be difficult for *Hansard* to hear him if there was a canopy over his chair. In our House there is no canopy. I am in favour of the placing of the Speaker's chair in the centre of the long, rather than the short, side of a rectangular chamber. In other words, if Mr. Speaker's chair were on the north, instead of on the west, side of the proposed new House of Representatives, as shown on the plan, members would be able to hear the presiding officer, as well as each other, better, and it would also be an improvement from the point of view of *Hansard*.

352. *To Mr. Mackay.*—I would object to a proposal to put my staff on the floor of the House. My objection to the location of the gallery in the Assembly is that we have members speaking from places under the gallery, and unless we stand up we cannot see them.

353. *To the Chairman.*—During the last fifteen years I have been engaged principally in installing efficient ventilation and heating systems in public and other buildings. The class of plant installed in any building depends, to a great extent, on the climatic conditions of the district. In Sydney and Brisbane the humidity is much higher than it is in other State capitals. In the ventilation of large buildings, particularly legislative halls, it is wise to provide for the removal of the moisture from the air before it is driven by the fan into the chamber. So far as I know, the principle has not been adopted to any great extent in this country. It has been discussed in connexion with the erection of many big buildings here, but the cost of the refrigerating machinery for de-humidifying has always been a stumbling block in the way of such an installation. I have installed plants in several large buildings in Sydney—the new Commercial Bank building, in Barrack-street, and Union House, among others—where modern ventilation systems are required; but in no case has the question of the control of humidity been considered. Each building is provided with an air-conditioning plant to wash and cool the air. We wash the air to take out the dust, and it then passes through an eliminating battery, consisting of a mass of corrugated plates reaching across the full width of the washing chamber. The air passes over these corrugations, which are kept wet, and the latent heat of evaporation is given off, the temperature of the air being reduced to, approximately, the difference between the wet and dry bulb thermometer which, in Sydney, on very humid days, is almost negligible. In Sydney, in very humid weather, an air-conditioning plant alone is of very little use for cooling purposes, but the washing of the air is done, principally, before it reaches the eliminating plates, by passing it through an atomized spray battery chamber. The water is sprayed at a high pressure so that a complete mist of water is created. The pathway of the air is through this atomized mist, and the whole of the dirt is thus removed from it. Should any be left it is caught in the eliminating battery. What I might describe as a kind of scrubbing process goes on there, so that any dirt that has escaped the atomized spray battery is caught and runs into the tank below. An air-conditioning plant is really very effective, and is practically a necessity in every ventilation system. The practice in vogue, years ago, of introducing the ordinary atmospheric air into a building, was not hygienic. In a well-known drapery establishment, in George-street, a white wall in the basement became perfectly black as the result of the introduction of air from the footpath level. The incoming air from the register, coming up against the white wall, made it black. Had the air been introduced from a higher level it would have been much better. On taking out that particular ventilation system I found in the duct at least 2 inches of fine, almost impalpable, powdered dust, and the dust-laden air had been sent through that system into the whole of the departments in the basement. A thoroughly effective and hygienic system is necessarily costly, and in this country, where the public idea of ventilation is still primitive it is difficult to induce one's clients to appreciate the fact that good value is

obtained from the outlay on such a system. In many cases where I am consulted the system of ventilation proposed is such that I prefer not to put it in. A defective system injures the reputation of the man who installs it, since as in the case I have just mentioned, instead of being useful it is a positive nuisance. The question of whether the passing of the air through a water spray adds to or decreases the moisture depends on the temperature of the water through which the air passes. In some cases an air-conditioning plant is required to provide humidity. In the case of a woollen mill, or textile factory of any kind, for instance, it is necessary to introduce moist air to rid the yarn or thread of its dryness. In such installation, two sets of atomized sprayers instead of one are required, and the water circulating through the sprayers is previously heated in order to add moisture to the air passing through it. By circulating water through an air-conditioning plant, at water-main temperature, which is usually taken at 60 degrees Fahr., the humidity in the air is not appreciably increased. If it is the moisture can be removed from the rear section of the eliminating battery. There are projecting lips provided against which the air strikes, and the entrained moisture falls into the tank below. I have made four or five big air-conditioning plants for supply of air to turbo generators for Newcastle, and the test as to moisture in those cases is a severe one. A piece of glass is held some 8 inches back from the eliminating battery, and should any moisture show on the glass the plant is not passed. That test proves whether or not excessive moisture has been added to the air. As to the efficiency of the plant from the point of view of removing all dust from the air the test is to throw 1 lb. of ordinary boiler soot into the spraying chamber and then to hold, at a distance of 8 inches from the battery, a cloth about 9 inches square, covered with honey or some other adhesive substance. If dirt of any description attaches to the cloth the plant is condemned, on the ground that its cleansing power is defective. All contracts provide for such tests, but in actual practice I have not seen them applied. A properly-constructed air-conditioning plant will extract 98 per cent. of the dirt, and with water circulating through the plant at ordinary water-main temperature the increase, if any, in the humidity of the air will be negligible. If on the installation of such a plant it was found that the degree of moisture was excessive the fault could be remedied. All that would be necessary would be to circulate the water through the atomized sprays, at say, 40 instead of 60 degrees Fahr. Everything, of course, depends upon the atmospheric conditions of the district in which a plant is installed. It is merely a question of added refrigerating efficiency to the water in order to take the heat out of the air. At Canberra, in winter time, the temperature might drop to 20 degrees; but even with a temperature of 32 degrees—freezing point—or at much higher outside temperature, it would be impossible for members to sit in the chamber, unless putting aside for the moment the question of heating, the air introduced for ventilation purposes was circulated above blood temperature. That would mean the circulation of the air in each chamber, for the purpose of ventilation, at about 80 degrees. The raising of the air to 80 degrees would not, in itself, remove the humidity. The air having been driven from the fan casing, through a system of ducts, and delivered through the registers would be pure and clean. It would be cool in summer or warm in winter, as the case might be, but one consideration would still be lacking. There must be some connexion between the temperature and the moisture of the room or chamber, and therefore, in a properly-designed ventilation plant the condition of the air, as to humidity or dryness, must be taken into account. In very dry winter weather moisture must be added. On a hot dry day in summer time, at Canberra, the air, in a House in which 80 or 100 members were seated, would

