

SENATE SELECT COMMITTEE ON THE PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT
OF CANBERRA.

MINUTES OF EVIDENCE

Taken at Canberra.

TUESDAY, 15th February, 1955.

PRESENT:

The Chairman (Senator McCallum)

Senator Benn

Senator Hanneford Senator Wood

Senator Ryan

WILLIAM ERNEST DUNK, Chairman, Public Service Board, Canberra,
sworn and examined;-

THE CHAIRMAN.- I think we have all read the statement that
you have presented to us. Do you wish to table the statement?

MR. DUNK.- Yes, Sir. I have not brought copies of it with
me but the Secretary has some copies.

THE CHAIRMAN.- I think we can proceed from that basis.
You believe that the central departments, the head office of every
department, should be stationed in Canberra?

MR. DUNK.- Yes, I am firmly convinced that that should be so.

THE CHAIRMAN.- And I gather from your statement that you
also believe that the division of head offices between Canberra, Sydney
and Melbourne and other places is wasteful in time and money?

MR. DUNK.- Yes, it is that, but more importantly, it is
a break in the wholeness of your administration. It is a weakness in
all your co-ordinating points of administration.

THE CHAIRMAN.- I wonder whether you could give us a
concrete instance of the sort of thing that you mean. In order to make
it plain?

MR. DUNK.- You get your most obvious example, I expect,
when the budget is under consideration in both Houses.
The estimates, as you know, come up and are departmentalised. There is not
any clearly arranged programme, nor is a clearly arranged programme
possible on the debates and you do not know, from the departments'
point of view, within any close date just when your particular estimates

SENATE CANBERRA COMMITTEE

will come up for debate. A Minister wants his head of the department and usually his Chief Finance Officer while that debate is in progress. As a consequence, you have the head of a department, usually the Chief Finance Officer and maybe other officers interested in sections of estimates here from Melbourne departments waiting until their estimates comes up. Sometimes that may be for days, or even a week or more. When their estimates are clear, they go back to Melbourne, or they may have to dodge down, and come back again if the estimates debate is delayed.

Then the process is repeated in the Senate when the budget is under consideration in that Chamber. That is possibly the clearest example, but there are all sorts of other matters within departments where you need to have your conferences and committees. That means, when a conference is located in Melbourne, that people here must go to Melbourne; or if the conference or whatever it may be is called on here, the Melbourne people must come here. That goes on all the time. It is so constant that it is rather difficult just to isolate cases.

THE CHAIRMAN.- I think you have given an excellent instance. I know from experience in the Senate that if we are conscientious and wish to spend time on discussing estimates, we know that we are keeping officers from Melbourne from any other duties.

MR. DUNK.- Yes, that is true.

THE CHAIRMAN.- Do you want to say any more on that aspect?

MR. DUNK.- No, I do not think so, except just to make one point if I can, and that is that when you speak of a central office of a department, it is an organisational whole that controls that department. Everything that is now organised as a central office in Melbourne does not necessarily have to do with a central department. Your final determination of that matter would only result from very careful organisational review, where you go through the whole functions of the department and how it is organised, and then you decide what you bring here and what you may peel off and leave in Melbourne. That can only be done as you get some firm decision on the departments that are coming, and some rough programme of when

they come. As the pattern emerges, that joint organisational review will be done by the Board and an agreement will be reached between us and the Department on just what is the content of the central administration which will come.

THE CHAIRMAN.- But to bring the head office - to use a convenient term - to Canberra would not mean increasing the number of public servants?

MR. DUNK.- No.

THE CHAIRMAN.- It might even mean a reduction in the number of public servants?

MR. DUNK.- Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN.- You told us in your statement that there was a plan for the transfer of departments to Canberra, and that it was put forward by an inter-departmental committee in 1947 and that it was endorsed by Cabinet. I should like to ask a few questions on that matter. Do you know who sponsored this committee?

MR. DUNK.- The then Minister for the Interior sponsored it on the letter which I wrote to him in 1947.

THE CHAIRMAN.- Who was the Chairman of the Committee?

MR. DUNK.- The Chairman of the Committee was Mr. Carrodus who was then Secretary of the Department of the Interior.

THE CHAIRMAN.- Do you know whether any cabinet since then has done anything to carry out that policy?

MR. DUNK.- There have been a number of decisions of cabinet usually dealing with some angle of the policy. The whole policy, to my knowledge, has not been under review by cabinet. It has always been taken that it is concrete policy.

THE CHAIRMAN.- Do you know whether all departments were advised of the cabinet decision endorsing the policy?

MR. DUNK.- Specifically, I could not answer that question. The fact of it was published in the Board's report at the time. I think the departments are aware of it, whether they have had specific advice or not.

THE CHAIRMAN.- Was any one department given the task of co-ordinating or trying to get the policy carried out?

SENATE CANBERRA COMMITTEE

MR. DUNK.- Yes, the co-ordinating authority for the construction programme of Canberra is the Department of the Interior. The constructing and building agent is the Department of Works. The main point of liaison and control in a departmental way would be the Public Service Board. We would determine what the organisation would be and the staffs which would come, but everything else in terms of physical requirements for them here would be the responsibility of the Department of the Interior, their job being to get the works programme accepted which would embrace all that requirement. Having done that, the rest of their job would be to get requisitions to the Department of Works to build the things in the programme.

THE CHAIRMAN.- Would you, as the Chairman of the Public Service Board, be under any special obligation or responsibility with regard to that policy?

MR. DUNK.- No, only the responsibility of reporting what we think should be done. We have no executive responsibility.

THE CHAIRMAN.- You report direct to Cabinet or to the Prime Minister?

MR. DUNK.- In the ministerial sense, the Prime Minister is the Minister in control of the Public Service Act....

THE CHAIRMAN.- So you report to the Prime Minister?

MR. DUNK.- Report to the Prime Minister, with the variation to that statement that under a spread of ministerial responsibility, I go a good deal to the Vice-President of the Executive Council. But as far as the Board is concerned, the Board is a statutory authority under its Act and its reports go from it to Parliament.

THE CHAIRMAN.- Yes we read them -

SENATOR HANNAFORD.- Sometimes.

THE CHAIRMAN.- We read fairly conscientiously the reports of the Public Service Board. Did that Inter-Departmental Committee continue to meet?

MR. DUNK.- Yes, through 1948 and 1949 and I think through 1950. I could not tell you when it ceased to meet but from memory it would be the end of 1950 of thereabouts.

SENATE CANBERRA COMMITTEE

THE CHAIRMAN.- Was it formally ended, or did it just die out?

MR. DUNK.- It just sort of faded away.

THE CHAIRMAN.- Did it make any final review or recommendation?

MR. DUNK.- No, I do not think it ever presented a report.

The work of the Committee, as I have said, was more or less done at that point of time. It had brought into discussion quite a number of things in connection with the Canberra programme. For example, it started off with a transfer programme which is the one to which you refer, and it dealt with a suggestion of ours that something should be done to examine the municipal management of Canberra. It dealt with what was then, and still is to some extent, a lack of good shopping facilities, and it also dealt with a number of amenities matters, including tourists, and quite a few things of that sort. It dealt with rentals and building costs in the calculation of rental, which is a Treasury responsibility. It even dealt at one point with the taxation of leaseholds but never to any point of finality. All it could do was to pass its suggestions on to the Treasury and the Taxation Department.

MR. DUNK (Continuing). - ~~Of course~~, I would say that most of the important things have been dealt with to some degree by the committee. I would not have thought that it had much work ^{left} to do but on the other hand I would have thought an occasional meeting would have been useful to discuss details of the programme and perhaps to lay emphasis on this or that weakness in it. However, that just did not happen.

THE CHAIRMAN. - There is no such inter-departmental committee today?

MR. DUNK. - There was one that followed that committee and dealt with priorities of buildings. It was established by Cabinet on the submission of the Minister for the Interior. That was about 1951-52. It was a committee of the Department of the Interior, the Treasury, the local Director of Works, and myself. It dealt with the programme and priorities within the programme but it never was a very effective agency on priorities. The main reason for that was that all it could deal with really was the Government side of the programme whereas the real points of priority relate to other competing agencies such as the defence forces at Duntroon, Fairbairn and Harman, the C.S.F. I.R.O., the Australian National University and so on which are ^{included in} the total Government programme and extend beyond departmental control.

THE CHAIRMAN. - The Minister for the Interior is the man who has the major responsibility to Cabinet and the Parliament for the programme in Canberra?

MR. DUNK. - Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN. - What is your major responsibility as Chairman of the Public Service Board in the development of Canberra?

MR. DUNK. - Just the very broad and general responsibility placed on the Board under the act for the proper organisation and efficient operation of the Public Service.

THE CHAIRMAN. - In carrying that out, the person you deal with mainly in Cabinet is the Prime Minister?

MR. DUNK. - Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN. - But you would have direct access to any

Minister whose work was concerned with y a responsibility?

MR. DUNK. - Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN. - When the Board makes representations or recommendations in its annual report, just what happens? Is it anybody's responsibility to see that they are discussed, say, in Cabinet or by Ministers?

MR. DUNK. - No, I do not think so. That is a matter for the Parliament. The report is made to the Parliament. It is tabled at each House of the Parliament and there is a motion that the report be printed which lays the report open for debate. Anything that emerges from that would either be something which arose from the parliamentary debate or something that one of the Ministers might take up.

THE CHAIRMAN. - The responsibility is primarily on the members of Parliament?

MR. DUNK. - Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN. - So, if the matter is neglected, we are as much to blame as anybody else?

MR. DUNK. - Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN. - Last year, I believe, you made a recommendation that specific instructions should be given to the Department of the Interior to embark on planning in close consultation with the Public Service Board and interested departments. Do you know whether that led to anything?

MR. DUNK. - Yes. It has, it has not led to anything that has been directed from Parliament or anywhere else. The purpose of the ^{recommendation} instruction was to emphasize the importance of detailed planning in the move of the departments. The idea was that there should be an organizational review and a staff census taken by all the departments to find out what exactly was involved in terms of dependants, housing accommodation, hotel accommodation, office accommodation and so on. What has happened, I think, is that the Department of the Interior is well aware of its position in the scheme. We have had every department that might be involved in this transfer appoint a liaison officer within the department who can

SENATE CANBERRA COMMITTEE.

talk to us and plan in conjunction with us and the Department of the Interior. In Defence which is a big group and a rather complicated organization, we had a working committee set up through the Minister for Defence to make a survey of the staffing of the whole group of the Defence departments. I saw the ^{Secretary} Minister for Defence and asked him to get a working committee ^{approached the Minister who} going and he agreed. That is an inter-department committee embracing all departments. Its report was recently furnished and I should think it would be available to this committee. These things are going on inter-departmentally. So, I am not concerned that the recommendation is ~~not~~ progressing.

THE CHAIRMAN. - You have said in your statement that the slowness in carrying out the scheme is due to shortage of manpower, lack of funds, and lack of appreciation of the importance of the scheme. That is a long-term view. Which of those factors would you consider to be the most important?

MR. DUNK. - Fundamentally, it is a matter of resources of men and materials and the money to use them. Because of a lack of men and material or the money to use them we have not accomplished the essential first step of getting Canberra ^{as it exists} itself balanced out. When this idea of programming first started we had a waiting list for houses of approximately 1,000, That is an internal waiting list in Canberra. It is now something like 2,500 and we are getting further behind instead of ahead.

THE CHAIRMAN. - Do you think that labour needs any special incentive or inducement to come here or is it just the general shortage throughout Australia?

MR. DUNK. - My impression is that at present, the building industry is going through another period of stress and excessive competition for the rather slender resources. The tragedy is that, at a time when resources were becoming fairly easily available, the programme here became restricted. Had we been able to sustain the effort that we had built up by the end of 1951 or early 1952 we would have stabilised the labour force but you cannot stabilise labour if you have a programme that is up and down year by year. Just what can be done to stabilise labour, I find it hard to say. There is one

SENATE CANBERRA COMMITTEE.

incentive which I regard as completely essential to any stability of labour and that is housing. If you can provide houses for your labour, by and large, you will get it. . That is recognised in all the areas under our control and particularly in the Territory. But what ^{other} kind of incentive and what degree of ⁱⁿ ~~incentive~~ ^{are} required I find it hard to ~~know~~. I put housing first. After that possibly would come some zone allowance if housing proved an inadequate incentive.

THE CHAIRMAN. - Do you agree that we should not be deterred from building houses in Canberra by the argument that we are competing with the States for non and material?

MR. DUNK. - It is a matter of whether you force your position or surrender it.

THE CHAIRMAN. - It would be fair to put it this way: By providing houses in Canberra to accommodate people transferred from the other capitals we are, in effect, making additional accommodation available in those capitals?

MR. DUNK. - That is true, but one of the big influences in the present situation in the building industry is the re-commencement of the construction of substantial city buildings. There has been very little such building done in Australia since 1939 and the lag is now being tackled. There are all sorts of plans and projects for new buildings under consideration.

THE CHAIRMAN. - But those buildings will also demand an increase of housing?

MR. DUNK. - Yes, but they are detracting from the building pool. That pool is not increasing, at least not dramatically.

THE CHAIRMAN. - Can you make any suggestion as to how you could increase the building pool? / ^{the} ^{Government} ^{has} ^{set} ^{up} ^a ^{top} ^{line} governmental committee on apprenticeship ^{and} ^{its} ^{relation} ^{to} ^{the} ^{matter} in some degree recently. I would say there are two ways to do it: One is through apprenticeship and the other is through immigration.

SENATE CANBERRA COMMITTEE.

THE CHAIRMAN . - Suppose it were impossible to get enough houses. Will you give an opinion on the use of cheap temporary housing, pre-fabs or things like that?

MR. DUNK . - Our experience has been that it is not cheap. Our prefab experiments have been neither cheap nor really satisfactory. But the pre-fabs did fill a gap when materials were so desperately short. If we had not used that means, we should not have had the houses at all. I should say that, given a reasonable supply of basic building materials, you should build in an orthodox way.

THE CHAIRMAN . - Would you go so far as definitely to recommend against having pre-fabs or temporary buildings at the present time?

MR. DUNK . - If your ability for orthodox building is good, yes.

THE CHAIRMAN . - In your paper you refer to home purchasing. Do you think that would be encouraged by raising the loan limit beyond the present figure, which I think is £2,750?

