

PRECIS OF THE SUBMISSION

BY THE N.C.D.C.

ON THE

NEW AND PERMANENT PARLIAMENT HOUSE

A COMPARITIVE STUDY OF  
CAPITAL HILL AND CAMP HILL AREA  
SITES

PRESENTED TO THE COMMITTEE BY:

SIR JOHN OVERALL

17th MARCH, 1969

GF  
725.11  
f  
OVE  
c.1

6

PRECIS OF THE SUBMISSION

BY THE NATIONAL CAPITAL DEVELOPMENT COMMISSION

on the

NEW AND PERMANENT PARLIAMENT HOUSE

A COMPARATIVE STUDY OF  
CAPITAL HILL AND CAMP HILL  
AREA SITES

PRESENTED TO THE COMMITTEE BY :

SIR JOHN OVERALL

17 MARCH 1969

Mr Chairman,

INTRODUCTION

I am very pleased to present this evidence and, in doing so, should like to refer to some of my colleagues from the Commission in the matter of any subsequent questions that the members of the Committee may put.

In the actual presentation of the evidence I would propose to give a precis of the submission which you have before you. At question time, however, I think it would be desirable for me to call upon one or other of my colleagues to answer those questions which deal with matters in the area of their own specialist professional concern.

As well as questions and answers which will come at a time to be decided by you, Sir, I should also wish to make available to you and the members of the Committee a tour of inspection of the sites and places to which I shall have made reference in my submission.

So, first of all, I should like now to request the opportunity to present to you personally members of the Commission's executive staff to whom I have referred who could help in the answering of questions if you so desired.

I should like to introduce:

/...Mr W.C.Andrews

Mr W. C. Andrews and Mr R. B. Lansdown,  
Associate Commissioners

Mr Roger Johnson, First Assistant Commissioner  
(Architecture and Civic Design)

Mr C. J. Price, First Assistant Commissioner  
(Engineering) and

Mr H. L. Westerman, First Assistant Commissioner  
(Planning)

With your agreement, therefore,  
Mr Chairman, it would not be my intention merely to read the pages which are contained in the document of evidence which has been distributed to Members, but rather to comment on the main points in it, understanding that the amplification of these points is contained in the full text which you have with you.

It is the Commission's wish to ensure that the best possible Parliament House is developed on whichever site is chosen. Parliament is the reason for Canberra's existence and its building must be pre-eminent. It must be clearly the major building and all else should be subordinate. If in fact all other development is to be subordinate to the new Parliament House and is to be related appropriately to it in a fine National Capital, then a clear and final decision is needed. Only in this way can all other action associated with the development of the central areas be undertaken so that the siting of the Parliament building is, in fact, enhanced.

/...It is hoped

It is hoped that a decision will be made on the site as soon as reasonably possible in order that complementary development of the central areas of Canberra can proceed and that indecision should not creep in. Obviously sufficient time must be made available for this and other evidence to be studied in appropriate depth by the Committee, but the Commission would urge that, if at all possible, a recommendation be made early, so that debate in both Houses of Parliament can go forward with a view to a decision on the site being available prior to the end of the Session. This would permit the planning and development of the central areas to carry forward without delay.

As I pointed out to you, Mr Chairman, in my introductory letter, it is necessary to plan the Parliamentary Triangle in recognition of the need to create a special quality in this environment.

In order to make a comparative study of the two sites it has been necessary to make an assumption about the size of the future Parliament House but this does not predetermine the architectural character of the future building.

CHAPTER 1

I turn now, Sir, to the first chapter of the submission which deals with the terms of reference.

The Joint Select Committee on the New and Permanent Parliament House met on 28 November 1968. The minutes of that meeting contain the following passage:

"The Committee agreed that the National Capital Development Commission be requested to prepare a comprehensive report on the alternative sites providing the Committee with all the available information which is of relevance to the question including such matters as the necessary alterations to traffic routes, sketch plans of the alternative areas showing the proposed new House and its relationship to other buildings, statements relating to or the arguments for and against the desirability of removing the present Parliament building and other buildings in the area, assessments of the remaining useful life of the buildings to be removed, maintenance costs of the present Parliament building and other buildings in the area and the scope for ornamental development presented by the alternative sites."

In conducting the analyses the Commission established a special project group to make a detailed investigation of aspects of the problem. The work of this group and of the Commission itself in the formulation of the statement of evidence has been aided by a wide range of reference material which has been available.