be altogether too dry. It would be necessary to add a slight humidity to the air as well as cooling; but provision would have to be made for a definite air movement in the chamber, so as to do away with the sense of drowsiness or lethargy which would otherwise arise. Thus, an effective ventilation system should provide for a definite movement of air currents, and a proper temperature and relative humidity. That presupposes, of course, that the air is properly distributed. Such a plant could be operated by any ordinary workman. In the best plants every operation is automatically controlled. Provision is made for thermostatic control. In the ventilation of theatres the accepted American practice is to carry the air in small streams through numerous registers under the seats, and at a low velocity. Four feet to the second is the standard velocity. The vitiated air is removed through the roof. I followed the American standard theatre practice in the case of the first picture theatres that I ventilated in this country, but I found that, in summer, there was very little result. I therefore changed over to side-wall ventilation—the American school-house system. Rapid improvements are being made in ventilation practice, and what was the practice ten years ago is obsolete to-day. Under the American school-house system the air is introduced into a building through the side walls, at a height of from 9 feet to 10 feet from the floor. The air velocity through the registers has been brought down to 300 lineal feet per minute. That velocity brings the air in a direct path into the centre of the building, and as it enters it drops down in minute sprays on the people. When its momentum is lost it falls to the floor. In order to make the system more effective it is necessary to have exhaust registers at the skirting level on the same wall through which the air is introduced. A centrifugal fan in the one case drives the air through the registers, and, in the other, removes it from the building. It is impossible to get a regular or constant pressure in any system of ducts, because the velocity of the air will drop in its pathway; but to compensate for that, the register openings are varied in size. The area of the inlet from the main duct to each branch is determined by the velocity at that branch. The lower the velocity of air required the larger you make the area of your ducts, and *vice versa*. The quantity of air that a pipe brings in in relation also with the velocity constitutes the area of the pipe. A ventilation system that submits any person to a draught is regarded as being positively harmful. In the case of a chamber 30 feet or 40 feet high it would be advisable to remove about one-third of the exhausted air through the roof. In connexion with side-wall ventilation it is considered that the only part of a building that needs to be ventilated is that within the respiratory zone. A blanket of air collects above the respiratory zone, and it should be removed. Its removal is secured by means of an exhaust system which permits of one-third of the air escaping through openings in the roof, or it can be got rid of by mechanical means. In many cases openings in a roof are more in the nature of inlets than outlets. Instead of the vitiated air escaping through the roof there is a rush of air into the building. In 99 cases out of 100 the ordinary 9 inches by 6 inches air bricks let into the walls of houses serve as inlets rather than outlets.

354. *To Senator Plain.*—A chimney in a room sets up a positive draught, and up to a certain point will act as an efficient exhaust system. On the other hand, a great deal of the oxygen in a room is drawn off by a chimney, so that the presence of chimneys in a house is not such a guarantee of healthy conditions as many imagine.

355. *To the Chairman.*—If the specific gravity or density of the air in a room were the same as that of the air outside there would be no movement. I once

put an anemometer on the sill of an open window in a clothing factory in Melbourne. It was a hot, dead day. There was no movement of air out of the factory or into same, because on each side of the open window the density of the air was the same. Had it been a winter's day there would have been a positive inflow as against an outflow of air, because of the greater density of the air outside. I mention this as illustrating the point that natural ventilation is most ineffective, especially when effective ventilation is most required. In winter the ordinary ventilation vents are inlets instead of outlets.