MR. DUNK . - I do not think there is any doubt about it. It depends how high you raise it. I believe the cost of the average normal smallish house here is of the order of £4,000. As a normal thing, your public servant just has not got £1250. Some could save it or raise it, but in general the ordinary public servant just cannot afford the deposit. Therefore, he does not buy his house. Of course, the thing is tied up with a lot of other points of economic policy. But just taking the single business of selling houses to your tenants, you will never sell them in important numbers if you do not give them more or less a full advance. Again taking it only on the single point of that as a line of business, there is very little - in fact no risk in it. The house is still there. Your tenant is employed by you, and you deduct his instalments from his pay. You could separate the sale of houses in Canberra from the question of how you limit advances to the States and that sort of thing, which is a matter in which the Treasury is concerned, there would be no risk as far as I can see, in increasing the housing limit for Canberra. But I know perfectly well

that it is not easy to get away from these other influences.

SENATOR HANNAFORD . - You agree that special circumstances apply to Canberra? The public servants in Canberra are in a different category from men whose employment is perhaps less certain?

MR. DUNK . - That is the only way in which you could justify a departure from the general rules and general standards that apply throughout Australia. They are our people, and we employ them. In those circumstances, I suppose it could be argued that we are entitled to give them special conditions that do not apply generally.

THE CHAIRMAN . - There is one sentence in your paper to which I shall refer because it bears on one of the most important things we have to find out. You say, "It is for the Public Accounts Committee responsible for construction to have a clear authority to spend a high level of expenditure on a programme based over a period of years rather than to have to rely on the fluctuations and uncertainty of annual budgets". Do you think it is possible to have that sort of thing under a Parliamentary system. - to give an authority money to spend over a period of more than one year?

MR. DUNK . - I should not like to be regarded as an expert on that. The Public Accounts Committee is working rather the other way. I should think that Parliament could do anything it wants to do.

THE CHAIRMAN . - The tradition is that that is the great safeguard of Parliamentary and democratic Government. It is a matter that we shall examine very fully. If you have any opinion on it, I shall be happy to hear it.

MR. DUNK . - I have no doubt whatever that when you are up against this sort of project, that is a basic necessity. It is not just a matter of spending money; it is a matter of committing yourself to expenditure. That is where you run up against the difficulty of doing something which has not been authorised and voted by Parliament. Parliament votes money, but this is a matter, not of spending money now, but of entering into commitments for which money will be required some-time hence.

SENATE CANBERRA COMMITTEE.

THE CHAIRMAN . - Do you think that voting money into trust funds would be justified in such a case?

MR. DUNK . - It is a technique. A trust fund is supposed to be a sort of revolving fund that rejuvenates itself. That would hardly be the position in Canberra. There would be a little money coming into your trust fund from rental, house sales and that sort of thing, but in the main it would be a matter of so many millions of pounds that had to be voted year by year and put into the trust fund. So I do not think you would get a much different result from the use of a trust fund.

THE CHAIRMAN . - More than one witness has referred to the type of authority given to corporations in Great Britain engaged in town building. I understand that they call it project budgetting. I understand that they vote money for a particular project which will extend over a period of years and that they give the authority power to spend that money. Can you offer us any advice on that matter? Have you any knowledge of it?

MR. DUNK . - My knowledge is very limited. As I understand the matter, these authorities in the United Kingdom have power to sell or lease land, put up premises and enter into arrangements with businesses for the tenancy of them. Apart from grants, they have a substantial incoming general revenue. However, I should not like to pose as having very much knowledge of the matter.

THE CHAIRMAN . - If such a proposal were put forward for the building of Canberra, how would you view it?

MR. DUNK . - As long as two things were certain, you could develop that sort of thing. The two things that must be certain are programmed funds and executive authority. If you have properly programmed funds and executive authority, you can do a good job of building or developing anywhere. But we lack both of those things. The executive authority is never nicely parcelled out or clearly explained. All sorts of side influences come into the execution of a job.

THE CHAIRMAN . - Do you think it would be possible at this stage to put all the major things connected with the development of Canberra

under a single authority which would be subordinate, not ^{to} a number of departments or ministers but to only one minister, and which might be given a commission directly by Parliament? Do you think that would be possible?

MR. DUNK . - Yes, it is possible, I should think that a move back to the old commission concept would be difficult at the present time, ^{but} it would be possible to create a works authority here under one or other of the Ministers. Whether that would be necessary would depend a good deal on how you programmed. If your programme were quite clear and if the authority of the Executive agents to commit themselves to expenditure were clear, it is doubtful whether you would need a separate authority. If those things were not clear, it would be no good having a separate authority, because the authority would be just as limited by the procedures as the departments are now.

THE CHAIRMAN . - It comes to this: you want a balanced programme of development. Would you say that, at the present time, there are difficulties in the way of getting such a balanced programme because a number of departments are responsible?

MR. DUNK . - Yes, to the extent that this funds fluctuation is a limiting factor, which it is. I should not like to say that, if you could overcome that difficulty, the departmental system could do the job. It has never really had a chance. I should think that, given a clear authority to make commitments, the present system will do its job. The question then is how much money would be required? My own impression, taking the housing end of it, is that you would need to build up a work force and a staff force - you have got to have your professional and administrative people behind it - for about 1,000 ^{houses} a year. I do not think you could do much better than that. An extra 1,000 a year would mean so many extra people, so many schools, and so many other things. The calculation could be made quite easily. That sort of programme could be devised and fairly easily costed. The spread of it could be determined. If we knew that we could build, say, 1,000 houses next year and maintain that output, there would then be no mystery about when other departments

SENATE CANBERRA COMMITTEE.

would come here. We should know when we could move them.

THE CHAIRMAN . - I believe that, in general, our departments do work well together. But suppose two departments responsible for the development of Canberra were not working well together. Whose responsibility would it be to secure a proper working liaison between them?

MR. DUNK . - I suppose the primary responsibility is with the Minister for the Interior. If he were not getting his job done, presumably he would take whatever steps occurred to him through Cabinet.

THE CHAIRMAN . - He would have no remedy except to take the matter up with Cabinet?

MR. DUNK . - Or with the other Minister

THE CHAIRMAN . - I am referring to the event of a clash of Ministers. Have you any definite recommendations about co-ordinating the activities of departments?

SENATE SELECT COMMITTEE

MR. DUNK.- No, I have not. The thing would work. As I say, you get that clear programme and you get executive responsibility. I think the job can progress. We can handle all the administration co-ordination that is necessary. We are well along the way with that.

THE CHAIRMAN.- Canberra is in a unique position in that it has neither State nor municipal authority and it might be said that the citizens of it do not have the ordinary right of self-government that other Australians have. I understand that the Board has some ideas that it submitted to the inter-departmental committee in 1949 about self-government on a municipal level.

MR. DUNK.- Our view then was, and still is that management of the city is a function which is outside the normal departmental functions and that management should be transferred from departmental to municipal authority at whatever time is appropriate. That is not true of course of the broader activities of Canberra. There is quite a lot of State activity which must go on. There is for instance the responsibility for a basic plan. But the sheer business of managing the city which includes such matters as the provision of garbage removal services and so on is far better done, in our opinion, if that responsibility is concentrated on people whose job it is to do just that. I think that that is also the view of the people of Canberra. The only question that arises is what is the appropriate time to do it. You will always have to have your departments and to subsidise your municipality. The spread of Canberra is so great and the population is so comparatively low in density that I think the municipality would always have to be subsidised.

SENATOR WOOD.- Could that subsidy be by way of payment of rates on Commonwealth property?

MR. DUNK.- It could be. The whole thing rests on the municipality getting the appropriate amount of money to do its job.

THE CHAIRMAN.- Do you think that municipal government could be established in Canberra at the present time?

MR. DUNK.- I am not an expert on that question,

SENATE CANBERRA COMMITTEE

but people who have studied it more closely than I have think the time is not ripe for it.

THE CHAIRMAN.- Have you read the Cole report?

MR. DUNK.- I think it was a good report. I think that if the municipality was adequately subsidised you could move now. I do not see any reason why you should not. As a preliminary you would have to provide buildings for the municipal authority. It would have to have its centre and offices. That is completely lacking now. Given that, I cannot see why you should not move now.

THE CHAIRMAN.- Would you care to make any suggestion, other than those you have already made, which have been very helpful, about what this committee would like to see in order to bring about the speedy transfer of public administration to Canberra?

MR. DUNK.- It is purely a matter of time. It is a job of how much of this and how much of that, horses and all the rest of it. The measurement of the job is not difficult. You can lay down the specifications of the programme and you can develop the programme. After that, you still come back to the two things that you need. One is a programme funded in advance and the other is departmental executive agencies. I think existing executive agencies, given the funded programme, could do the job.

SENATOR WOOD.- Do you not agree that the establishment of municipal administration in Canberra would develop a much better community spirit among the people of Canberra and a more lively interest in their own affairs?

MR. DUNK.- It should, but I do not think that that is their form. They have not displayed any great anxiety to have it. The Cole report and the meetings that followed it did not seem to produce very much enthusiasm ~~in them~~. However, I think that it should produce such a reaction, and would, in time.

SENATOR WOOD.- It is probably a case of the government having done so much for the people of Canberra for many years that they have lost a sense of self-reliance.

SENATOR WOODS COMMITTEE.

MR. DUNK.- I think that that is an element in it.

SENATOR WOOD.- They may think that if they have their own municipality they might have to pay more towards its upkeep. Judging by information that we had the other day they would pay relatively more than do the people of other municipalities.

MR. DUNK.- I think that that is the ^{main} ~~only~~ certainty in the minds of the people. If you establish a municipality the next point is how much you subsidise it nationally. When that is known you will know what the effect on the ratepayers will be. Until it is known the ratepayer is a bit cautious about the whole thing.

SENATOR WOOD.- Do you know if the tenants of government rental homes in Canberra are given any option by the government to purchase the homes they occupy?

MR. DUNK.- I think there is a general option. I think that anybody in a house here can purchase it at a valuation which is given by the Department of the Interior and subject to their finding the difference between the purchase price and the housing advance of £2,750.

SENATOR WOOD.- You are very keen on the transfer of the balance of the departments to Canberra. Would not the wholesale transfer of public servants from other parts of the Commonwealth to Canberra inconvenience other cities? People will be brought to Canberra eventually from as far away as North Queensland. Would you suggest that we should transfer these departments at such a speed that the transfer would inconvenience the rest of the people because it would draw so many people to Canberra all at once? Do you think the matter is of such urgency as to do that?

MR. DUNK.- It is a matter which has been floating now for 20 or 30 years. It cannot be urgent because it has taken so long. There cannot be any real deep failure of administration as things are and the fact that things go on from day to day smoothly is proof of that. I do not think that there is any magic in it. I do not think you could get it done quickly but you can get your physical resources so built to a point where you are doing better than just keeping track. You are not even doing that on your present internal growth.

SENATE CANBERRA COMMITTEE.

SENATOR WOOD.- Do you think the right policy might be to have a continuing development of Canberra at a pace sufficiently leisurely not to inconvenience the rest of Australia?

MR. DUNK.- ^{The fact} ~~Your~~ ^{is} ~~form~~ ^{is} that you are not building it up. The years since the war have not resulted in any move of any importance to add to the administrative wholeness of Canberra.

SENATOR WOOD.- This morning you mentioned something about tourism. I am particularly interested in that side of the question. What steps are taken to encourage tourists to come to Canberra? Does the government take any active steps in the matter?

MR. DUNK.- I cannot answer that in detail. The Department of the Interior has a tourist section. There used to be a Tourist Bureau which was run by the local Chamber of Commerce with some subsidy from the department.

SENATOR WOOD.- It is not a completely government affair?

MR. DUNK.- It was not at that time but my understanding is that it has since been brought into the department and is run now as a purely departmental function.

SENATOR WOOD.- Apparently the matter of getting tourists to Canberra is left to tourist organisations? To my knowledge I never see any advertisements encouraging tourists to come to Canberra.

THE CHAIRMAN.- I think it is fair to say that the N.S.W. Department of Railways runs tourist trains to Canberra.

SENATOR WOOD.- I am speaking from the Federal aspect.

MR. DUNK.- I have never seen anything done in that respect.

SENATOR HANN AFORD.- Could you inform me, Mr. Dunk, of the proportion of public servants and their dependants in the Canberra population?

MR. DUNK.- I cannot give you the figure for dependants but I have figures here of total employment. Total civil employment in Canberra is 11,000 and of that number 8,700 are employed in one way or another by the Commonwealth. The breakup

SENATE CANBERRA COMMITTEE.

of that 8,700 is, 6,900 under the Public Service Act and 2,800 industrial staffs of one sort or another.

SENATOR WOOD.- It seems as though it requires one person to give ancillary services to every three public servants.

SENATOR HANNAFORD.- That is what I am trying to arrive at. I am trying to get a rough estimate of what will be involved in the transfer to Canberra of public servants when the new administrative building is occupied. I wish to get some idea from you, Mr. Dunk, of what the total increase of population would be as a result of that transfer and what the increase would have to be in order to provide the ancillary services necessary for the new population.

MR. DUNK.- We have not taken any final complete census that would give that information precisely, but a rough estimate is that the total number of people transferred would be about three times the total staff transferred and the chances are that you require about another one for that unit of three. So I think it would be reasonable estimating to say that the transfer of public servants and dependants would be three for every staff unit and in relation to total population would certainly be not less than four for every staff unit.

SENATOR HANNAFORD.- That is to say, that by the time that building is completed in 1957 or 1958 it will mean an approximate increase of Canberra's population by about 12,000 people?

MR. DUNK.- No, that building is being completed in three sections. The first section will not bring anybody new to Canberra. That is the section now nearing completion. The middle section will accommodate about 800 people and the end section about 600 people. That would mean a total of 1400 people although you might be able to get 1500 into it. On my arithmetic that number of 1500 people would produce a total figure of about 6,000 people.

SENATOR HANNAFORD.- That figure is considerably less than what I have in my mind.

MR. DUNK.- The biggest increase will come with the Defence group of departments which have a total staff of about

SENATE CANBERRA COMMITTEE.

4,000. On the same arithmetic that would produce 16,000 or 17,000 people.

SENATOR HANNAFORD.- On the submission you have made the programme of transferring the departments to Canberra is actually losing ground instead of gaining ground. You suggest, for instance, that the lag in satisfying the housing demand has increased from approximately 1,000 to 2,500. Would that not suggest to you that all that is being achieved departmentally is a failure?

CANBERRA SENATE COMMITTEE.