A study has been made of the documentation of the planning of Canberra and, in particular, of the location of the Parliament House, reaching

/...back to

back to the report of the assessors in 1912 on the designs submitted in the Canberra Competition.

Advice to the Commission has been available from the Joint Select Committee through the presence of Commission observers at earlier meetings of that Committee.

Mr W. C. Andrews, Associate Commissioner, was abroad with the Joint Select Committee in June 1968 to assist the Committee in its technical assessments.

Mr Roger Johnson, the Commission's chief architect, was also abroad from September 1968 in Europe and America on a series of discussions associated with the Commission's planning of the central area.

To work with Mr Johnson on central area planning, the Commission was fortunate to have the services available of Mr John Kirkpatrick of the firm of Skidmore, Owings and Merrill of San Francisco.

Mr Kirkpatrick has been recently involved in development proposals for the United States Government for Pennsylvania Avenue and The Mall in Washington and has an extensive background in civic design, architecture and landscaping.

In the following evidence references are made to the planning of the areas adjacent to the Parliamentary Triangle and Capital Hill and then to the general planning intention for the Parliamentary Triangle itself.

These references, I believe, are necessary preliminaries to allow the detailed analysis of Camp Hill and Capital Hill to be seen in full context.

I refer you to illustrations numbered 1 and 2 which show in general outline our thinking on the future development of the Capital Hill and Camp Hill sites.

## CHAPTER 2

The second chapter of the submission reviews the evolution of the Canberra plan extending over a fifty-nine year period from 1911 to 1969.

The chapter reiterates Walter Burley Griffin's theme for the Central Area and his evidence before the Parliamentary Works Committee in 1923 when he strongly opposed the building of the existing provisional Parliament House in front of the site he wanted for the Permanent Parliament House, which was Camp Hill.

His design is shown on illustration No. 3.

Events leading to the construction of the present Parliament House are detailed on page 5 and are familiar to you, and I don't think I need to go over this here.

Coming further on in history, you recall that the Senate Select Committee Report on the development of Canberra tabled in 1955 recommended

/...the Capital

Capital Hill site and in 1957 the then Sir William Holford visited Canberra at the Government's invitation and submitted a report.

In 1958 the National Capital Development Commission submitted its observations on the Holford Report and made three major recommendations which are set out on page 6. In regard to the Parliament House site the Commission's report stated of the lakeside site - and I quote - "The site is the only suitable one in the Parliamentary Triangle unless the present Parliament House were demolished." Unquote.

The Government of the day accepted these recommendations in July 1958 and authorised planning to proceed involving the lakeside site for Parliament House. The Commission planned on this basis for ten years until the matter came up for debate in Parliament in August 1968, and, as you know, the lakeside site was rejected and the alternatives of Capital Hill and the Camp Hill area were referred to this Committee for consideration and recommendation back to the Parliament.

CHAPTER 3

In chapter 3 I deal with the assumed user requirements for a New and Permanent Parliament House.

As I said earlier, this submission has been forced to make certain assumptions because no final decision is yet available on the size, let alone the site, of the New and Permanent Parliament House.

/...The

The existing building measures some 250,000 square feet gross and membership of the Parliament is at present 124 Members of the House of Representatives and 60 Senators. It is estimated the population of Australia at the year 2000 could be between 24 and 25 million people. Proportional increases in the membership of Parliament would take this figure of Members and Senators to 370. Again on assumption, it might reasonably be assumed that space requirements for Members and Senators to handle the increasingly complex legislative processes would increase proportionately. Allowing for present pressures for expanding this existing building we reached a figure in the order of 900,000 to 950,000 square feet gross as a broad appreciation of a space need which could develop over a period. This would be three to four times the size of the existing provisional building.

It is believed that this assumed building volume is reasonably consistent with information which this Committee has so far received.

It is important also to note that such developments would require parking areas for some 1,200 vehicles, including visitors' cars. Furthermore, a Permanent Parliament House merits a large scale setting predominantly landscaped with facilities for Members and Senators and public areas.

CHAPTER 4

In the next chapter, chapter 4, which begins on page 9 of the document, reference is made to the three buildings which could be directly affected by the siting of the Permanent Parliament House. These are East Block, West Block and the provisional Parliament House.

Appendices A and B contain in detail the advice obtained from the Department of Works, Canberra, and from the Valuations Section of the Taxation Branch of the Treasury on the future economic life of these buildings.