356. *To Mr. Mackay.*—The first consideration in providing for the ventilation of an auditorium is an equal distribution of the air. In other words, provision must be made for a proper distribution of air all over the chamber—To secure that care must be taken to have a sufficient number of inlets; the multiple of those inlets must be such as will allow a sufficient quantity of air to enter the building.

357. *To the Chairman.*—It is now held that a ventilation scheme, to be effective, must supply 30 cubic feet of air per minute to every person in such a building as a legislative chamber, or other large hall. I say, without fear of contradiction, that with a lower intake the efficient ventilation of a legislative chamber or theatre would be impossible. Some six months ago, in connexion with a lecture that I gave, I had occasion to look up the latest American ventilation laws, and found that there it was held that the minimum supply of air for effective ventilation was 1,800 cubic feet per hour per person. As a matter of fact, allowing for the exudation of CO₂ from the lungs of a number of persons in a hall or theatre, the intake, to secure ideal conditions of air purity, should be 3,000 cubic feet per hour per individual; but that would involve tremendous inconvenience in regard to the size of the air ducts, &c. There is, however, no gainsaying the fact that an intake of 30 cubic feet per minute per person is the minimum. That intake of air must be equitably distributed. In practically every large city in America samples of the air in public buildings are taken at a height of 4 feet from the floor, with 10 feet centres. These samples are submitted to chemical analysis, and if the CO₂ contents vary to any extent the ventilation scheme is not passed. Medical men say that an ordinary individual cannot sit in a draught of air at 60 degrees or under without subjecting himself to a considerable danger of getting a cold. The temperature of the inflowing air should not be below 60 degrees, or, preferably, 70 degrees Fahr. I would emphasize the point that air movement is also necessary. Whirling planes in a room act like a big fan. They do not change the air, but they stimulate the action of the skin. With excessive humidity in a room the skin does not act, and there is a sense of oppressiveness. A surprisingly large quantity of moisture is given off from the bodies, apart from the exudations from the lungs, of a number of persons in a room or hall, and unless that moisture is removed from the hall, or diluted, the atmosphere becomes oppressive. The movement of the air compensates for that, but in order to properly ventilate a hall there must be, not only washing and cooling or heating of the air, but complete control of humidity.

358. *To Mr. Mackay.*—A surprising economic loss follows from the failure to effectively ventilate a building in which a number of persons are employed. The best service is obtained from a staff employed in a well-ventilated building. As to the heating at Canberra I think that hot water radiation should be provided to warm up the buildings. A low-pressure hot-water heating system would be preferable to give the necessary warmth, but, in addition, there should be a ventilation system in connexion with which there should be warmth in the air, otherwise draughts would be created. No

system of ventilation in Sydney has yet supplied warm air during winter, the systems not being provided with heating batteries because of the expense. My firm is now installing a system of ventilation at the new Manchester Unity building in which the air supply will be delivered warmed during cold weather. A great revolution in industrial ventilation must take place in Australia. The loss of labour and of life, due to faulty ventilation, is enormous. Unless a man is working under the best hygienic conditions the best cannot be expected of him. Effective ventilation pays for itself in hard cash. I have not studied the plans of the proposed buildings at Canberra, but, in connexion with the cooking and catering arrangements, ventilation is absolutely necessary. Every committee room in the House, as well as the Library, should also be included in the ventilation, as well as the heating scheme.

359. *To the Chairman.*—The building will be heated, I understand, by hot-water radiators. To raise the temperature of a room in that way, without adding to the quantity of air in that room, or changing same, would be to create what I might speak of as stuffiness. The Library and committee rooms can be made healthy only by proper ventilation, and comfortable in winter, only by heating. There should be a good supply of air to the dining room, which is to accommodate 150 persons, in order to prevent odours reaching it from the kitchen close by. Without an efficient air supply system of ventilation the dining room would act as a sort of vacuum to the kitchen. I would drive the air in from the north side towards the kitchen. There should be a powerful exhaust system for the kitchen to carry off the cooking odours. During the last ten years hot-water heating has become general. It is odorless, and the warmth which it gives forth is more genial than that of steam, and not so dry.

360. *To Senator Newland.*—I saw last October the ventilation system recently installed in the telephone exchange at Collingwood. It is of the best design, and is of the class that I would advocate for the Parliament House at Canberra. Such a system, on a large scale, would constitute the most modern appliance for the ventilation and warming of the proposed parliamentary buildings at Canberra. There would be no difficulty in ventilating the smaller rooms. From a cursory glance at the plans it would appear that it is not a set of buildings for one large system of ventilation. One large system applied to the whole block would be both wasteful and ineffective. In order to give effective control and distribution I think three complete and distinct systems of ventilation would be necessary. Considerable waste is involved in carrying heated air over long distances. The three distinct systems would not involve greater running costs. I do not think the installation costs would be appreciably higher than the cost of one large system. Automatic working plants would be preferable. Experience shows that small systems are better than large ones. I ventilated the Commercial Travelers' Association building in Melbourne. A loss of power is involved in this building in working one large system. I have not investigated the plans, but think it would be advisable to break up the ventilation system. A low-pressure hot-water heating system could be easily worked from one centre. With proper insulation of the mains you could reasonably circulate your hot water for heating from the one central system. If the air, however, is circulated through sheet metal ducts above ground, or concrete ducts below ground for any considerable distance, there is much loss of heat. At Canberra, in winter time, it would be necessary to circulate the air for heating at a temperature of not less than 100 degrees as it left the heating chamber. Even then if it had to pass through very long ducts the radiation loss would be very considerable. By the time that it reached the extreme point of the service the drop in its temperature would be too great. Experience has shown that