SENATOR HANNAFORD.- Do you suggest that there is no likelihood of any improvement?

MR. DUNK.- Not until the rate of housing construction is increased. A housing construction rate of onethousand houses a year would do that.

SENATOR HANNAFORD.- Do you not think that the sensible thing to do would be to establish an authority which would have, as its only purpose, the housing and office accommodation position, for the satisfactory transfer of departments?

MR. DUNK.- If you mean the total programme, yes.

SENATOR HANNAFORD.- On the lines of the Snowy Mountains Hydro-Electric Authority, where certain money is provided for that purpose each year?

MR. DUNK.- Of course, it goes much further than the provision of housing and office accommodation. Community facilities, schools, and things like that also have to be provided.

SENATOR HANNAFORD.- I was rather surprised to hear you say that the average public servant in Canberra has difficulty in raising the sum of £1,250 for the purchase of a house that would cost in the vicinity of £4,000. As far as I am aware, the public servant in Canberra is on a higher salary rate than most other members of the community in similar circumstances. It seems to me that their status and their income are considerably higher than those of other people in Australia, and I cannot understand why they have difficulty in finding that deposit. You said that because of that, the proportion of rented homes in Canberra is greater than that of other cities.

MR. DUNK.- I think that that is so.

SENATOR HANNAFORD.- You put it down to the fact that the pecuniary circumstances of the average citizen are such that he is unable to dig up the necessary deposit of £1,250?

MR. DUNK.- That seems to be the reason. I have never examined the matter in detail. The average public servant - if you can strike an average of public service pay - is not paid a higher

rate than are other members of the community. According to statisticians' figures, the rate of income of all employed people in Australia is £819 a year. Our level is in the very early £820's. Some of the top salaries have been receiving a certain amount of publicity lately, but the fact is that in terms of the average wages, they are not out of line with the over-all employment rate in Australia.

SENATOR HANNAFORD.- Does that apply to the civil service as well as to those employed by the Government but who may not be classed as civil servants?

MR. DUNK.- That applies to the total number of public servants - 147,000 odd - divided into the total payroll, and the total employed people in Australia divided into the national payroll. Those two figures are very much in balance. The rate here is probably considerably higher because you are dealing with a higher kind of administration for which you pay higher salaries.

THE CHAIRMAN.- It is a question of whether you compare a highly placed civil servant with a man in a similar position in industry. If you do, you will probably find that the public servant is getting far less.

MR. DUNK.- Yes.

SENATOR HANNAFORD.- We are referring to Canberra, not to the whole of Australia. Therefore, I say that there is some basis for my submission that you should be in a slightly better position than are civil servants throughout Australia.

MR. DUNK.- Yes.

SENATOR HANNAFORD.- Therefore, I am at a loss to know why civil servants here have difficulty in meeting the £1,250 deposit on homes.

MR. DUNK.- That is an assumption. I have nothing at the back of it.

SENATOR HANNAFORD.- Perhaps the civil servants in Canberra have not been imbued with the spirit of thrift and saving. It does not seem to be evident here, as it is elsewhere.

MR. DUNK.- You will find that the man who is lucky enough to live in one of the older houses, for which he gets a comparatively low valuation, buys his house. The man who occupies a house which has

been completed recently, and for which the construction cost was high, does not do so. Whether it is because he thinks the price is too high, or because he has not the £1,250, I do not know. The assumption that he has not the £1,250 is problematical, but the fact is that he does not buy his house for one of those two reasons.

SENATOR HANNAFORD.- Are the facilities provided for advances on homes in Canberra comparable with those that exist in other cities?

MR. DUNK.- I think they are probably even better. My understanding is that if a tenant wishes to buy a house from the Department of the Interior, that advance is available to him as a matter of course. In addition, you have the normal things that apply in other cities, such as War Service Homes advances and the normal banking facilities.

SENATOR HANNAFORD.- What about building societies?

MR. DUNK.- I am not certain, but I do not think they operate here.

SENATOR RYAN.- You have already told us in your statement that you favour a central administration, and you outlined the reasons for that opinion. Do you think that the Department of Works should be housed here?

MR. DUNK.- Yes.

SENATOR RYAN.- At one time that Department was housed here. was it not?

MR. DUNK.- The Department of Works has had a peculiar history. At one time it was with the Interior. They were then called Works and Railways. During the war the Allied Works Council was set up, and it handled all the works programme. It was organised at that time in Melbourne as the Allied Works Council, and it has been in Melbourne as the Department of Works and Housing ever since.

SENATOR RYAN.- And after Melbourne, it was in Sydney?

MR. DUNK.- Not as a separate Department.

SENATOR RYAN.- Since the Departments have been established here, to what extent have they increased numerically?

CANBERRA SENATE COMMITTEE.

MR. DUNK.- I could not give it to you in statistics, but I can say that they have increased very greatly. Originally a very small nucleus of administration was brought here, but the tendency has been to develop complete centres of administration. I could find out the extent of the increase for you. I should say off-hand that most of the departments have probably trebled or quadrupled compared with the original numbers that were brought here.

SENATOR RYAN.- And the tendency is for them to continue to increase?

MR. DUNK.- Yes.

SENATOR RYAN.- Has the Public Service Board any policy regarding the housing of public servants in Canberra?

MR. DUNK.- No, there is no policy, except the general one that when we transfer people here, or when people come here from outside the public service, it seems to be the accepted obligation on the Government to provide houses. We have not grown to the stage where industry is providing houses. I do not know whether the Department of the Interior people gave you any evidence on that, but my impression is that something like a quarter or one-third of the houses here have been allocated to people who are not civil servants. I should not like those figures to be taken as exact, but my impression is that it is quite a substantial percentage.

SENATOR HANNAFORD.- You mean, similar to what the Broken Hill Pty. Co. Ltd. and other large industrial undertakings do?

MR. DUNK.- What I was trying to say was that of the total number of houses that have come into the possession of the Department of the Interior over the years, a substantial number - I think 25% - have been made available under tenancy to people who are not employed by the Government at all. Whatever may happen eventually, and however you may encourage people to buy or build their own houses, if you are going to transfer big sections of staff to Canberra, you can only do that if the Government builds houses. I can see no escape from that.

SENATOR HANNAFORD.- You have no quarrel with the fact that 25% have been made available to people other than civil servants?

CANBERRA SENATE COMMITTEE.

MR. DUNK.- No. I am trying to emphasise that everybody who comes here seems to expect the Government to provide him with a house.

SENATOR RYAN.- To date, have the officers whom you constantly transfer here from other states been satisfactorily housed?

MR. DUNK.- No. Most of them have gone through a lengthy waiting period of the order of two years. Some of them may manage to get furnished accommodation, but many of them live in a hostel for a couple of years before they get a house.

SENATOR RYAN.- Do they have to find their own accommodation when they receive a transfer to Canberra?

MR. DUNK.- The wise ones get their name on the list in anticipation, so that when they come here they are reasonably high on the list and will not have to wait too long; but those not on the list when they arrive here have to wait the full period until sufficient names have been removed from the list to bring theirs to the top of it.

SENATOR RYAN.- Do officers when they receive notification of transfer to Canberra readily accept the transfer?

Mr. Dunk.- Not very readily.

SENATOR RYAN.- Do they object?

MR. DUNK.- The work is more attractive on the central side of administration. Let me put it this way: we find that it is easier to get people for a job in Melbourne than it is to get people for a job in Canberra, and to that extent, there is a tendency for people to avoid Canberra. But that is another one of the difficulties of having departments split. While you have departments in Melbourne people would just as soon apply for a job there and would rather not apply for one here. When we get them up here, if people want to get on, they will have no option. Ambition will force them.

SENATOR RYAN.- I refer now to the opportunities for promotion for public servants. When vacancies occur, public servants have the opportunity to apply for the position?

MR. DUNK.- Not universally, but very often vacancies are advertised in the Staff Section of the Commonwealth Gazette and any officer who feels he is competent for that position can apply for it. That applies whether he is here, Melbourne, Sydney or anywhere else.

THE CHAIRMAN.- Attached to the paper that you have submitted to us is a list of government agencies other than federal departments. I would like you to say whether you think each one, as I mention it, should and could be brought here, or whether you have no opinion on the matter. The first is the High Court of Australia.

MR. DUNK.- I really have no opinion. The centre of the High Court is at present in Melbourne, but the Court goes to all States. Whether or not the centre should be here is outside my province.

THE CHAIRMAN.- The High Court would probably think that it, and it alone, should determine where it should sit, and that is probably the right opinion. The next is the Commonwealth Court of Conciliation and Arbitration.

MR. DUNK.- It is a matter of where the Court can function most effectively. Their evidence is taken from employers and from the trade union side, and counsel is engaged; and I would think that most people who have to use the Court would feel that it is best situated

SENATE CANBERRA COMMITTEE

where it is fairly close to trade union activity. On the other hand, you will, in time in Canberra, get a great many central points of commerce and trade unionism and many other things, so you could reach the time when it would be appropriate to have the Court here.

THE CHAIRMAN.- The next is the Federal Court of Bankruptcy.

MR. DUNK.- That is one judge only, and he is mainly on circuit.

THE CHAIRMAN.- The next is the Public Service Arbitrator.

MR. DUNK.- My comment there is the same as for the Arbitration Court. At the moment, there is so much of the unions side of the public service centred in Melbourne that they would object to the Arbitrator coming here. On the other hand, if we get more administration here, union activity will centre here too, and at that point of time, the Arbitrator could come here.

THE CHAIRMAN.- What about the Commonwealth Grants Commission? That is an occasional body.

MR. DUNK.- It is an itinerant sort of thing.

THE CHAIRMAN.- It meets here?

MR. DUNK.- Yes, but whether you could get the headquarters here is another question. It is a very small body.

THE CHAIRMAN.- The C.S.I.R.O.?

MR. DUNK.- Now that is very important. This is a very big show. I would think that somewhere at the end of the departmental programme which we have been talking about this morning there is an important final job to be done, and that is to centre the major scientific sections here, and you could not do better than start with the C.S.I.R.O.

THE CHAIRMAN.- What they have here now is just a branch?

MR. DUNK.- They have mainly the land use section here. The call it the Division, I think. That is purely an operating branch.

THE CHAIRMAN.- The Commonwealth Bank of Australia?

MR. DUNK.- From the point of view of the Central bank, note issue control and all that side of central banking, there is every reason why the central bank should be here; but not from the trading side.

THE CHAIRMAN.- The two are separated to some extent.

MR. DUNK.- At the present time they are all in the one building in Sydney. They have a Manager in Sydney and he is quite as distinct as the manager in Melbourne, so you could peel those off.

THE CHAIRMAN.- The Australian Aluminium Production Commission?

MR. DUNK.- I take it that they will always be closer to their point of operation than here.

THE CHAIRMAN.- And I suppose the Australian Atomic Energy Commission?

MR. DUNK.- There again, they need to be in pretty close touch with high level research really. When you finally get this scientific centre, the position could be reconsidered.

THE CHAIRMAN.- The Tariff Board.

MR. DUNK.- I do not think so. Again, it has to be closely in touch with commerce. You would put a lot of people to the necessity to come to Canberra if the Tariff Board were transferred here.

THE CHAIRMAN.- The Overseas Telecommunications Commission.

MR. DUNK.- When the Central Post Office comes here, the Commission should come here.

THE CHAIRMAN.- The Australian Broadcasting Control Board.

MR. DUNK.- The same goes for that. When you get the Central Post Office here, the Control Board should be here.

THE CHAIRMAN.- The Australian Broadcasting Commission.

MR. DUNK.- That is quite separate. It is my understanding - and I should like to have your Secretary check this - that the Australian Broadcasting Commission Act provides that the Commission should come here.

THE CHAIRMAN.- The Commonwealth Railways.

MR. DUNK.- They could come here. Their present headquarters are in Melbourne where of course there is the Commonwealth railway. Their operating end for west and north is Port Augusta.

THE CHAIRMAN.- Is there any reason for having the headquarters in Melbourne?

MR. DUNK.- It is a nice place to be. If they can operate from Melbourne, they can operate just as effectively from here.

SENATE CANBERRA COMMITTEE

SENATOR RYAN.- Earlier, we were dealing with the position of an applicant for a position here in the public service. The person applies for a position here as a result of an advertisement in the Commonwealth Gazette, and he is accepted. When he comes to Canberra, how does he manage for accommodation?

MR. DUNK.- He gets his name on the housing list, if he has not already done so, and he goes into hostel accommodation until he can get a house. In the meantime, he may get the opportunity to take over a furnished place temporarily. He is either in a hostel or in temporary accommodation somewhere until his name comes to the top of the waiting list, which takes about a couple of years.

SENATOR RYAN.- Is he financially recompensed?

MR. DUNK.- Yes, while he is in the hostel, we pay a substantial allowance to him. If he is in a furnished house, we pay a part of the rent. He is looked after that way.

SENATOR RYAN.- That would also go for his family?

MR. DUNK.- If his family is in a hostel, we pay a part of the total bill.

SENATOR RYAN.- Would you care to express an opinion on the question whether similar conditions could be applied to workmen in industry, particularly the building industry?

MR. DUNK.- In general, I expect they are. Mr. James can tell you more particularly about that. The Department of Works operates workers' hostels.

SENATOR RYAN.- I understand that the inter-departmental committee began to deal with transfers in 1947 and arranged for a specific programme covering ten years for the transfer of public servants to Canberra.

MR. DUNK.- The best you can say is that it seems ^{ed a} ~~the~~ reasonable guess at the time.

SENATOR RYAN.- In the light of developments it was rather ambitious?

MR. DUNK.- Yes.

SENATOR RYAN.- I notice that the inter-departmental committee proposed to transfer 882 officers to Canberra in the first three years.

SENATE CAMBESINA COMMITTEE

In your opinion, could they have been accommodated in houses satisfactorily at that time?

MR. DUNK.- Yes. I forget the precise component on that 882. One was the Bureau of Mineral Resources and another was the trades section of the Department of Commerce and Agriculture. Some of them have been transferred and to the extent they have been transferred they have been accommodated.

SENATE CANBERRA COMMITTEE.

SENATOR RYAN. - Are all Canberra public servants accommodated at present or are some of them waiting for accommodation?

MR. DUNK. - Many of them are waiting for houses but they are all accommodated somewhere. Many are at hostels whilst others have made some temporary arrangement.

SENATOR RYAN. - The peak of house construction in the A.C.T. was reached in 1950-51?