In brief, the office accommodation which East Block provides is generally of less than acceptable standards and the same may be said of West Block.

The provisional Parliament House has stood the test of time and is considered to be structurally sound. However, current immediate requirements for additional accommodation and equipment are estimated to cost \$2.5 million. The original building and extensions are illustrated on diagram No. 4 (which follows page 12 of the submission).

The total amount so far expended on capital works on this building, including the initial construction and additions made in 1947 and 1965 and a new roof being put on in 1958 is \$3.9 million.

/...Details

Details of individual items of expenditure on maintenance on this building are set out on pages 10 and 11 of this chapter as well as in Appendix A, but it should be mentioned that maintenance costs incurred by the Joint House Department alone have risen over the ten year period 1957-1958 to 1967-1968 from about \$30,000 a year to about \$50,000 a year. Recent assessments by the Department of Works on the need to replace electrical and mechanical items alone indicate a likely additional expenditure based on present day prices of \$100,000 in five years, a further \$350,000 in ten years and an additional \$500,000 in fifteen years.

Based on an estimated future life of 10 years for its present use and having regard to the Department of Works \$10.5 million estimate of present replacement costs, the expert valuers consider that the present value of Parliament House excluding land is \$2 million.

This value is at today's date and is based on existing use; but the value of the improvements could be significantly less if it is based on some alternative use.

CHAPTER 5

In Chapter 5 the evidence deals with the planning of areas flanking the Parliamentary Triangle and Capital Hill because, quite clearly, these contiguous areas are of importance to the final result and have to be studied in some detail to achieve an approach which is realistic.

I realise, of course, that all that is required is for the Commission to illustrate to the Committee possible land uses in these areas, understanding that these possible land uses may not, in fact, be the actual uses finally settled on.

I refer you now to illustrations 5 and 6 which define the areas studied in detail and which demonstrate the use to which land is currently put.

This chapter explains what already exists in the areas flanking the Parliamentary Triangle and Capital Hill and points up some of the developments which are already recognised as being needed.

The movement of traffic is, of course, very important in the planning of the Central Areas and the existing road pattern of central Canberra is based on the original Griffin plan - a concept formed before the motor car had become a major factor in town planning.

/...The current

The current plan for metropolitan Canberra envisages a desirable reduction of traffic pressure on the Central Area road system in two ways. One is the development of town centres in the expanding metropolitan area which most significantly reduces congestion and concentration in Canberra City and in the Parliamentary area. The other is a system of peripheral and separate freeway systems connecting outer town centres and Canberra City. This has the important function of allowing the internal roads to perform their original function of serving old Canberra and, importantly, the Parliamentary Area.

The chapter explains in detail the function of the major roads in the Parliamentary area and recognises the increasing demand for departmental offices and private offices to be readily available relatively close to the Parliament. This involves, to a significant degree, the use of the areas flanking the Parliamentary Triangle and Capital Hill and, I should say here, that the Commission believes that all development in these areas should recognise the fact that the future permanent Parliament House is the dominant element.

This has far reaching design implications because of the degree to which - depending on height - development of the alternative Parliament House siting would be seen from and overlook the whole of this outer area.

/...The Commission

The Commission believes that development surrounding State Circle should be of a controlled height with any tall buildings carefully located to preserve the views between them. The Committee's specific request for information dealing with (quote) "necessary alterations to traffic routes" (unquote) is dealt with in detail on pages 14 and 15 of this chapter. The main point emerging from our studies into this question is the confirmation of the earlier studies that the construction of the Capital Hill Ring Road should be proceeded with and that none of the alternatives for road connections with Capital Hill could compare with the Ring Road for its combination of flexibility, function, effectiveness and respect for the formal geometry of Griffin's plan.

The relationship between the Ring Road design and the alternative sites for the Permanent Parliament House will be referred to later in this submission.

## CHAPTER 6

Chapter 6, beginning on page 16, with important illustrations numbered 7 - 11, deals with the planning of the Parliamentary Triangle, including the Capital Hill area. The Parliamentary Triangle lies within boundaries established by Kings and Commonwealth Avenues and the Lake.

/...This

This chapter also takes in the Camp Hill area and Capital Hill but the actual siting and studies for the new and permanent building are dealt with in detail in the following chapters. It is axiomatic, however, that for the effective use of either of the alternative sites this vital sector of the environment to Parliament House should be both functional and aesthetically pleasing.