it is unwise to circulate heated air under velocity to any very great length.

361. *By the Chairman.*—The chief difficulty in keeping a block of one-story, 840 feet by 440 feet, warm by means of a hot-water service from a central heating chamber, would be to prevent loss of heating by radiation from the pipes. To overcome that difficulty the work would have to be carefully and faithfully done. The insulation of the piping would involve much attention and expense. No great disadvantage would attach to the installation of separate heating systems. The water sent through the pipes to all these different buildings would have to come back to the boiler to be re-heated. In America a hot-water service is laid out even in townships. Five or six inch mains are put down in the streets, and the services laid on to every building. Payment for it is made on the basis of so many British thermal units, gauged by the quantity of water that passes through the pipes at a given temperature. Water so supplied is used for baths, sinks, &c. Cast-iron pipes, covered with asbestos, and finally sheathed in wood, are put down in concrete conduits, and provided that the insulation is kept dry there is practically no radiation from the pipes.

(Taken at Sydney.)

TUESDAY, 29TH MAY, 1923.

Present:

Mr. GREGORY, Chairman;

Senator Foll	Mr. Cook
Senator Newland	Mr. Jackson
Senator Plain	Mr. Mackay.
Mr. Blakeley	

John Sulman, Consulting Architect and Town Planner, recalled, and further examined.

362. *To the Chairman.*—The Advisory Committee has not, at any time, recommended the Minister to call for competitive designs for the proposed Parliament House at Canberra. We were informed when we took up our work that there was no legal obligation to carry on the competition that was inaugurated before the war, and revived during the course of the war. Our instructions were that the Parliament was to be installed at Canberra in the shortest time, and at the least possible cost. That entirely put out of court any possibility of erecting at once a big permanent building, or even the possibility of erecting, as has been represented by different architectural bodies, a portion, or sort of core, of a permanent Parliament House. We reported to the Minister that that, in our opinion, was not feasible. We expressed the opinion that the cost of erecting for immediate use a sort of core of the permanent building would be thrice that of a provisional building. If the core of a permanent House were erected the walls would have to be much thicker than those of a temporary building, and the internal finishings would have to be in keeping with those of the permanent structure. It would also be necessary to provide for a basement to form a satisfactory exterior. In other words the building would have to be raised up. A permanent building built flat on the ground would look undignified. Then, again, in a permanent Parliament House much greater accommodation for storage would be required than in the case of the temporary structure. Every Parliament House needs a big storage capacity. You have that in the present Federal Parliament House. We reported that, in our opinion, it was inadvisable to erect the core of a permanent Parliament House, because—

1. The cost would be thrice that of a separate temporary building, as—

(a) The walls would have to be much thicker.

(b) The internal finishings must be in keeping with the permanent building.

(c) The necessity of a basement under the main floor to form a satisfactory exterior as in Parliament House, Melbourne.

2. To build at present for houses of respectively 90 and 36 members, with all the other accommodation in proportion, will probably prove quite inadequate in the future, and need expensive and costly alterations before the building is completed.

3. The inconvenience to the members and staffs while carrying on future building operations would be so great as to drive them out of the building while these operations would be in progress.

4. It is impossible to plan a building in a fully satisfactory manner under the conditions originally suggested by Mr. Griffin, and supported by the Federal Council of the Institutes of Architects, of occupying the core while the exterior is added at a later date.

5. The loss of time in carrying out the above scheme would be at least one and a half or two years, even if confined to Australia, as the competition would have to be started all over again, and new conditions formulated as to accommodation, the evidence given before the Parliamentary Works Committee amply proving that those prepared by Mr. Griffin are quite inadequate. The time occupied in building part of a permanent building would also be much greater than that required for a temporary building.

6. Any building designed now would probably be quite out of date architecturally by the time—20 or 30 years hence—when it would be likely to be completed, as permanent administrative buildings would have to be provided meanwhile, and would absorb all available funds for many years.