MR. DUNK. - It was, but the main feature of 1951 was that we had the highest number of houses under construction in that year. The number of houses completed did not fall off very much for some time. So, for a couple of years we were living on the fat of the 1951 peak.

SENATOR RYAN. - In 1951 the Government issued an edict that several thousand public servants were to be dismissed. To what extent was that carried out in Canberra?

MR. DUNK. - It was carried out fairly proportionately, based on 5 percent. The Department of Works, however, lost more than its proportion mainly because at that time a switch was being made from day labour to 'contract work.' I do not think the influence of the cut was in any way marked on the Department of Works but it did apply to the Department of the Interior,

SENATOR RYAN. - Did the dismissal of public servants result in many departures from Canberra?

MR. DUNK. - No. There were departures in 1952 but for different reasons. I do not think many people left Canberra because of staff cuts in 1951. However, that is a point of detail on which we would not have exact information.

SENATOR RYAN. - It is expected that block A of the new administrative building will be available for occupation some time this year?

MR. DUNK. - Yes. The way it is going I should think we would be in occupation in roughly six months.

SENATOR RYAN. - Will that result in the transfer of interstate public servants to Canberra?

MR. DUNK. - Not of any importance. We will move the Attorney-General's Department from West Block to block A of the new building and thereby make additional space for the departments of the Treasury and External Affairs, and the Taxation Branch at West Block. We will move the Department of Health from Barton and thereby provide more room for the Department of Commerce & Agriculture which has been over-strained. That department may be able to bring up a small section from Melbourne as the result of the move. The Department of the Interior will go into the rest of block A. So, the only possible influx to result will be the arrival of a small section of the Department of Commerce & Agriculture.

SENATOR RYAN. - That is nothing like the transfer of 882 officers envisaged for the first three years of the programme?

MR. DUNK. - The best way to look at that is to regard the part of stage one that has not been completed as merging into stage two. Stage one was never determined precisely in any case. It was recognised that quite a number of small sections should come to Canberra. Some have come but others have not. The only significance of stage one now is the waiting list in Canberra. Everything else merges into stage two and from then on to stages three, four and five, etc.

SENATOR RYAN. - It is expected that office accommodation will be available in about eighteen months for stage two?

MR. DUNK. - Probably it will be nearer two years.

SENATOR RYAN. - The transfer of 7,022 public servants is envisaged over a period of 25 years according to the programme?

MR. DUNK. - It was not all transfers of course. There has been a lot of growth in that figure.

SENATOR RYAN. - It is plus normal growth?

MR. DUNK. - Yes.

SENATOR RYAN. - Do you think that having regard to the two wars and a depression, a great deal has been accomplished in the development of Canberra in a period of 42 years?

MR. DUNK. - Yes. Taking into account the inevitability of cessation of activities during the wars and the presumably inevitable

SENATE CANBERRA COMMITTEE.

cessation of activity during the depression - I hope we never follow the same process again - I think the accomplishment is substantial but I do not think it is dramatic.

SENATOR RYAN. - Do you think that, having in mind the experience of 1931, we should have pushed ahead with the expansion of the building potential here knowing that the development of Canberra is inevitable?

MR. DUNK. - That is a rather significant matter but, on the economic side I would prefer not to express a view. Claims against available funds will be made with the same expression of urgency. If the policy is to cut, I can see great difficulty in cutting in one place and not in another.

SENATOR RYAN. - But the cut was not applied generally in the Public Service in Canberra?

MR. DUNK. - I am speaking of economic cutting. The cutting of the Works programme in 1952 was applied in all the State Works.

SENATOR RYAN. - Have you any knowledge of the volume of private contracts in the development of Canberra?

MR. DUNK. - I would prefer to leave that question to Mr. James.

SENATOR HANNIFORD. - You have referred, Mr. Dunk, to the cost of bringing senior public servants from Melbourne and keeping them here while Parliament debates the Estimates. Have you any data that would give an idea of the actual cost? It should be comparatively easy to keep records of the actual travel costs and the time lost by civil servants through absence from Melbourne. I should also be interested to know what type of transport is used and whether there is a tendency on the part of public servants to travel by one particular airline, say T.M.A., as against A.N.A. Can you touch on those matters?

MR. DUNK. - We have never made any real survey. Our impression is that the costs are high and the loss of time substantial. Most people travel by air although there are some who use other means of transport because of sickness or other reasons. There is no instruction that travel shall be by any

SENATE CANTERRA COMMITTEE.

particular means or by any particular operator. I use either
airline and I should think that other public servants would do the
same although probably there is a general tendency to use T.....
if the time-tables ^{set} ~~set~~.

(THE WITNESS WITHDRAWN).

(continued on page 515)

SENATE CANBERRA COMMITTEE.

JAMES JAMES, Civil Engineer, Assistant Director of Works, Australian Canberra Territory, recalled and further examined.

MR. JAMES . - I produce a photograph which shows the private industrial area at the Causeway. The area of government activity ends at the line of trees shown, and private activity covers the rest of the area. Senator Benn asked for more information about apprenticeship matters. I can say at once that we pay our apprentices a little better than they are paid in the adjoining States. We also pay our apprentices a percentage of the tradesmans wage.

THE CHAIRMAN . - That is those apprentices employed by the Public Service?

MR. JAMES . - Regardless of where they are employed.

SENATOR BENN . - That is how apprentices' wage rates are really decided throughout Australia.

MR. JAMES . - I gathered from the news broadcast this morning that that system was being advocated for other States.

SENATOR BENN . - It has been in operation in Queensland since 1924.

MR. JAMES . - Our rates appear to be substantially better than those in other States. We have very complete statistics of apprentices, showing the different trades and those employed by private and governmental employers. A document is being prepared and I shall submit it to the committee in due course.

SENATOR RYAN . - Does private industry in the A.C.T. pay its apprentices the same wages as the government pays?

MR. JAMES . - Private industry pays the same as the government. I think there is an A.C.T. ordinance which covers apprenticeship. We have an Apprenticeship Board on which all the different authorities and private employers are represented. It is a very active and efficient body.

SENATOR RYAN . - The ruling rate for an artisan is approximately £20.0.0. a week. What proportion of that sum do apprentices receive?

MR. JAMES . - I cannot give that information precisely now.

SENATE CANBERRA COMMITTEE.

I shall table also a typical manpower return for our department. It is a return that comes to me each month. It dissects the manpower employed and shows those engaged by private employers and those engaged in departmental employment. It covers all trades and different classes of work such as maintenance, engineering, the administrative building and general building. It will give you an idea of the breakup of our total manpower. When I said yesterday that we had only 400 men on housing and that our total manpower was about 1,900, you probably wondered what had happened to the other 1,500. You will see that some are employed in workmens hostels, some in stores, ^{workshops} some on building maintenance and ^{and water supply construction &} some on road maintenance.

SENATOR HANNAFORD . - Building takes up the greatest proportion?

MR. JAMES . - Yes. There are ⁵⁰⁰ ~~400~~ men on housing. There are ~~something over~~ 200 employed on the administrative building. ~~From memory, I think there are about 400 on building of other sorts -~~ ^{240 or 250} schools, play centres, industrial buildings and buildings of that kind.

SENATOR RYAN . - What about roads?

MR. JAMES . - On road building and maintenance there ^{are 206} ~~would~~ be ~~something of the order of 250~~ men. There is ^{are 120} ~~a somewhat smaller~~ number employed on water supply construction and maintenance. When we broke off last night, I had dealt with the Kingston stores area and was expecting some questions.

SENATOR HANNAFORD . - We were given to understand by a previous witness that the Molonglo area had been set aside for heavy industry. Do you corroborate the statement that up to date there has been very little response from heavy industry to the invitation to take sites there.

MR. JAMES . - There are three plants there at the present time. There is our own big constructional plant shop, there is a wood flour factory across the road, and there is the Hume Pipe factory not very far from it. I understand that many applications have been received for the fifty or sixty blocks that ^{were} ~~we~~ offered

to private interests quite recently. I expect that the place will fill up pretty quickly now.

SENATOR HANNAFORD . - You are quite optimistic about that?

MR. JAMES . - Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN . - As a matter of convenience, do not you think that it would be possible to provide a small shop within the administrative area, quite close to Parliament House? If I forget to put anything in my baggage or if I lose anything, I have to go to Kingston, Manuka, or Civic Centre to get it. I suppose I have done that twenty times. It may be a stud, a pocket comb or a bottle of pills. Do not you think it would be possible, without destroying the beauty of the administrative area, to provide a sort of general store? It could be hidden by trees, or even put underground.

MR. JAMES . - A big hotel or a ship has those facilities.

THE CHAIRMAN . - After all, it is ridiculous that a person working in a certain area who wants quite a trivial thing has to travel miles to get it. If you walk out of Parliament House in Sydney and go across Macquarie Street - Macquarie Street is quite a comely street it is by no means ugly - you will find a little Chemist's shop, a little restaurant and other facilities. They are provided in what is, after all, a dignified part of the city. Do you know whether the provision of such facilities in the administrative area here has ever been considered?

MR. JAMES . - That is a question for the town planners. Speaking as a layman, I see no objection to it.

THE CHAIRMAN . - The lack of such facilities is one of the things that makes Canberra an annoying place to many people who come here.

MR. JAMES . - Quite so.

SENATOR RYAN . - Has your department received any definite instruction to alter the roads in the Kingston shopping area? Do you know of any plans to alter the roadway in order to cater for the heavy volume of traffic that has developed here?

SENATE CANBERRA COMMITTEE.

MR. JAMES . - I should like an opportunity to check on that. I think there is something in the office on it, but I should like to make a check first.

SENATOR RYAN . - Is it proposed to widen the road that runs from the Kingston shopping area to the transport depot?

MR. JAMES . - I rather expect there is something of that sort, but I should like to check on it.

THE CHAIRMAN . - Will you go on to your next point?

MR. JAMES . - The next item is the swimming pool and the reasons for delay in connection with it. I shall sketch the situation as it exists and then answer any questions put to me on it. Straight after the War people became interested in another swimming pool here. The existing pool was a small one. It was built at the tail end of the depression and was kept down to the bare minimum in size for financial reasons. If you are interested you can read about it in the reports of the Public Works Committee at that time. It was not until October 1951 that the Department of the Interior asked the Department of Works to prepare designs and estimates. In January 1952 we were told that funds had been made available. That, of course, is the signal to us that the occasion is serious. In February 1952 ^{Interior} they confirmed decisions reached at conferences covering the building of an Olympic pool and a childrens' pool, making provision in the pool for diving but specifically excluding, at that stage, a separate diving pool.

The project received considerable attention. Swimming Associations and the like began to take an interest in it. We kept on with our planning. As we were planning at a time of rising prices, our estimates had to be revised. We received advice of further funds being made available in August 1952, Then in January 1953, following discussions between the Department of the Interior and the authorities concerned with competitive swimming, the Department of the Interior asked us to include in the plan a separate diving pool. At the same time we were asked

SENATE CANBERRA COMMITTEE.

to increase the depth of the pool for diving. We had planned for a certain depth, which was the standard as far as we could ascertain, but the swimming authorities asked for another eighteen inches or so at the diving end of the pool. That upset the apple cart a bit. Our plans were well forward, and they had to be recast. Also, because the scheme had been extended, we had to ask for some more money. The action to include a diving pool was begun in January. It was early in March when we were asked to increase the depth of the diving pool. We accepted a tender for the construction of the swimming pools and the diving tower in January 1954. Our tenders had closed in the previous November, but we had some difficulties in closing the deal with the lowest tenderer. Tenders closed on the 17th November 1953, and a tender was accepted on the 22nd January 1954. That includes a month of close down period when all the buildings went to the coast. Although we stick to our desks, we cannot get any sense out of any builders ~~for~~ *usually take a vacation of* about three or four weeks over the holidays. A tender for the dressing pavillion was accepted in April 1954.

At the present time the job is barely half finished. Barely 50% of the total expenditure has been incurred at the present time. However, the work that has been done is the underground work, such as laying a deep pipeline in heavy shale. You cannot put too many men on to that kind of work. If progress is maintained, the pool should be in running order by the early part of next Summer.

SENATE CANBERRA COMMITTEE

SENATOR HANNAFORD.- An undue amount of time seems to have elapsed between the original approval of the proposal and the calling for tenders. I know that modifications had to be effected but the time lag still seems great. What was the date of the approval of the proposal to construct the pool?

MR. JAMES.- The 4th October, 1951. We were then asked to prepare detailed designs and estimates and on the 31st January, 1952, funds were made available to us.

SENATOR BENN.- And the time lag between approval and the calling of tenders was actually about two years?

MR. JAMES.- Yes.

SENATOR BENN.- Is that an inordinately great time lag in this particular case?

MR. JAMES.- I am not any more keen about it than anybody else. The answer to that question would be yes.

SENATOR BENN.- From where is it proposed to get the water for the baths? From the Molonglo?

MR. JAMES.- No, the water will come from the town supply and will be re-circulated every eight hours. It will go through the filters and come out better than new.

THE CHAIRMAN.- We shall now deal with the next subject.

MR. JAMES.- The next subject is the telephone exchange in front of the Hotel Kurrajong. Our department received a requisition from the Postmaster-General's Department covering the construction of a Bristol type aluminium alloy building. It came to us in October, 1950. The site plan of the land came with the requisition and showed a permanent and a temporary exchange building. The site plan, of course, would come from the Department of the Interior and would be the document upon which the arrangements between the Postmaster-General's Department and the Department of the Interior were made for the occupation of that site. A little later the Postmaster-General's Department asked us to add to this building a little, which we did, in the same style of construction. Aluminium buildings were bought by the Postmaster-General's Department, I understand in fairly large numbers,

SENATE CANBERRA COMMITTEE

when building materials were scarce and when they were bought the department did not know where they would be erected. They were, in effect, bought as a wholesale means of providing exchanges. We had no part in selecting that particular building for that particular use. We merely acted as the contractors, as it were, to take charge of the cases, take the buildings out, put them up on the site arranged between the Postmaster-General's Department and the Department of the Interior, and that is all.

THE CHAIRMAN.- I am very glad that you have brought that matter up. The responsibility of your department, then, is to do what another department wants? You are not responsible for choosing the site or the type of building? Are you responsible for choosing the site?

MR. JAMES.- No, but in the ordinary way, if the client department approaches us we might suggest a site. We cannot, however, dictate what the site is to be.

THE CHAIRMAN.- Who suggested this site?