The functions which the Parliamentary Triangle and the Capital Hill area should be designed to serve would include :

- (a) Parliament House
- (b) National Centre
- (c) High Court
- (d) Central Government Offices
- (e) Open Space
- (f) Facility of Movement.
- (g) People such as tourists and other visitors.

As a general statement these conditions predetermine that the design of the Parliamentary Triangle area requires one of broad spaces and building relationships by the lake edge, rising in height and becoming narrower towards Camp Hill and as Kings Avenue and Commonwealth Avenue converge.

/...I should

I should say here that the planning concepts have a substantially common character whichever site for a permanent Parliament House is chosen, and the possibility of a group of National Centre buildings on Capital Hill seems to disappear in both cases. One of the common elements in both of these cases is that the proposed new site of a National Centre is as part of the group of buildings around the northern or lakeside part of the Triangle. The details of how both sites could be developed to accommodate the new Parliament are set out on page 18 of the text of this chapter and briefly they are these:

- . Camp Hill would be a broad platform containing parking and services for Parliament with pedestrian and vehicle access to the Parliament building which rises above this platform
  
- . The Capital Hill siting study is dominated by the vistas along the land axis being kept open and the completion of the Parliamentary Triangle composition being marked by an open amphitheatre built in the northern slopes of Camp Hill.

CHAPTER 7

Chapters 7 and 8 now specifically deal respectively with the Capital Hill site study and the Camp Hill area site study.

In dealing with the alternative sites it should be noted immediately that a broad cost appreciation leads one to the conclusion that a decision in favour of either site should not be influenced by costs. They are broadly of the same order for both sites.

Also both sites are able to accommodate a building volume of some 900,000 square feet which has been assumed, and each site has room for a notional expansion provision of a similar order. Space would be available for future growth over subsequent decades.

The illustrations numbered 12, 13, 14 and 15 deal specifically with the Capital Hill site being selected, and the associated and complementary use to which Camp Hill could be put is given in some detail on page 23.

The summit of Capital Hill is 175 feet above the lake surface and 75 feet above the summit of Camp Hill and is the geometrical apex of the

/...central

central triangle. Seven avenues radiate from State Circle and this broad pattern has increased the natural prominence of Capital Hill so that any building or group of buildings on its summit would be clearly seen from the major avenues.

Satisfactory road approaches to the summit of Capital Hill could be designed and I refer you to illustration No. 13. On page 20 of this chapter, details are given of the type of surrounding road and landscape development which we feel could be appropriate.

I must mention here one or two of the architectural implications which are inherent in the Capital Hill site.

Capital Hill is sufficiently dissociated from other development in the Parliamentary Triangle to be considered as a separate site which is independent of other buildings. The all-round nature of the site requires an architectural solution which is equally satisfactory when viewed from all sides. It also needs a treatment which will allow later additions that will not reduce the impact of the original design. The site is a formal one and will need very skilled and careful design.

/...Then,

CHAPTER 8

Then, as I said, chapter 8 similarly deals with the Camp Hill area siting study.

As I mentioned earlier, cost is not a significant factor in the merit of both sites as they are broadly of the same order.

An essential quality of Camp Hill is its visual integration with the rest of the Triangle. Camp Hill itself is the spur running from Capital Hill into the Triangle and the Hill itself merges very gradually into the adjoining areas. For purposes of this siting study the Camp Hill area has been defined as extending to King George Terrace, taking in the site of the provisional Parliament House.

As indicated earlier, Camp Hill would accommodate a building volume of some 900,000 square feet together with a notional expansion provision of a similar order, with room for further growth.

The illustration No. 20 shows the relative prominence of the two sites if a tall element were introduced into the architecture of the new Parliament House. Access to the Camp Hill site would be relatively simple and would allow road linkage with the major avenues and State Circle as well as from the road system within the Triangle which serves the Library, Government offices and the future High Court.

/...The

The directional character of the Camp Hill site - that is it has a defined front and rear elevation - would give a beneficial impetus to architectural design of the initial building and to subsequent extensions.

This chapter is illustrated by plates 16, 17, 18 and 19.

CHAPTER 9

I would now like to indicate to you, Sir, that Chapter 9 is an itemised response to the terms of reference established by the Joint Select Committee in its request to the Commission on 28 November 1968. With the permission of the Committee I will not read them here. But now as the main threads of the analysis contained in this submission are drawn together in the following chapter I think I should read it in full since it is, in fact, the general summation of the Commission's Evidence.