Those are the reasons why we have recommended, and still recommend, a provisional building to serve 20 or 30 years, or whatever time might elapse before funds were available for the erection of a Parliament House worthy of the Commonwealth. I do not see any difficulty in the way of the erection of permanent offices before a design for the permanent Parliament House has been approved. Architectural styles, like other fashions, are constantly changing. The contention raised by the Federal Council of the Institutes of Architects that the permanent Parliament House should set the style for the whole city is wrong. As developments take place changes will take place, and the style of architecture adopted for Parliament House will be departed from. The grandiose styles suitable for a Parliament House are absolutely unsuitable for the smaller buildings such as cottages. I do not think it is necessary to refrain from erecting the permanent administrative offices on the areas allotted to them by Mr. Griffin until the design for Parliament House has been approved. Styles, as I have said, change, and as an architect of long experience, I think that an absolute uniformity of style would be monotonous, and by no means pleasing. The permanent buildings of the Commonwealth, whether they be built now or a century hence, should represent the best thought of the time. I see no objection to the immediate erection of permanent administrative offices. The general consensus of opinion on the part of the Advisory Committee is that permanent administrative buildings, which would be symmetrical with the future permanent Parliament House, could now be erected if funds are available.

363. *To Senator Foll.*—I would throw open the designs to competition. The Government have given a pledge that designs for any permanent building of a monumental character shall be thrown open to public competition. That has been agreed to by our Committee.

364. *To the Chairman.*—The temporary Parliament House at Canberra is to be a "provisional" rather than a "temporary" one, since it is to be constructed of brick. The word "temporary" would apply better to a building of fibro cement, iron, or weatherboard. Fifty years would be a fair life to allow the building, whether it be used as a Parliament House or for other purposes. By keeping the building in proper order, that period could be extended for a further terms of years. It will have, for the most part, 11-inch hollow exterior walls and 4½-inch, inside walls, so that it will really belong only to the cottage class of building, and 50 years is about a fair life for that form of construction. We did not assume in our report to the Government that the permanent Parliament House might be completed

within the next 20 years. We cannot forecast the future, but we do not think that the finances of the Commonwealth will be such as to justify the Government in proceeding with the erection of a monumental Parliament House—seeing that the provisional building will be a very workable and comfortable one—for at least twenty-five years or more, more especially as the permanent administrative offices will have to be erected before the permanent Parliament House. The idea of the Advisory Committee is, I think, that when the permanent Parliament House is built, the provisional Parliament House shall disappear. If, however, the country were labouring under a stringent financial position, it could be allowed to remain, because the permanent Parliament House, if erected on Camp Hill, in the position allocated to it by Mr. Griffin, would look over the top of the provisional building. The view from the permanent House would still be open, but instead of overlooking garden or ornamental treatment, with shrubberies and so forth, it would be looking over the top of the provisional structure. It is, after all, only a matter of aesthetics. I still think that the Camp Hill site is preferable for the permanent Parliament House, but I am going to modify to a certain extent the view I expressed on a former occasion. Since I was last before you the Advisory Committee has visited Canberra. On the occasion of that visit we gave special attention to this matter, because we gathered from the questions put to witnesses by members of your Committee, that there was a certain degree of feeling in favour possibly of the Kurrajong site. Mr. de Burgh was the only member of our Committee who was absent, and he has expressed approval of the decision we arrived at in the matter. We went up Kurrajong, looked at it carefully, gauged the quantity of rock that would have to be cut out, and considered the class of buildings which could be erected on it. Access to Kurrajong is rather steep, and we thought, on inspection, that it would be impossible to place in fairly close proximity to the Parliament House, if it were erected on that site, some of the more essential Departments, in respect of which there is close inter-communication. We thought the matter so important that Mr. Ross, Colonel Owen, and I went specially to Melbourne, because Colonel Owen had told us that Mr. Murdoch had prepared a sketch dealing with Kurrajong. Mr. Murdoch had, six or nine months before, suggested to us that it might be possible to do something with Kurrajong—that it might be possible to erect Parliament House on it. We went to Melbourne to see his sketch, and we did not approve of it. We think that the Kurrajong site would be inconvenient because the Parliament House, if erected there, would be detached very largely from the main body of the administrative buildings. We also think, as I mentioned on a previous occasion, that the site is very exposed to the wind. Still another consideration is that a Parliament House of three or four stories only would not be a good crowning of Kurrajong Hill, which is the very centre or kernel of the planning of the city. The main avenues all radiate from it. We looked at Kurrajong Hill from different aspects, and it seemed to us that any structure on what was intended to be the symbolical centre of the city, should be 200 or 300 feet high. In his original competition design, Mr. Burley Griffin provided for a kind of spire or steeple running up several hundreds of feet. Personally, I do not like the design, and Mr. Ross and I—the two architects on the Advisory Committee—came to the conclusion that unless a dominating building of very considerable height were erected on Kurrajong, it would not form an adequate radial centre for the main avenues. Anything less than a building of very considerable height would not be sufficiently dignified. I think I mentioned before that, as far as we could judge Mr. Griffin's intentions, the building was not to be for utilitarian needs of the Government. It was to