MR. JAMES.- I do not know. I presume it would be the Department of the Interior. The documents certainly make it clear that that department agreed to it. Before we leave that point I should like to clear it up. We do not take every direction from a client department without examining it, analysing it or checking it. We have a clear responsibility to check up to see whether what is proposed meets our ideas of a fair proposition. After all, we are the guardians of the public purse. It is our duty to see that the taxpayers' money is spent wisely.

THE CHAIRMAN.- Can I take it that your department thought that a suitable site and that building for the building?

MR. JAMES.- We certainly did not object to it. We might not have liked it very much but we took no objection to it.

THE CHAIRMAN.- Was the building approved by the National Planning and Development Committee?

MR. JAMES.- I understand not. Our department did not take any steps in that direction.

THE CHAIRMAN.- Do you think any building should be on that

site? I understand it is free land. What should have been on that site according to the plan?

MR. JAMES.- I do not know.

THE CHAIRMAN.- I had an idea that it was vacant land that might well be left as a park.

MR. JAMES.- I am not sure about that. We have some plans and I would expect to find that that particular area had not been allotted for any purpose up to that time. That question might better be directed to the town planning people.

THE CHAIRMAN.- I shall put it to them. The point is, your department is responsible for deciding whether a site and a building are suitable or not?

MR. JAMES.- Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN.- Were any steps taken by your department to decide the question of suitability on that occasion, or did it simply accept the request of the Postmaster-General's Department and the Department of the Interior?

MR. JAMES.- We took no steps to criticise or object on that occasion.

THE CHAIRMAN.- I shall put it this way - we have to try to fix responsibility for this on someone. We may have to fix it on many people. Whose final responsibility was it for having that building there?

MR. JAMES.- I think you had better fix it on many people. Qualifying that, I must say that we have not a very good record of wins when we take objections on matters of that sort. For one reason or another our case has got to be clean-cut or very exceptional before we are able to make an objection stick when we don't like the type of building or the site. There are many temporary buildings which are cases in point. There is no future in temporary buildings from any point of view and yet through pressures and emergencies and expediencies there are many temporary buildings. That illustrates my point that we, with the best of intentions, are very often not able to press our views home.

THE CHAIRMAN.- But you could have got the information from

SENATE CANBERRA COMMITTEE

the National Capital Planning and Development Committee and got their opinion?

MR. JAMES.- Yes.

I have some notes on the temporary National Library buildings. That job was initiated with us by the Department of Interior sending us survey plans showing the approved position for the temporary library buildings. The Department of the Interior, as you know, functions very closely with the National Capital Planning and Development Committee and when we receive a document of that sort we take it that the National Capital Planning and Development Committee has been consulted or that the Department of the Interior has not considered it appropriate to consult it and we do not go any further. At about the same time, within a month or so, the Prime Minister's Department told us that funds had been provided to cover the construction of six Romney huts and asked us for early action. Attached to that communication was a minute which explained that the permanent library had been delayed by the action before the Public Works Committee and stated that that committee had urged ^{that} considerable storage space be arranged as soon as possible to relieve the congestion in Parliament House caused by library material. We planned it and got busy with it and we tried to make it as reasonable as we could. But, obviously, it is a temporary building.

THE CHAIRMAN. I shall make a statement here myself because I know the history of that matter and I must take a measure of responsibility for it. The Library Committee initiated that and we did it because the permanent library would not arrive in time to house the collections. We hated doing it, particularly I hated doing it and we tried every way to avoid it. Before doing it we visited all the places around the country where archives and other documents are stored. Many of the documents are in buildings that are neither fire-proofed nor vermin-proofed and they might well be destroyed. They include important documents which would be necessary for historians. I think that the erection of this ugly temporary building was necessary in order to save these very valuable documents which deal with the early history of the Commonwealth, which might otherwise run the risk of destruction.

J. 4. 523 & 524. J. JAMES

THE CHAIRMAN.- It is only for purposes such as that that I would agree to a temporary building. That is the only justification for it.

MR. JAMES.- The next item is the Public Service Board cafeteria. That has not yet been built. It was a project first discussed shortly after the war. The Public Service Board obtained Cabinet approval in 1948 to carry out a normal industrial procedure which, they stated, was essential to efficiency and morale, much on the lines that ^{the NSW Council} we ~~advocate~~ for factories. Labour and National Service have their standards, and the intention was to build a cafeteria to those standards in the Prices Building, which would supply about 500 lunches. We were approached at the end of 1948 and we did a certain amount of planning. It soon found that it was impracticable to install such accommodation in an existing building, because the cooking of food would make the building untenable very quickly. With the concurrence of the parties, we designed a separate building on a site not far from the garages and boiler house, behind the Barton offices. These plans were approved by the National Capital Planning Committee, and we got to the point of lining up a contractor to build the place. That was back at the end of 1949 or early 1950, and we proposed to let a fixed fee contract. However, the financial shades were closing in, and no financial provision for the item, the cost of which approached £50,000, has ever been made in any programme. Actually, we get on with a privately run canteen in one of the buildings of the old Eastlake hostel, which is very different from this proposal, but at least it meets half the need.

THE CHAIRMAN.- Do you think it meets the immediate need?

MR. JAMES.- We do not seem to have had many complaints. It is run privately by a former hostel manager.

The next item relates to the central park. So far as our Department is concerned, we know that a site has been set aside and we have received a requisition and have taken action to provide a water supply. We have tenders for a pump to take the water from the Molonglo, and we have the funds to carry out ~~what~~ ~~looks like being~~ the laying of a couple of miles of piping, from K1

CANBERRA SENATE COMMITTEE

six inches down to one inch, to reticulate ~~to~~ this area and so that the Superintendent of Parks and Gardens can really get busy and commence to build a park.

SENATOR WOOD.- When you speak of "central park" have you in mind a park proper, or public gardens?

MR. JAMES.- As I understand it, it is to consist of public gardens, with a band shell, a cafeteria and so on. It will really combine all the necessary activities.

SENATOR MANNAFORD.- But not sporting activities?

MR. JAMES.- No.

SENATOR WOOD.- Will it be on the same lines as the public gardens in Sydney and Melbourne, with flowers and so on?

MR. JAMES.- Yes. I think the intention is to make it a real show place. *The site work is practically complete. I feel pretty sure the heavier mains are down. We accepted a tender for the pump in November, and I think there is a couple of months delivery on it.*

The next item relates to forward planning. It is possible to talk about this subject for a long while, but I shall be brief and let the subject develop by way of questions. The Director has already explained our budgeting systems in his formal tendered evidence. Much evidence has been given to the Parliamentary Committee on Public Accounts concerning budgeting procedures, and between those two sources the Committee will be able to see something of the pitfalls in the past and our hopes for the future. The trend is towards closer estimating and greater control by Parliament.

So far as planning actual works is concerned, I have already spoken of the collaboration with the Town Planner and how he plans his development. He gets ideas from the engineers as to what is the most feasible, the easiest and most economical method, and the plan gradually evolves. We do a good deal of forward planning ourselves. You will have seen the results of some of our heavy forward planning referred to in the evidence we have tendered to the Public Works Committee, particularly in relation to the water supply, *lakes & city bridges*

CANBERRA SENATE COMMITTEE.

Our men are continuously checking, analysing and estimating. We even have a crew which wanders round at dead of night checking the flow in the sewers. That helps us to forecast what we will need in the way of trunk sewers in time to come. Forward planning in respect of the water supply was going on long before the Cotter Dam was built before the first world war. We have a Senior engineer who does nothing else but plan 10, 20, 30 or 40 years ahead, so that we can ask for our funds and put up our proposals for head works for the water supply. That is a very responsible job and takes a lot of our strength. Incidentally, it is very well done.

The same thing applies to our bridges. We tendered evidence to the Public Works Committee which was the result of a lot of planning and analysis. We took all possibilities quite seriously there. The Department of the Public Works, which is the land-lord of the area, merely said to us, "Well, in the time you re-built the Commonwealth Avenue bridge. We think it is falling down." Those were fighting words to engineers. We ^{know} think it is not falling down, but we also feel that the time has arrived, because of the growth of traffic and development generally, for us to look at the bridges generally. Our ^{broader} approach there ^{proved to be} was thoroughly justified. You all know how the enquiry widened until it included the lake scheme as well. The little seed that we planted perhaps will result in the establishment of the lakes and the ^{of which} bridges and ^{also} result in a very big step forward in development within our time.

We also plan in relation to materials. A big quarry which we are about to start is the result of five years' planning.

SENATOR HANNAFORD.- Did you have to make drillings?

MR. JAMES.- Yes. The geologists put us on to ^{all the possible} the right sites, and eventually we went ^{back} practically to a site worked in the Federal Capital Commission days. We bought our machinery. At the time we ordered it, things were very difficult, and it took nearly four years to get the machinery on the site. That called for considerable forward planning. Our activity in regard to timber has developed solely as the result of our forecasts on materials needed

for one thousand houses ^{annually to meet} to operate the big master plan from Melbourne.

SENATOR BENN.- You feel that you have a good organisation?

MR. JAMES.- We certainly do. We have ^{positions for} over 200 technical men in our branch. ^{offer 75 engineers, 95 architects and 50 non-professionals,} There are ~~more than 100~~ engineers ^{such as work supervisors and engineering superintendents.}

SENATOR BENN.- The organisation has been built up slowly?

MR. JAMES.- When I came here six years ago it was less than half its present size, and the quality was nothing like what it is now.

SENATOR BENN.- You have confidence in your organisation?

MR. JAMES.- Between us and our head office, you could not match the breadth of talent by that of any other organisation in this country. We cover all fields - mechanical, civil, electrical and hydraulic, as well as architectural. We are really general practitioners in all fields, and yet we are expected to reach specialist efficiency, and in most of those functions we do that. In evidence before the Public Works Committee, our Director of Engineering stated that our men have won competitions in architecture, in open competition, as well as in engineering. He made a statement in much the same terms as I have spoken this morning - that man for man and group for group, he could not see where they could be matched in this country.

SENATOR RYAN.- Are you under-staffed?

Approximately 85% of the positions are filled, but as for the vacancies, the greater proportion of the vacancies are for design architects.

MR. JAMES.- A little. We have our perennial tussles with Mr. Dunk and his people. Personally, I rather begrudge the time and effort that I have to spend in trying to persuade people in the Public Service Board that we are not claiming for certain positions ^{unless} more than we should ^{where} because we are having difficulty in filling them with people of the quality we need. We also have our worries because men, more particularly architects, leave us frequently. That, of course, also is perennial. Architects have their feasts and famines. When there is a feast, they are not in the public service; but when there is a famine, they come back. We have to expect that.

THE WITNESS WITHDREW.

CHARLES STUDDY DALEY, Retired Public Servant, Canberra, sworn and examined.

THE CHAIRMAN. - Would you care to make a statement on the committee's terms of reference which are to inquire into the original plan for the building of Canberra, modifications of it, the reason for those modifications and matters incidental thereto?

MR. DALEY. - I have not prepared a written statement of my views, because I thought that you would like to question me on many matters. First of all, let me say how pleased I am with the interest that is being taken in the development of Canberra by Parliament, because I think that this has been a serious short-coming in the past, and has been responsible in itself for quite a lot of awkward situations, delays dilemmas and frustrations to loyal and hard-working public servants who frequently have felt that there was no over-coming the political difficulties.

The political machine, as you know, works in a peculiar way. It goes backwards and forwards and very often the building of Canberra has been held up very seriously by causes quite outside the control of persons who were honestly trying to get on with it.

You all know that it is an important decision, and a proper decision, that a city should be built according to the plan. I assume that you are conversant with the steps taken to obtain the plan. I need not traverse the history of the competition, although there were some aspects with relation to it which were disadvantageous. That is to say, it was a competition among foreigners, owing to the opposition by the Minister of the day, Mr. King O'Malley, to the suggestion that he should not be the adjudicator. That was contrary to all precedent. We tried to change his view, and in desperation, we got the R.I.B.A., to see him, as a deputation, but he would not budge from the stand that he was to select the plan. We put it to him that it would be just the same if he approved. The Government would ultimately decide, but no, that had to go in the conditions. For that reason, the British Town Planning world was out of our competition. That was a great sorrow to those of us who had assisted in the preparation of the conditions.

SENATE CANBERRA COMMITTEE.

That, therefore, brought difficulties in its wake with Mr. King O'Malley because he had trouble in getting a competent board of adjudicators. As he had excluded the Institute of Architects and Surveyors and Engineers, none of their members was prepared to act on his board of assessors, so he ran into trouble from the beginning, and there was not a unanimous opinion about the selection of the plan. However, the Minister did make the award according to the majority report of the three adjudicators, and he also purchased the alternative plan recommended by the chairman of the adjudicators.

SENATOR WOOD. - Whose plan was that?

MR. DALEY. - A plan submitted by a Sydney firm. There are three partners, W.E. Griffiths, R.C.G. Coulter, and C.H. Caswell. They were Australians who had entered for the competition.

SENATOR WOOD. - Who came third?

MR. DALEY. - The first prize, of course, went to Burley Griffin, and the second was awarded to Saarinen, one of the greatest figures in architecture in the past 50 years. There is no doubt about the standing of this man. He was borrowed by America later for work in Michigan. His plan was very elaborate, and was much more costly than Burley Griffin's plan. The third prize was awarded to Adolphe Agache, a Frenchman.

3) You probably know that the Minister then referred those designs to a departmental committee for review. The committee finally suggested to him that none of the designs, as they stood, was suitable for adoption, and the committee prepared another plan known as the Departmental Board's plan, which embodied features of the several designs, but was mainly based on Griffin's plan. Its object was to meet the criticisms that had been made about the extravagant cost involved in Griffin's plan, and the Departmental Board's plan provided for a concentration of development mostly on the south side of the river.

I now think that had that plan been adopted, we would have been in difficulties. In my opinion, it was a little too restrictive, and I think that Griffin had a better vision of the development. It is notorious that, in the building of cities, the generation which criticises the plan always lacks vision. People said that

SENATE CANBERRA COMMITTEE.

about Washington in the early days. The size of Washington was considered to be ridiculous. Of course, there is no argument about it today. They wish they had more space. They were so foolish in the past as to hand back the part of their territory to the State of Virginia.

HOWEVER, the Departmental Board put its report into the hands of Mr. King O'Malley, and prepared another plan. I do not wish to take up too much of the committee's time with a recapitulation of facts that have already been put before it but I have here the report and the plan of the Departmental Board.