/...CHAPTER 10

CHAPTER 10

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

A decision on the siting of the New and Permanent Parliament House, in all probability, will be made on individual principle, reflecting the particular understanding of physical and philosophical requirements of Parliamentary purposes and national purposes.

There are advantages in and indeed a need for a determination of the siting question; it is also important in the context of the uneasy calm which has fallen over the development of the balance of the Parliamentary Triangle. The National Gallery building, buildings for major government departments, for the High Court, the Harold Holt Memorial, have been already held in abeyance pending the preparation of these studies.

The review of the Parliamentary area which was put in hand in January 1968 was very materially modified on 15 August 1968. The debate in the Parliament on the siting of the Parliament House commenced on that day, introducing a new set of conditions which affected the whole of the Parliamentary area. The final decision was that the Capital Hill site and the Camp Hill area should be assessed in the context of the present day requirements for the Parliament. During the debate, reference was also made to the possibility of the eventual demolition of the existing provisional Parliament building.

/...Arising

Arising from the debate in both Houses of the Parliament, the Joint Select Committee of the Parliament on the New and Permanent Parliament House was asked to undertake an enquiry into the two sites. From that request, this comparative analysis springs.

The Commission's task has not been to submit a final conclusion on one site as against another; rather to bring out in an objective way the inherent potentialities, opportunities and challenges posed by the two sites so that a Parliamentary decision could be made in the light of all the relevant material.

As an essential complement to these comparative analyses, the Commission moved into two additional conceptual studies. The first of these related to what is described in the report as the outer areas. These areas are the environs of the Triangle and Capital Hill, and were introduced into the study because of their increased importance with the move of a permanent Parliament House from the lakeside to one of the southward sites.

The second of these conceptual studies proceeded within the Parliamentary Triangle and Capital Hill itself. In addition to the work associated directly with studies of the siting of the parliamentary building, a major review of the broad land use dispositions and design concepts for

/...the

the Parliamentary Triangle proper has been brought to a broad conclusion.

In general terms, it has been established that for the Parliamentary Triangle, a notional design concept capable of staged development is available, providing a satisfactory background for the location of a parliamentary building on either Capital Hill or the Camp Hill area.

Turning directly to the detailed analysis related to the two alternative siting possibilities, early consideration was given to the existing provisional building. Authoritative advice has been available on the present character and maintenance cost of this building which cost initially \$1.5 million. It can be said summarily that the provisional Parliament House is in good structural condition reflecting the fact that during the course of its life, \$2 million has already been spent on maintenance and \$2.4 million in extensions. Some ten years from now, the building will enter a new phase of substantial maintenance costs.

An important consideration in forming a judgment on the provisional Parliament House is what appears to be its rapidly approaching inadequacy for the purposes of the Parliament. An estimate to meet present urgently needed additions is of the order

/...of

would be seriously reduced, while from the main floors of the new House itself on either Capital Hill or Camp Hill, that portion of the Triangle known as Parkes Place, between King George Terrace and the lake would be completely shut off from view.

The combination of these three considerations of increasing maintenance costs, rapidly approaching functional inadequacy and material impediment to views in both directions, has led to the conclusion that demolition of the provisional Parliament House could be only a matter of a decision about time. Obviously, the building could be retained for a period and there would be a judgment to be made on interim uses for the building and on actual dates of demolition, but it could not be conceived that the provisional building would remain indefinitely.

The Commission considered carefully the possibility that the existing provisional building should be incorporated in a new and permanent structure. This would have the apparent advantage of retaining the provisional building in perpetuity as part of a total design concept comprehending both the old and new portions. It would, by definition, avoid a decision on demolition. The Commission's view is that the advantages of such a scheme would, in the long term, be more apparent than real.

/...Incorporation

Incorporation of the provisional building would be a major restraint on the siting and architectural design of the new and permanent structure. Substantial expenditure would still be needed on internal renovation, reconstruction and re-equipping. In the Commission's view, incorporation of the existing provisional building in a new and permanent structure would not be a supportable economic proposal and would be a second class solution from the viewpoints of design, convenience and quality.