be a sort of commemorative memorial to hold the archives of the Commonwealth, and its erection was to be deferred until the Commonwealth had a larger population, and more money to spend. Mr. Murdoch proposed to cut 20 feet or 30 feet off the top of the hill. I give him credit for the ingenuity of his design. Judging by surface indications, we do not think it would involve quarrying into solid rock, but the grades of the approaches are not good, and there would have to be a lot of cutting and filling. One side of the hill is very steep, and there you would have a switch-back road. These defects might be overcome by the expenditure of a lot of money on banking up, but our conclusion is that it would be wiser to put the provisional Parliament House on the site unanimously recommended by us, leaving Camp Hill and Kurrajong open for the future to deal with. Other people may come along with different views, and it may be that, eventually, the permanent House might be erected on Kurrajong. For the reasons we have given, we do not think that would be advisable, but we want to leave the matter for decision in the future. Mr. Murdoch proposes in his sketch to put the provisional Parliament House on Camp Hill. That would make it no longer available for the carrying out of Mr. Griffin's scheme which, on the whole, I think is the better one. It is the one part of Mr. Griffin's plan of which I, and my colleagues also, really cordially approve. Later on, when a monumental Parliament House building was erected, the temporary building would have to be scrapped. It would be a provisional job quite out of harmony with the fine permanent buildings which, no doubt, the Commonwealth will erect as time goes by. I still hold the opinion previously expressed by me, that the Kurrajong Hill site would be very much exposed, and that the wind would be very badly felt. You tell me that Mr. Hunt has given evidence that the wind pressure at Canberra is less than in Melbourne. I cannot speak from my own knowledge, but I am told that complaint is made that the anemometer at Canberra does not register properly. We are making inquiries about it. Mr. Murdoch's sketch plan provides for the erection of a few of the administrative offices around the Parliament House if Kurrajong is chosen as the permanent site, but the bulk of them would have to be somewhere in the vicinity of the sites allocated to them by Mr. Griffin. Mr. Murdoch's suggestion would very materially alter Mr. Griffin's scheme. I read in the press that Senator Pearce recommended the erection of auxiliary buildings to the Parliament House for the use of members of both Houses. I do not know if anything of the kind is contemplated in the future, but the site below Camp Hill would be more suitable for these auxiliary buildings from the point of view of putting them in close touch with Parliament House, than would the Kurrajong site. The feeling of my colleagues is that it would not be feasible to call now for competitive designs for a permanent Parliament House, and then to call for tenders for the nucleus of a Parliament House, which would be suitable for the time being. We are strongly opposed to anything of the kind. I am sure it would take far more than twelve months to call for competitive designs, and to prepare the working drawings, invite tenders, and obtain a contract for the work.

365. *To Mr. Blakeley.*—It is ridiculous to talk of all that being done within six months. The time involved would be at least one-and-a-half or two years, even if confined to Australia, as the competition would have to be started all over again and new conditions as to accommodation, &c., laid down.

366. *To Senator Foll.*—Between one-and-a-half and two years would be occupied in calling for competitive designs and the preparation of the working drawings after a design had been accepted.

367. *To the Chairman.*—The alterations that the erection of the nucleus of a permanent Parliament

House would necessitate, as against what Mr. Griffin asked for, would involve entirely new plans. The sending in of competitive designs might have to be thrown open to the world, and you could not get a design within six months. All necessary data would have to be prepared. That alone would take at least nine months, and if the Government made proper arrangements the arbitration proceedings would occupy another two months. In addition, six months would be required to get out the working drawings. I do not agree with Mr. Henderson that all this could be done within twelve months. Those who express that view are very optimistic. Their desire is that the competition shall be carried out, and because of that desire they give you the most optimistic evidence. To provide for the temporary accommodation of the Parliament in the nucleus of a permanent building would cost three times as much as would a provisional Parliament House. To begin with, it would be necessary to build a basement such as would be required for the future permanent building, but which would not be necessary for a provisional building, and there would be all the inconvenience attendant on work being carried on in connexion with the completion of the building whilst Parliament was actually sitting. That would be fatal to the comfort of members and to their capacity to carry on business. As to the possibility of the work being carried on when Parliament was not in session I would point out that that would involve the dismissal of all the workmen when Parliament met, and their re-engagement at the close of the session. That would be a very costly process. I should not like to attempt to complete the building while the Parliament was sitting. I am absolutely opposed to the proposal to erect the nucleus of a permanent House, to meet present requirements, and to complete the building at a later period. As an architect in England I had to make alterations and additions to churches from time to time. Even in connexion with such buildings which are not in every-day use there is great difficulty in making additions, but in connexion with a Parliament House the difficulties would be almost insuperable. If competitive designs were invited the reports and plans of the Committee would be of assistance to competitors in determining the nature of the building to be erected. We, as an Advisory Committee, have not discussed the question of a permanent Parliament House. You and your colleagues could throw some light on the subject, but either my Committee or the Department would have to collaborate with you in setting out all the conditions. We have discussed the question of whether or not it would be suitable to erect a provisional Parliament House on the Knoll to the north of the permanent site, and to build at least a three-story administrative office to the north-east, because we learned from Colonel Owen that such a suggestion had been made. We came to the conclusion, however, that it would not be a very good proposal. It would be very unsatisfactory to erect a one-story building on the hill and a three-story building in the hollow. A lot of the administrative buildings will be of two stories, and they could not be placed in the hollow because, as permanent buildings, their foundations would have to be very deep. It would be necessary to go down to the existing foundation. The soil taken from the top of the hill would have to be put into the hollow, and permanent buildings could not be erected on made ground. We have discussed the matter carefully, and have come to the conclusion that our original recommendation should be adhered to. We have considered whether we could make use of the Knoll, but we adhere to our original opinion that it would be cheaper in the end to erect a temporary or provisional Parliament House on the slope of Camp Hill in front of the proposed site for the permanent building. For convenient administration the more closely we can bring the Parlia-