SENATOR RYAN. - Does it vary much from the Burley Griffin plan?

MR. DALEY. - The Government adopted the same place and had the same general triangular approach but development was to be concentrated on the south side of the river. The University was to be placed on the north side, where the shopping centre is situated at the present time. Essential development was to be concentrated on the ground of economy. Very often people are criticised many years later for having done certain things, but the atmosphere in which their decisions were taken is not visualised.

There was a good deal of press criticism of Griffin's plan, and the statement was made that Australia could not afford to build a capital on the lines that he envisaged. So one of the matters in the mind of this board was that it had to try to meet that particular criticism and reduce the amount of development involved in establishing the capital in the first instance. For that reason, that plan was confined mostly to development on the south side.

SENATOR RYAN. - Was this plan given any attention?

MR. DALEY. - It was approved by the Minister, who brought it to Parliament, and it was approved by Parliament. We started to develop in accordance with it. Griffin's plan was set aside, and that became the plan on which development occurred. At the opening ceremony when Canberra was named by Lady Dedman on the 12th March, 1913, that was the plan, and that was the basis. A little earlier, Mr. King O'Malley had driven the first peg in the survey. The

SENATE CANBERRA COMMITTEE.

surveyors were instructed to put that plan on the ground.

SENATOR RYAN. - And Canberra has not developed along those lines?

MR. DALEY. - The plan was later set aside, and Griffin's plan was reverted to. I do not think that I should go through all the intervening history, because there is quite a lot of it, including a royal commission. It is a curious story.

(continued on page 535)

SENATE CANBERRA COMMITTEE.

MR. DALEY - I think the original conditions on which the competition was called provided that the successful architect would not be employed. The work was to be carried out by the Government's own staff. So, there was no breach of contract with Mr. Griffin in paying him the premium for his design and then setting it aside or not employing him. But there was a difference of opinion as to whether Mr. Griffin should be associated with the scheme as he was the winner of the competition. One of the persons who suggested that Mr. Griffin might come out here and confer with the departmental board was J. S. Murdoch, the Commonwealth Chief Architect who was a member of the board. He was a very fair minded person and it rather irked him to get the winner of a competition such as that should be left out of it. Mr. Murdoch went abroad in connection with Australia House and came back through America. He interviewed Mr. Griffin in Chicago and he cabled the Minister suggesting that Mr. Griffin should come out. At that stage, there was a change of Government. We had a new Minister, Mr. Kelly. I think the Hon. Joseph Cook was the Minister but he never entered the department and we had an honorary Minister, Mr. Kelly. Mr. Kelly agreed to this proposal and Mr. Griffin came out to Australia. Mr. Murdoch went to Sydney to meet him and bring him to Canberra. He showed Mr. Griffin the whole of the Territory and was eager to give all possible help to him. Then Mr. Griffin had a meeting with the departmental board. The upshot was that the board found that Mr. Griffin was not prepared to compromise in any way on his own ideas. That, unfortunately, was one of Mr. Griffin's failings. He could not compromise. But, as we all know, the world is not carried on like that. My own opinion is that it would have been more politic and a little more human if Mr. Griffin had been brought out here earlier.

When Mr. Griffin came to Australia he found his own plan set aside and another one in its place. That was rather a bitter pill to swallow. Of course, he had heard of this before but to have it all placed before him did not make for the best relations or encourage him to try to evolve something ^{acceptable} to everybody concerned. Therefore, there was no

SENATE CANBERRA COMMITTEE.

possibility of any compromise with Mr. Griffin. Added to these circumstances was Griffin's own make up and personality. He was not able to concede anything to the views of the board. When Mr. Kelly found that, he disbanded the board and installed Mr. Griffin in its place. An agreement was drawn up under which Griffin was appointed Federal Capital Director of Design and Construction. He agreed to remain in Australia to carry on this work. His first task was to develop his plan because, after all, the plan he had prepared was merely a sketch plan drawn in Chicago. All such plans need adjustment of some kind in detail in conformity with the site. Griffin commenced work. He opened an office in Melbourne and the Minister gave him permission to employ staff.

Another thing for which Mr. Griffin got approval and started on was the holding of an international competition for the design of the permanent Parliament House. Mr. Griffin prepared the conditions of that competition. We were asked to comment on those conditions and we did so but we found that we could not have any personal collaboration with Griffin because his mind was not open even to suggestions that we thought would be suitable from our own experience or from the point of view of Australian conditions. So, that competition was launched. However, about three weeks later the first World War broke out and of course one of the first things the then Government did was to withdraw this competition. It had not gone very far. The documents and conditions had been circulated through various agencies, mostly British Embassies, but most of them had only reached their destination. So, the competition was delayed. However, Mr. Griffin went to Europe and, upon his return, he proceeded with the development of his plan. He began putting it on the ground.

Then we had another change of Government. Mr. W. O. Archibald from South Australia became Premier. For some reason, Mr. Archibald did not like Mr. Griffin. As the war conditions were becoming more acute, it was obvious that there could not be any very active development of Canberra. Departmentally, we had already done

SENATE CANBERRA COMMITTEE

a lot of work here. We had established the Royal Military College. That was our first work in Canberra, and it was done in November 1910. We had also started to build a power house to generate electricity. We had designed a water supply scheme at the Cotter, and also an outfall sewerage scheme. Competitors in the Canberra Plan Competition had all been told about those factors when the competition was held. So, they were not called upon to provide for those facilities in their plans. We also had a suggested survey of the city railway. That was put in the information given to the competitors. The competition for the Canberra plan had probably the most complete set of conditions ever specified for a competition. In holding the competition for the plan of the permanent Parliament House, advantage could be taken of the information supplied in the first competition. However, some of the conditions contained in the conditions for the Parliament House competition was American and not English, if I may put it that way. Some of it was jargon that we were not accustomed to and that is what we wanted to alter but we did not get anywhere with it. As I have said, when the competition for Parliament House was withdrawn owing to the war, Griffin proceeded with the development of his own plan. Mr. Archibald was very concerned about the cost because, owing to war conditions, costs were more important than ever. He posed a lot of questions to Griffin about the comparative costs of earth works in his plan as against the departmental board's plan. I think Mr. Archibald wanted to satisfy himself that Griffin's plan was a sound proposition financially.

There was a lot of work in this because Griffin's plan was only a sketch plan. It had certain principles but a lot of engineering investigation was needed before fairly hard estimates of cost could be prepared to answer Mr. Archibald's questions. Before these were really answered we had another change of Minister. Mr. King O'Malley came back into office. Although he had set aside Mr. Griffin's plan earlier, when he came back he was a firm friend of Griffin's. Mr. O'Malley, Mr. Griffin, and

SENATE CANBERRA COMMITTEE.

the then Postmaster-General, Mr. Webster, were very close . Obviously there had been a change of the situation in Griffin's favour. It ended finally by Mr. O'Malley giving formal approval to Griffin's plan. I think that was on the 3rd of November 1916. That action put Griffin's plan back as the plan for Canberra, and it has never been departed from fundamentally since. In 1916 Mr. O'Malley - I shall never be able to understand how he was able to do this - got Cabinet to re-open the world-wide competition for a permanent Parliament House. He said that the time was opportune or Griffin thought the time was opportune. However, it was not very opportune in 1916 when we were bogged down on the Somme. Nevertheless, the Minister asked the President of the Royal Institute of British Architects to be the Chairman and he sent a most insulting reply out which should have given the Minister a good deal if he was capable of being jolted.

(CONTINUED ON PAGE 538)

SENATE CANBERRA COMMITTEE

MR. DALEY SPEAKING.- The government went on with this, and the competition was launched again. They had not got very far - perhaps about a month had elapsed - when we had the situation in which Mr. Hughes walked out of the House on the conscription issue and a new government was formed. One of the first things that it did was to withdraw the competition for Parliament House. Although the competition was definitely withdrawn, Griffin did not quite carry out the instructions of the government. He was told that the competition was withdrawn but he notified the Registered competitors that it had been postponed and that it would be re-opened when the time was opportune. He went beyond his charter. That little trick of Griffin's cost us thousands of pounds later on. It led to a great deal of misunderstanding in the architectural world, and the Federal government by its dishonesty, breach of trust and all kinds of other things, particularly those from America. Lots of American architects had been preparing for the competition; they had had more opportunities than other people to do so.

Not a great deal of work was possible on the development of Griffin's plan during that period, although Griffin was employed for half of his time. He had the right of private practice. However, succeeding governments renewed his agreement until the 31st December, 1920.

During the period when Griffin had complete charge here, after the end of 1916, he did definitely attempt to put his plan on the ground - that is, to develop on both sides of the river. He even excavated Linslie Avenue to a depth of about six feet. Linslie Avenue is a level grade, and there was no necessity to excavate it. But that showed Griffin's point of view. He was determined that his plan should go on the ground. He started to make the West Basin Boulevard, which involved a lot of heavy construction work. It may be argued that some of those things did not represent the best use that could be made of the money at that time, but he was anxious that another and later administration would not set aside his plan again. He tried to key it down on the

SENATE CONFERENCE COMMITTEE

ground wherever he could. He cut through the road to make Adelaide Avenue and put in that road which is part of State Circle going round past the Prime Minister's Lodge. He did all the things that would really serve to put his plan physically on the landscape.

In the early part of 1920, through the anxiety and zeal of Sir Littleton Groom, who was Minister for, it used to be Home Affairs but it was then called Works and Railways - Sir Littleton Groom had been very keenly interested in the building of the Capital. Without making any odious comparisons, I think I can say that Groom showed more interest in and zeal for the building of this capital than any other person I came across. Groom had been our Minister on two previous occasions. He had been handling the dispute with N.S.W. about the site when they refused to hand over Dalgety. That is another piece of history, but it does not concern us now. Groom had, I might almost say, a flaming zeal for the building of this city. The idea appealed to him. He was a man of ideals and of great personal integrity. He took up this matter with the government after the war in an attempt to get things going again. He wanted to appoint a commission. He could not get the government with him at the time, but he got this far - he got approval to appoint an advisory committee of expert people, partly departmental officers and partly representing ^{the} engineering, architectural and town planning professions outside. The Chairman of that committee was Sir John Sulman. Griffin was offered a position on that committee, at his existing remuneration, with the idea that he should police his plan and report to the government on anything that he thought to be detrimental to it. The intention was that he should keep in touch with the development. But Griffin had earlier shown his disposition to wish to control the whole of the development. Although he was a landscape architect of ability, he was very poor at construction and he knew little about engineering. The government was not prepared to give him a charter for the whole of the development but it was prepared to associate him with other people and give him sufficient opportunity to see that his ideas were carried out. That was a fair proposition. However, he would

not accept it. He is reported to have said to Sir Littleton Groom, "Mr. Minister, I will not sit on a board. A board has length and breadth but no depth". His agreement was not renewed, and he passed out of the picture.

I was appointed by Sir Littleton as Executive Officer and Secretary of this committee. The Order in Council appointing the committee stated -

With a view to enabling the Federal Parliament to meet and the central administration of the Commonwealth Government to be carried on as early as practicable at Canberra, and on the basis of the acceptance of the plan of layout of the Federal Capital City by W.B. Griffin....

That, so to speak, enshrined the plan in the scheme and we had to proceed according to the Griffin plan. One of the first things that some members of the committee did was to suggest to the government that there be a reversion to a scheme something like that prepared by the departmental board. The funny part of it was that the departmental members of the committee had nothing to do with the suggestion. It was put up by Sir John Sulman, the Chairman of the committee. The committee was actually an advisory committee, not an executive committee.

By that time, the departmental situation had become complicated. The administration of the Territory was in the hands of the Minister for Home Affairs. That is the portfolio that used to be called External Affairs. It is most confusing to follow. It was owing to this trouble with Griffin and the old Department of Home Affairs, which contained the Works Branch, that Griffin's work and some other sections were transferred to this other department of Home Affairs, which included the administration of territories. Therefore, there were two Ministers involved. The Minister for Works and Railways was responsible for constructional matters, which were of the foremost importance at that time, and administrative matters connected with the Territory were in the hands of the Minister for Home Affairs. That meant that there were two departments. Although this committee was to prepare a scheme and the government referred all kinds of administrative things to it, such as policy in regard to

land development, finance and so on, it was under the Minister for Works and Railways. You can see that it was a very difficult situation. I have nothing more to say about that with regard to the question of the momentum that can be gathered in doing a large job and the ways in which it can be effectively stopped.

I am dealing now with the plan. The plan was the basis of this committee's work. When the Minister received this report from Sulman and one or two other members, he referred it to my old chief, the Director of Works, Colonel Owen, who was also a member of the committee. However, he had not been at that meeting. Owen opposed the suggestion, although he had been one of the authors of the departmental board's plan. He knew his loyalty was to the government and its decision. So there was a meeting with the Minister. Finally the Minister said that the government was emphatic that there should be no more backing and filling about this plan and that development had to go forward on the basis of the Griffin plan. We pointed out to the Minister at a meeting that that did not mean that we had to take every little detail of Griffin's sketch plan as sacrosanct and that the committee must have power to recommend alterations of detail. We showed the Minister the many alterations that Griffin himself had made of his sketch plan in order to suit it to the ground. The alterations were very numerous but very minor. They did not effect the main principles or the cardinal points of the plan. They were just things dictated by commonsense, economic requirements and practical requirements such as drainage. They were alterations of the kind that are made in any scheme between the time you initiate it and the time you actually carry it out. The Minister agreed that the Advisory Committee could make recommendations in regard to amendments to the plan, provided they were not amendments of points of principle. The committee did make some recommendations which were approved. Let me refer you to some of the important ones.

SENATOR WOOD.- Recommendations in principle?

MR. DALEY.- That is a question of how far principle goes.