One of the matters mentioned during the parliamentary debate was that of traffic, and reference was made to the proposal to introduce a ring road within the circumference of State Circle. Alternative forms of traffic movement have been assessed therefore as has the impact which the ring road would make on major development on Capital Hill. It is the Commission's considered view that the ring road does not create a design impediment to a New and Permanent Parliament House on Capital Hill and, in fact, the proposed traffic system best fits into the parliamentary environment.

The essence of the comparative studies can be summarised briefly. Two sites have been available for analysis. Each is well located relative to the National Areas. Each is generous in dimension, provides ample room for continuing expansion, for

/...generosity

generosity in development and for imaginative architectural solutions. Either site provides a tremendous opportunity for a fine building.

The sites have some individual differences. The Camp Hill site has a directional character and this would seem to make it a somewhat easier task to establish a design of quality for a building which is complete in itself at the moment of occupation and must be capable of continuing expansion over the decades. Obviously, the expansion elements must sit harmoniously with the first stage central structure and should add strength to its architectural form. Camp Hill appears to present no special challenge in this respect.

The Capital Hill site, because of its all-round character, would require an architectural solution of a different kind; the building must present a fine appearance from all points of the compass, for the Avenues are not evenly spaced around State Circle. The design of a building in the round for continued expansion is a challenge which architects would have to meet. It would require superlative architectural talents.

Whichever of the two sites is finally decided on, Capital Hill and Camp Hill, taken together, have a shared functional and design purpose. This purpose is to provide for the Parliament building, a fine setting for it and for the location of

/...elements

elements of national and commemorative interest. The total area is large, some 150 to 160 acres. In the Commission's view, Capital Hill/Camp Hill can be considered as falling into two zones - firstly that zone which is related to the buildings, uses, expansion and convenience of the Parliament itself, and, secondly, the commemorative zone, described in this report as the Commemoration Gardens.

The siting studies already presented in this report illustrate the alternative locations for the Parliamentary Zone and the Commemoration Gardens, dependent upon which site for Parliament House is finally chosen.

The development of Commemoration Gardens offers also the opportunity for concepts of symbolic value to be developed. With a Capital Hill parliament site, the Gardens could be on Camp Hill. If Parliament were to go on Camp Hill, then the summit of Capital Hill, the virtual centre of the Gardens, could be developed with an architectural shaft or feature which would possess a limited symbolism on a geometric centre. The design of any structure on the high ground of Capital Hill obviously requires association with the design of a Parliament building on Camp Hill and, in the Commission's view, the design of these two elements could proceed ultimately as one exercise.

...There was

There was a strong and recurring emphasis on symbolism in the parliamentary debate. This appeared to be presented in two ways. There was the major emphasis on the symbolism offered by the concept of a fine building mass located on a topographical eminence viewed readily from the avenues and from the City at large and possessing the quality of dominance.

There was another concept, the view that Parliament should be seen to be involved with public activity; this was a concept of association with the whole Seat of Government, as opposed to the separation underlined by a Capital Hill location.

A common element in both concepts is the idea of visual eminence. The Commission has studied, therefore, the possible requirements for a parliamentary building. It has studied the visual impact of a building of this general functional character and volume as it might be located on Capital Hill or in the Camp Hill area, and has concluded that in terms of visual eminence, every opportunity exists on each site to create a strikingly impressive visual feature. Insofar as symbolism is related to visual eminence, adequate opportunities for a satisfactory form of development exist.

An appropriate way to sum up the studies on visual eminence and symbolism would be to comment

/...that the

that the Capital Hill site is dominant, detached and obvious. The Camp Hill site is prominent and is associated with other development in the Triangle and with general public activity. Visual eminence is assured in either siting.

A New and Permanent Parliament House on Capital Hill has a self evident location and symbolism; a New and Permanent Parliament House in the Camp Hill area is the culmination of a complex which possesses its own symbolic quality of a different kind. This is the symbolism of association.

\* \* \* \* \*

Sir Alister -

That concludes this part of the Commission's presentation of evidence. I suggest that, if you do not have other matters which you would wish to deal with immediately, it would be most helpful, to finish the actual presentation, if the Committee would join Mr Andrews in an hour's tour of sites and places to which specific reference has been made in the submission.

As I said, this would take approximately an hour to cover.

/...I understand

I understand that it would be your wish, after lunch, to have questions put by the Committee to me and my colleagues for reply - and this we should be very happy to do.

If I may, I should now like to ask Mr Andrews briefly to outline to the Members the proposed procedure for the next hour or so.

\* \* \* \* \*