ment House into touch with the administrative buildings the better, and the more effective the appearance will be. If I were building for myself a house that was to be used for only 25 years, I would choose the site which the Advisory Committee has recommended where, as you say, there is a cutting of 10 or 12 feet, and no view whatever, rather than erect it on the Knoll. The cutting will screen the back quarters of the Parliament House—the kitchens, yards, store-room, &c.—which one would not wish to be seen—whereas, if the Parliament House were erected on the Knoll the back quarters would be visible. Moreover, on the Knoll, the winds are rather severe.

368. *To Senator Newland.*—I do not think that designs for the permanent Parliament House should be called now, if it is not to be constructed for fifty or sixty years. It is my decided opinion, as well as that of my colleagues, that it would be an absolute waste of money to call for competitive designs now, unless it was intended to go on at once with the permanent Parliament House. I understand that Mr. Griffin is very anxious that his original design should not be interfered with, and that his contention is that the building of the provisional Parliament House on the suggested site would materially interfere with his design. I do not agree with him. The erection of the provisional Parliament House, at the point suggested by us, would almost compel the Government later on to follow his design. The block of buildings proposed by us will not interfere to the least extent with his layout. The buildings are to be mainly of one-story, so that the outlook from the hill will not be interfered with. In our recommendations we are adhering to Mr. Griffin's layout, but Mr. Murdoch's proposal to put the Parliament House on Kurrajong would make that impossible. You say the question is whether or not we should spend £200,000 or £250,000 on a building which ultimately will have to be removed to permit of the construction of a reservoir. Our estimate of the cost is £174,000, and on the whole I and my colleagues think that our proposal is the cheapest, best, and wisest. We do not think it would be wise to recommend the Knoll site for the provisional House, even if the greater part of the building to be erected could be used for many years for other purposes. Mr. Ross gave special evidence on that point.

369. *To Mr. Mackay.*—Our instructions were to submit suggestions which would enable Parliament to meet at Canberra as soon as possible. Our recommendation is that a comfortable provisional Parliament House should be erected, and our scheme is such that when the Commonwealth is ready to erect a permanent House it can do so without any disturbance of the provisional House. Any attempt to erect the nucleus of a permanent building would lead to all sorts of inconvenience and expense in connexion with its extension. Another objection I have to that proposal is that, before 50 years have expired the Federal Parliament will be a far more important and numerous body than it is today. If a building were erected to provide for the present membership any attempt to convert it to the requirements of a much larger membership in years to come would involve a great deal of trouble.

370. *To Mr. Blakeley.*—The development of the Federal Parliament during the next twenty years will, probably, be unprecedented. I have a very strong impression that having regard to the desire of some of the States for subdivision, and the creation of new States, a Federal Parliament with greatly enlarged powers is almost inevitable, and will come, as you say, within the next twenty years.

371. *To Mr. Jackson.*—The sooner the Parliament goes to Canberra the better. I spoke of the difficulty of making alterations to church buildings. The same difficulty would occur in the extension of parliamentary buildings. The more complicated the organism, the more difficult it is to co-ordinate with other

requirements. It would be very difficult to harmonize present requirements with possible future needs.