It depends on individual views. There was no alteration in the governmental area or the allocation for the university or for civic purposes. They suggested a slight alteration in the siting of the railway station which was at that time to be built at Civic Centre. Griffin would have agreed to it himself for practical reasons. Griffin had proposed ribbon development in regard to shops. That is of course the most modern principle of design. The Sulman Committee was against that proposal, recommending that shopping areas should be concentrated both in the main shopping area, and also in the suburbs, on the lines which have actually been carried out. One other alteration that the Committee put forward and which was approved was the concentration into one centre of Griffin's commercial focus and civic focus. If you are acquainted with the large triangle dependent on Capitol triangle you will know that getting out towards Ainslie you have on the right Kings Avenue. Griffin had placed his commercial focus at the end of that and to the left of what is now called Commonwealth Avenue there was the civic centre. Griffin's civic centre was not a commercial centre. The Sulman Committee really consolidated these two centres. That was another variation it made in the plan, which was approved by the Government. The alterations that it made were very minor things required by practical necessities. That Committee was active from 1921 to the end of 1924. Senator Groom did not of course by any means put aside this idea of having a Commission and he succeeded in 1924 in having the Seat of Government (Administration) Act of that year passed, which set up the Commission. The Commission was given very wide responsibilities to control and develop this territory and it was laid down again that the development must be in accordance with the Griffin plan. I remember being sent for one morning to go to the Attorney-General's room about it. A sub-committee of Cabinet had been appointed in 1921 to deal with Canberra matters. I was its secretary for four years, although it was a Cabinet sub-committee. That was an unusual

CANBERRA SENATE COMMITTEE.

arrangement. This Commission was so secret, and Canberra matters were so touchy and inflammable at that time that they did not even trust me although I had their confidence and on occasions attended Cabinet meetings. I was not given details of this bombshell of bringing in a commission. Senator Groom kept it up his sleeve until that particular morning although it was to be introduced in the House that night. I was asked how the Griffin plan could be put into an act of Parliament. They said they wanted to introduce it that night and wanted the Government Printer to have it ready for introduction. I told them that they could not put the Canberra Plan into an act of Parliament because we did not have an up to date plan drawn with the various amendments that had been approved. After a lot of argument it was decided that a clause would be inserted in the new body, the Federal Capital Commission, to gazette within a certain period a plan which would be the plan to be followed. It was finally understood that that plan was to be the Griffin plan. The Minister was to approve of it and he would not have approved of any serious departure from the Griffin plan. So that was the next move on the plan, and again the Government was firm about adherence to the Griffin plan. Of course this story could become a little wearisome.

THE CHAIRMAN.- It is very interesting and not wearisome to us.

MR. DALEY.- I wanted to show what view has been taken about adherence to the plan in principle. The Federal Capital Commission then was duly appointed and assumed its responsibilities from the 1st January 1925; I joined the Commission at the request of Sir George Pearce and came up here as its secretary on the 3rd November 1924. The commissioners were appointed from that date although they assumed control as from 1st January 1925. The Commission had very wide powers. In relation to another matter I should like to point out to you that actually for five years the Commission had control of this Territory, and so far as development and construction and policy were concerned that period was Canberra's golden age.

SENATOR HANNAFORD.- What were the names of the Commissioners?

CANBERRA SENATE COMMITTEE.

MR. DALEY.- Sir John Butters was Chairman. He was the only full time member. The other two commissioners, who attended meetings and were not required to be in Canberra all the time, were Sir John Harrison of Sydney, who was a builder, and Mr. Clarence Gorman of the Sydney firm of Hardie & Gorman . Ltd., land specialists and stock and station agents. Naturally Sir John Harrison took a great deal of interest in the building of Canberra and spent a lot of time here although he was not paid for it. The same thing applied to Clarence Gorman who took a great deal of interest in development and also in soldier settlement and took care of a lot of the confusion that had grown here regarding outside leases and so on. Unfortunately, Mr. Gorman died as a result of an appendix operation just before the opening of the Parliament in 1927 and did not live to see the result of his efforts. It was an important task to get Parliament here and we had to meet all kinds of difficulties that were not of the Commission's making. However, the Commission being a statutory body with a large degree of independence could make its own arrangements and carry them out. One of the chief benefits it had was that it was independent of the budget and we did not have this annual wrangling about money that we see now. There was not an opportunity then for all the opponents of the scheme to try to block it. You gentlemen are probably conversant with all the actions and statements of the people and press of Melbourne at that time which often very effectively held up work in Canberra, prevented development, and confused issues. We were up against that all the time. There was difficulty in getting information, and the scheme was not in any way definitely sold to the Australian people as it should have been. We take our national pleasures sadly. The worst sort of thing happened in relation to the building of New Delhi. There were all sorts of trouble about that. It also happened in connection with the building of Washington. It is common knowledge that these large projects never proceed easily and it takes a long time for national consciousness to be aroused. That is why I am glad more interest is being taken in this project by the Senate as a national project. Do you wish me to proceed any further regarding the question of the protection

of the plan?

THE CHAIRMAN.- No, I think we shall ask questions on that.

MR. DALEY.- I should like to make some observations in relation to that. The Federal Capital Commission saw the necessity of having expert advice outside its own staff, and it appointed what was virtually an architectural planning and advisory committee, consisting of architects in private practice in Australia. It conferred with them on major projects. They met periodically. The chief commissioner was nominally the chairman but he did not act as chairman except to have consultations. When they were doing consideration of projects I think either Mr. Kingsley Fenderson or Mr. B. J. Waterhouse acted as chairman. The commission was abolished by the Scullin Government and ceased its operations on 30th April 1930. We reverted then to this old scheme of splitting the activities and responsibilities amongst various departments. That was a time of great hardship; the country was in the throes of the depression and any suggestions for any large development and the expenditure of money were completely frowned on and received no endorsement anywhere. Between that period and the beginning of World War II no considerable development occurred. For several years there was no outside body available to be conferred with in respect of the Canberra Plan. As a result of situations that occurred in Parliament over the university area and the high school I suggested to the minister of that day, Mr. McEwan, that we should have a body something like the Fine Arts Commission in Washington to reinforce the minister in his views, because public servants were fair game for anybody to shout at in Parliament, and a minister very often does not know what trust to put in his officers. Sometimes he is told they are no good and know nothing. It is easy to hurl these criticisms about and many public servants know that despite the fact that they have devoted their life to something they will be attacked when the opportunity occurs. A lot of attacks made in Parliament at that time were made on me personally. I told the Minister that this kind of thing had happened in America and that they had there a Fine Arts Commission which had

CANBERRA SENATE COMMITTEE.

certain powers and responsibilities and represented the best technical and professional opinion in that country. I said that if a proposal was approved by such a body the minister would be on pretty safe ground in supporting it.

He could, with confidence, deal with his critics. That suggestion was adopted by Mr. McEwen, and what is now the National Planning and Development Committee was appointed in 1929. In the ordinance appointing the committee there is a long list drawn up by me and which covers everything I could think of, but the committee has no executive power. It is an advisory committee. However, I put a clause in the ordinance to provide that if the Minister or any responsible public servant set aside the recommendations of this committee in respect of any work, the Minister must place the matter before Parliament and say why the recommendations have been set aside. That is the position in America. The Fine Arts Commission is not responsible to any Secretary of State, but is responsible only to the president. Therefore, it is put in a position where it cannot be torpedood.

The Minister said to me, "But that interferes with ministerial responsibility". I said, "That is just what its aim is. We want to prevent action by incompetent, dishonest or ignorant ministers," and I added, "and we have had all three". } I had to be forceful to make the Minister realise that I was challenging a very important principle - ministerial responsibility.

This is a national matter. I could give you a list of instances where ministers have erred and have deliberately tried to interfere with this plan without bringing the matter before Parliament or anybody else. In most cases I have been able to prevent things going completely wrong. I should like to give the committee two examples of instances of the plan being set aside by ministers who had the idea that they would get away with it if they could, without doing it through the proper channels and bringing it before Parliament. We had one minister give directions to the department to prepare plans for building a hall on the site of the old hospital, that is, where the present University is. Although he was told that that was a breach of the plan, he just waived it aside. I knew nothing about this, because it was done in the Department of Works. That illustrates the weakness of having a lot of departments dealing with Canberra, instead of having one body

responsible for policy and the whole of the activities, such as the Federal Capital Commission, when everything was focussed through one channel and everybody knew what was going on. Each move could be considered in relation to the whole. If anything prejudicial came up, some one would soon sense it, and it would be discussed and rejected if it was bad.

At the time of which I am speaking, I had to try to take a stand, although I was not in that Minister's department. It was my responsibility to see that Canberra was built according to the plan, so I had to tell my Minister that this could not go on, and he had to bring the matter up before Cabinet, and it was set aside. Nevertheless, that Minister had given emphatic directions that the work was to be started - that is, that that hospital which is built where Griffin located it, was to be built further up where the University is.

The other instance I propose to cite, also concerns the hospital. It occurred at a time when the Department of Works was a branch of the Department of the Interior. I had been away on leave for about six weeks, and when I came back I noticed a lot of little jigs which are used for setting up building foundations amongst the trees where the Nurses' Quarters at the hospital are placed today. I rang up the Chief Architect and said, "What is this business over there? There is no scheme at the moment for starting a hospital." He said, "That is to be a residence for a Minister. We have directions for it to be built immediately". I knew nothing about it. I said, "Look, a house cannot be built there. That is the site for the hospital. That is a breach of the Canberra plan." He said, "This has been approved by Cabinet and I have directions to start work next week on the foundations, and while we are doing that we are going to let a contract for the superstructure". The architect, who had been instructed by the Minister to do it, did not have the courage to say, "You cannot do that." I said to him, "Why did not you tell the Minister that that is a breach of the plan and simply cannot be done without the authority of Parliament?" He said, "Why should I put my neck out?" I said, "That is what you and I are paid for by the public - to put our necks out when required -

and if we do not do that, we should get the sack. I am ashamed of you." He said, "I have enough trouble." I said, "Well, I have the trouble now."

I went back to my office and dictated a report to the Minister. I sent it through my permanent head. Neither the permanent head nor the Minister knew the enormity of the proposal. The Minister sent for me - he was the Hon. J.A. Perkins, who was a very fine man to work with - and he was very upset about this matter and also very annoyed. He said, "Why did not you tell me about this earlier? This has been through Cabinet, and now I have to take it back and explain it!" Incidentally, the Minister whom he was up against, the one who wanted the house built, was a pretty strong man. I do not know why he should have been getting a house built anyhow, because he was not the Minister for Territories. I told my Minister that I had let him know about the matter within two hours of learning about it myself, so that he could not accuse me of neglect. He took the matter to Cabinet with the result that next day he told me to go out with this Minister and his wife and tell him where he could have a house built.

That was the second occasion on which I had blocked that same Minister from building a house. As far as I was concerned, the interview was not as cordial as it could have been, and our relations have not been cordial since then because of other matters. That illustrates my point that despite all the safeguards, these things still occur. If that house had been built, it is possible that the hospital plan would have had to be altered. A Minister may be misled by people or may take the bit between his teeth. For instance, a certain Minister asked me to give a map of this governmental area on which to build a hotel. I had the argument about that. Those things are quite wrong and should not occur.

SENATOR HANNAFORD. - Did the Minister get a house?

MR. DALEY. - Yes, he got a house where Griffin intended it to be built - in the domain. The house is now being used for the Canadian High Commissioner's office. All that territory is a kind of domain, and it was intended by Griffin for official residences.

I think we have a very fine site for this capital, and we also have a very fine plan. There is a lot of unnecessary disturbance in people's minds because they think that many things are being done on wrong lines. Cities are organic things. They grow. But you have to have some character in them and you must start with a plan. You cannot keep chopping it to pieces. If you do, you will finish with a jumble like they have in London. If Wren had been able to get his plan adopted after the Great Fire in the 17th century, they would have a marvellous set-up in London today. Many of us love London, but we must admit that from a planning point of view a great opportunity was lost there because of vested interests. The fact that you have certain principles embodied in a plan does not mean that the plan cannot be adapted and developed to the changing modern requirements. I am satisfied that the plan we have for Canberra is quite capable of meeting any requirements that are likely to eventuate. It has enormous walls in which we can expand readily without great expense, and it has a dignified basis. It has points of emphasis which you must have to get character. The great triangle which is bounded by Commonwealth Avenue, Constitution Avenue, the other side of the river, and King's Avenue, is the heart of this plan. The Lakes' scheme - both the formal basins and West Lake - are also integral parts of the plan which should never be set aside. We should hesitate before we do anything which is going to dismember the skeletal basis of our city.

(Continued on page 550)

SENATE CANBERRA COMMITTEE.

As you know, the Americans had this trouble. It was 100 years before they put it right. Washington was a very poor place until considerably after the Civil War. The Civil Service was transferred to Washington in 1801 and it was not until after the Civil War in the 1860's that Washington actually came into its own. This was due to a man named Shepherd who started to develop Washington as a city. Indeed there was a move to have him impeached, because he spent money that he did not have. He put it back on to Congress, but his action forced them to get a national conscience. They did not realise until after the Civil War that they had a capital, or how important it was. It was from that time that Washington began to become the exemplar of all that was best in America and a city which ^{to} was ~~be~~ outstanding by world comparison was initiated.

They were very influenced by the British disposition where, there were fine examples of architectural treatment. That seemed to give some inspiration to Washingtonians, or soon Americans, and an important commission was appointed which went to Europe to make investigations. Although 100 years had elapsed since the original plan had been prepared, the main recommendation of the committee was to go back to the plan and to cut out the excrescences that had occurred since they were damaging to its integrity. They did not say that the plan had been made 100 years before and there ^{fore} was obsolete and would not take modern traffic. Indeed, people are saying that about the Griffin plan for Canberra. That is a misconception and is an approach from the wrong angle. Washington is an object lesson for us. Everyone went back to the plan which had been prepared 100 years before, and it is being adhered to. People are very concerned lest any temporary or modern movement should affect the city, such as modern architecture. They have done a good deal of development more recently, but you will not find that any so-called modern buildings in their official groupings. They have a dignified form of architecture which expresses its purpose, and even though it is costly, they do not run away with ideas that it must be changed just to meet the modern trend. I read in today's newspaper that

Q.1. 550. C.S.DALEY.

SENATE CANBERRA COMMITTEE.

these modern things become dated. Many of you have doubtless seen the French Boulevards and the squares of Paris, or some of the British cities where they have uniformity in buildings and you will have noticed that there is an impressive dignity about them. Of course, there is no necessity to carry that style throughout a whole city or the residential areas, but you must have points of dignity, and emphasis must be placed on them. That is my object in alluding to this American example, because we relied on America very much for our constitution, and we gathered a great deal of inspiration from American history, even in the administration of this city.

There is one matter relating to the interest that Parliament should take and having some relation to suggestions made that we should hand the whole of this place over to the ordinary form of municipal government. This report refers to the responsibilities of Congress in relation to the national capital and I think that they may be taken to apply with equal force to the Federal Parliament.

THE CHAIRMAN . - What report is that?