372. *To Mr. Blakeley.*—I prefer the site below Camp Hill to the Knoll site and Kurrajong. From the point of view of both economy and convenience the Camp Hill site is the best for a permanent Parliament House, and that below Camp Hill is the best for a provisional Parliament House. The cost of a provisional building, no matter where it may be erected, will be practically the same except that, in the case of the Knoll site, additional expenditure for cutting away would be involved. We have selected the cheapest site. If the Knoll site were selected a large quantity of earth, &c., would have to be removed, and deposited on the side, which would mean a certain amount of disfigurement. It would be quite possible to adhere to the site below Camp Hill for the provisional House, and to erect permanent offices without interfering with the view from that point. The blocks north-east and north-west from the provisional Parliament House site, which have their axis east and west, could be used for the erection of permanent Government offices at the present time if it were decided not to erect temporary offices. The erection of two or three story buildings there would not interfere in any way with the direct view from the Parliament House. The direct view is axial northwards. I would put the permanent offices in the positions I have already indicated and explained to the Committee. Mr. Ross mentioned at our last meeting that he did not approve of Mr. Griffin's lay-out of this area, and suggested that a better lay-out would be obtained if the permanent administrative buildings flanked Commonwealth-avenue and Federal-avenue, leaving an open area for park purposes in front of Parliament House. I do not agree with that view. I do not know what is the opinion of other members of the Committee in regard to it, but I think it is only fair to Mr. Ross that I should state it. I would prefer the permanent administrative offices to be erected now. The erection of temporary offices in brick, in lieu of wood and iron, would mean an increased expenditure of 15 per cent. I think it would be better to have permanent offices at once erected. We would not recommend the building of permanent offices in the same position that we have chosen for temporary offices. I would adopt one or two of Mr. Griffin's permanent office blocks. The cost of erecting permanent administrative offices would probably be twice or thrice that of temporary buildings. I would suggest units on two sides in order to maintain the balance. So far as I know, all the members of the Advisory Committee still hold the view that the provisional Parliament House should be erected on the site below Camp Hill. Mr. Murdoch's plan, which we examined when we went to Melbourne, did not convince either Mr. Ross or myself.

373. *To Senator Plain.*—In the event of the powers of the Federal Parliament being widely enlarged, and its membership being greatly increased during the next 25 years, I think that it would be easier for the Government to extend a temporary building than it would be to extend a permanent building. The life of the building would not be affected. As soon as the permanent building was erected on Camp Hill the provisional building, on the lower Camp Hill site, should be removed if the Government could afford to demolish it. If, however, financial conditions were stringent the provisional building could be retained for administrative purposes for a term of years, since it would not obstruct, to any material extent, the view from the

permanent Parliament House. I do not think it would be an eyesore. Even if I thought that the permanent Parliament House would be erected on Camp Hill, within the next 30 years, I would not recommend that the temporary building should be placed on the Knoll. The selection of the Knoll site would be a cardinal mistake.

374. *To Mr. Cook.*—Having weighed the evidence I agree with certain views expressed by Mr. Murdoch, but disagree with him on other points. Mr. Murdoch is a most competent architect. I have the greatest respect for him, but it is possible for him, as for every man, to make a mistake. I do not think that the nucleus of a permanent structure should be erected on Kurrajong. I do not think Mr. Murdoch used the word "nucleus" in that connexion. I think he suggested that a monumental building should be erected on Kurrajong. I have come here specially to say, on behalf of Mr. Ross and myself, that we would recommend the erection of the provisional Parliament House on the site below Camp Hill, thus leaving Camp Hill and Kurrajong free for the people of the future to deal with as they think best. We consider it would be wise not to affirm any definite resolution now as to where the permanent Parliament House should be. We are giving expression to our own personal opinions, but we want to leave your Committee free. In the event of your Committee deciding to recommend that the nucleus of a permanent structure should be set up I would erect that nucleus on Camp Hill. If any witness has said that, at the most, another £100,000 would provide a structure that would form the nucleus of a permanent Parliament House, and would take the place of the proposed provisional building, I am sure he is mistaken. I am the Chairman of the Advisory Board. I do not know that Mr. Ross desires to be recalled. I think I have voiced all that he would tell you. There is, however, one suggestion he has made which he has not yet brought before the Committee. I refer to his suggestion that, if the plan is departed from, a stringing out of the administrative buildings along the two main avenues—the Federal and Commonwealth avenues—would be desirable. That is his individual opinion. It is not mine, nor is it, I think, the opinion of the remaining members of the Advisory Committee. I am sure Mr. Ross would be pleased to attend before the Committee if you would like him to do so.

375. *To Senator Foll.*—If our suggestion were adopted it would be quite possible to erect the permanent Parliament House on Camp Hill and to leave the provisional building on the site below Camp Hill, without fear of destroying the view from the permanent House. It would not obstruct the view of the permanent building from below unless one were close up to it. There would be no obstruction of the view from the river. Had Mr. Griffin's plan been carried out the lower Camp Hill site would have been used for a reservoir or basin of water and shrubberies. The temporary building, if desired, could be converted into administrative offices and retained for a certain number of years. Considerable alterations would, of course, be necessary. It would be more costly to erect part of a permanent structure.

376. *To the Chairman.*—Mr. Ross's proposal to erect the public offices along Commonwealth and Federal avenues would entirely alter the lay-out of the design. I do not agree with him. I do not think there are any aspects of this question outside my knowledge that Mr. Ross desires to put before the Committee.