MR. DALEY . - It is the report of the commission of Fine Arts of the 1st July 1929 to the 31st December 1934. It refers to the fact that Congress is given power to exercise exclusive legislation in all cases whatsoever for the federal district. That was adopted. The constitution, therefore, makes Washington the capital city. It belongs to the people of the United States. Congress representing all the people^{is} its Board of Aldermen. Our Parliament is the Board of Aldermen for Canberra. The report states that the United States President, acting under the constitution, is the Mayor of Washington. Such concepts have never been sufficiently understood here. This has exemplified the weakness in our thinking in the past from the point of view of the attitude of Parliament.

The man who was responsible for the development in Washington which altered the outlook of the nation to embellish Washington and make it a thing of beauty and an inspiration was Daniel H. Burnham, who was head of the Fine Arts commission and who was known as Burnham of Chicago. He was a very eminent Architect. I direct attention to

SENATE CANIERRA COMMITTEE.

a passage at page 7 of the report of the Commission of Fine Arts which is some valuable advice tendered by Burnham. He said, "Make no little plans. They have no magic to stir mens' blood..... Make big plans. Aim high in hope and work remembering that a noble logical diagram, once recorded, will never die but long after we are gone will be a living thing asserting itself with evergrowing intensity. Remember that our sons and grandsons are going to do things that will stagger us".

^a
There are/lot of those reports which indicate the success they have had in overcoming troubles like we have, that is, stopping schemes that would have been to the detriment of the nation or which would have impaired the beauty of Washington. I do not think those matters need to be emphasised. The principle is clear. We want people who have no axe to grind and who are competent and who are animated only by desire to safeguard those things which make for the building up of a national capital for the people. Such a body must have as much independence as you can grant to it.

MR. DALEY CONTINUING.- I think that all I want to say about the plan. In regard to administration I believe Canberra deserves to have, in the executive section, high level people, professionally, to watch its architecture and development. That is most important. The English planner Abercrombie, after his visit to Canberra - it was most regrettable that the Works Department thought so little of the National Capital that it only allowed him one day to see this city - said "Be very careful about the quality of all your buildings, even houses. You have a wonderful opportunity; do not throw it away". He said that the general impression of Canberra would depend very largely on the quality of its buildings, even its residential buildings. In 1924 I had to draft a set of building regulations for Canberra and it was endorsed by the Sulman Committee. Provision was inserted for the registration of architects. We made it compulsory for architects to be employed in the designing of buildings and we licensed builders. So far as I know those controls were not in force anywhere else in the world. I was told that we would not be able to get away with it but we had no trouble although I believe that recently, the regulations were amended and it is now possible to build without employing an architect. I have a great respect for builders, but they are not architects. I could take members of this committee around Canberra and show them things that are in bad taste and even offensive. When I was the proper authority, the regulations gave power to control the appearance of buildings, their siting on their blocks, and their colour. Those were very great powers that had to be exercised with discretion and without an arbitrary frame of mind. But I found that when I explained the reason for the regulations, people usually were agreeable to forego some of their own notions. Some may say that the variety is desirable but, in my opinion, having different coloured buildings all over the place is one way to make the city almost hideous. Certain principles have to be followed to get dignity. I am not against ^{restraint in} variety but the colouring of buildings in streets

and reasonable conformity to certain principles in design are necessary otherwise streets become just like they are in any other place. Therefore I believe you need someone of very high attainments because he will deal with all sorts of people who will come to him for authority to put up buildings. He will have to deal with Australia's leading architects. Therefore, the principal architect here should be a man of high standing and capacity.

THE CHAIRMAN.- Would you recommend the establishment here of a body similarly constituted and with similar powers to the American Fine Arts Commission to safeguard such things as the quality of buildings?

MR. DALEY.- I would. I am still in favour of that. Whatever organism you have here controlling it, you should still have a body of that character. I have seen it work and it can work provided it is given full information. When I was the executive member of the National Capital Planning and Development Committee I made it a cardinal point to give members of that committee the fullest information about what was going on even although I did not bother them with all sorts of details of things that were being carried out from day to day. When the committee was first appointed I got it to agree with or disagree with certain questions of principle that I put up to it. Then when a matter came clearly within a principle that had been agreed upon by the committee I dealt with it. But I always told the committee what I was doing. If there was a dispute with an architect I brought the matter immediately to the attention of the committee. So, I used that committee to the full. I knew that, to do so, there had to be complete frankness.

THE CHAIRMAN.- I am not drawing a comparison between our National Capital Planning and Development Committee and the American Fine Arts Commission but have you any suggestions to make about the composition of a committee that could be set up here on the lines of the Fine Arts Commission?

MR. DALEY.- I think the Fine Arts Commission in American is representative of architecture, engineering, town planning, and the fine arts. I think the basis of that, generally, would be very

SENATE CANBERRA COMMITTEE.

suitable. A decision made by the Government and one which was not in my recommendations, was that the Public Works Committee and the Advisory Council should be associated with the National Capital Planning and Development Committee. That, I believe, was a mistake because those two bodies have functions in another orientation. However, it has very often been useful to have the Chairman of the Public Works Committee on the National Planning and Development Committee. He has frequently been a tower of strength although of course he cannot contribute very much on technical and professional matters. The Fine Arts Commission is a technical, professional committee. If there are to be other people on our committee you will slightly vary its constitution. However, I would say that to have a link with the Parliament is not a bad thing.

THE CHAIRMAN.- Do you think it might be a better idea if we had a body that was a fine arts commission and nothing else, and then another organisation on which the Parliament could be represented, as a parliamentary watch dog, not interfering all the time, but with power to inquire into and report to the Parliament upon any serious departures?

MR. DALEY.- I think that we could again follow the American practice there. In that country a joint committee deals with the District. I recommended that for years,

THE CHAIRMAN.- There could be a joint committee of the two Houses or a committee of either House?

MR. DALEY.- Yes, a standing committee to take a continuing interest. Members of Parliament come and go but the existence of a standing body of that kind would be a great strength to the development of Canberra and to the people of Canberra.

THE CHAIRMAN.- I should like some idea of what Griffin intended to build on Capital Hill. We have looked at the site. I have been looking up my Roman history and I find that the Capitol in Rome was the temple of Jupiter. As this is a Christian country we cannot set up a temple to Jupiter.

SENATE CANBERRA COMMITTEE

Can you say from your acquaintance with Griffin just what he had in mind? It seems to me that his idea is fairly vague. He wants a fine building there but a building surely must have a specific purpose.

MR. DALEY.- May I quote from what Mr. Griffin said about it -

Centrally located, the Capitol is focussed in an extensive hill park, and at that has a limited function, either as a general administration structure for popular reception and ceremonial, or for housing archives and commemorating Australian achievements rather than for deliberation or counsel; at any rate representing the sentimental and spiritual head, if not the actual working mechanism of the Government of the Federation. "Kurrajong" is deemed too large and too high for a convenient working organisation of Parliament, but, being the only conspicuous internal eminence that has a skyline visible from practically every portion of the city, it lends itself to an architectural treatment that need occupy little more than in the necessary ramps, stairs, and terraces the outlook to make it, by its natural bulk, the dominating architectural feature.....

The whole group of Government buildings is directed out from the one popular point along lines of convenience in function. The fact that Parliament is in two "Houses" is an incident in addition to the topographical situation that precludes making of that structure a focal feature.

I might explain that Capital Hill was originally called Kurrajong because of two kurrajong trees that stood on it but were subsequently removed. The name Capital Hill was given to it by the Federal Capital Commission.

THE CHAIRMAN.- You will admit that the purpose indicated by Griffin is rather hard to put into concrete terms?

MR. DALEY.- There are of course intangibles but after all many of our deepest sentiments are intangible and I think we must give Griffin some credit for saying -

...at any rate representing the sentimental and spiritual head, if not the actual working mechanism of the Government of the Federation.

THE CHAIRMAN.- But before such a building is put up, it will be necessary for the Parliament to determine what it symbolises?

MR. DALEY.- That is so.

THE CHAIRMAN.- Obviously we cannot put up something and say "That symbolises the Australian nation". It would have to be something more definite?

MR. DALEY.- It might have some of the functions that have been assigned to the Pantheon in Paris. We have always had in mind that in addition to having a place for special ceremonial or even to house archives there should be something on the fundamental side in which you wish to memorialise certain ideals or services.

THE CHAIRMAN.- Or certain events in Australian history of outstanding importance?

MR. DALEY.- That is so. Very distinguished people might be even buried there.

THE CHAIRMAN.- The one important building we have so far of historical value is the War Memorial. It would have to be something of equal importance of that kind?

MR. DALEY.- Yes. I think that Griffin, being an American, necesarrily hesitated to be too explicit on what he thought but I think he has given us the germ of an idea.

THE CHAIRMAN.- I think he has given as much of an idea as we could get. You have spoken of advertising the competition for Parliament House. Is there any plan in existence for Parliament House?

(Continued on page 558.)

SENATE CAPITALS COMMITTEE

MR. DALEY.- No plan accompanied the competition specifications except certain plans of the site. In 1920 - or 1922, when this particular building, or the project for it, was referred to the Public Works Committee, the Committee asked the Chief Architect, Mr. J. S. Murdoch, to get out a scheme for building Parliament House on Capital Hill. He got out the designs which you can see in the relevant report of the Public Works Committee. The report contains some plans showing how, in Murdoch's opinion, Parliament House could be placed on top of Capital Hill. That was not Murdoch's recommendation, but the Committee asked him to do it and he got out some sketches. However, I do not think they went very far in regard to the actual planning of the building. I do not think there is in existence anywhere anything more than the schedule/ ^{of} accommodation which Griffin included in the conditions of his competition, but I think that would be found to fall very far short of present day requirements.

THE CHAIRMAN.- We know Griffin's opinion that Capital Hill is unsuitable for a Parliament House, but do you think we need necessarily accept that? Do you think Capital Hill could possibly be a site for Parliament House, or do you regard as conclusive his argument that it is too high?

MR. DALEY.- He had another argument that you should know about. It is a conical hill. If you put a building on top of it, the building would necessarily have to be almost a square. Griffin said -

The whole group of government buildings is directed from one popular point along lines of sequence and function. That is a typical Griffin sentence that no one can understand. He continued -

The fact that Parliament is in two houses is an incident, in addition to the topographical situation, that precludes the making of that structure a focal feature.

What he really meant was that with a bicameral system you have two houses and a library and, therefore, you must have a somewhat long rectangular building rather than the square type of building which would fit on top of that hill.

SENATE CANBERRA COMMITTEE

THE CHAIRMAN.- This building is almost square, is it not?

MR. DALEY.- Griffin's criticism of this building would be that you have got a main building and courtyard. That would not fit in with his idea of building up a ramp. You have courtyards and, so to speak, ancillary buildings at the back. A building on that hill would have to be four square in its design. It would have to present a first class appearance on every side, which would indicate square treatment. That is what he meant. It would be quite practicable to put a Parliament House there, but it would be very costly. You would have to cut a lot of the hill away. The question is whether the people who had to go up there might not feel the fatigue of going up the hill. Of course, in these days of motor cars, that does not matter very much.

SENATOR WOOD.- A lot of people would talk.

MR. DALEY.- While the climb up the hill might not matter to a person who only went to the place occasionally, it would be a very different matter for someone who had to go there constantly,

THE CHAIRMAN.- I understand that the Royal Military College was set up at Duntroon before the plan was drawn. Is that so?

MR. DALEY.- That is perfectly correct. We built it as a temporary affair. When we decided to implement the Kitchener report, General Bridges had a look at the military colleges throughout the world. My chief, Colonel Owen, was also a member of the Military Board. We had a very close association with them. They had a look at various sites suggested for the College. Colonel Owen was very anxious to put the college at Tugranong on the Murrumbidgee. They went out there one day in the winter. It was a very bleak day. Mr. Pearse was the Minister at the time. When the wind comes from the west in that place, you know all about it. Colonel Owen was describing the beautiful treatment that the site of the river permitted, and explaining what a fine site it was for the college. General Bridges was not so enthusiastic; he did not like that site. Then the minister asked, "Owen, what does this word 'Tugranong' mean?" The old coachman - we travelled by wagonette in those days - said, "Mr. Minister, I think

SENATE CONFERENCE COMMITTEE

it means 'windswept'". The Minister said, "It once is what it means, we are going to have some shelter from these westerlies." So they went round into the lee of Mount Pleasant. He would not listen to going out to Tugranong.

As we planned it originally, the college was further round towards the east than it is now. When the college moved to Paddington at the end of 1929 or the beginning of 1930, I pulled down all the cadets' blocks. They were all temporary buildings. It was intended that they should be up for only about five years but they had been there for about twenty years. They were all pretty rotten, so we pulled them down and sold the material. We moved the good buildings to Kingston to form the Technical College.

There was a change in Government in 1932. That government said that it was going to bring the college back here because Paddington was no place for it, and I quite agreed with that view. We were ordered to arrange to put up permanent buildings. I said that, according to the old plan, they had to go further round the other side of the road with better shelter from the hill, but the military people could not swallow the idea of departing from the parade ground with its then history. They said, "No, we cannot move from this hallowed spot". So we enlarged the parade ground and we put the present building up on the old site. That was still within the compass of the area that Griffin acknowledged was a military area. Griffin suggested in his report that Mount Pleasant should be regarded as being within military control.

(Mr. Dalry pointed out on a map the area of the Royal Military College and its relation to the city boundaries.)

MR. DALEY.- I think there is ample room, without impinging on the Canberra plan, for all the normal and academic requirements of the college, but if the college thinks it is going to have all its manoeuvring ground right at its back door, that is a different question.

THE CHAIRMAN.- The point I want to get at is whether there was confusion from the beginning, whether they dumped the college there without regard to the city plan and whether, consciously or unconsciously, Griffin allotted to the college the land which might

be necessary for it.

MR. DALEY.- Let me refer the Committee to what Griffin said about it himself. After talking about the spacious public park allotted to one side of the upper lake, he said -

On the other are the grounds of the present military college, with the steep bald knoll of Pleasant Hill - the highest crest within the city - their most conspicuous feature.

Griffin evidently regarded Mount Pleasant as being within the grounds allotted to the College. Therefore, that lower road would be within the College. I think he must have envisaged a much larger area than the little constricted one that I showed you on the map. Still talking of Mount Pleasant, he said -

This maybe crowned either by future development of the military college, or, citadel like, given over, together with its adjacent slopes, to the military post, with its armories, arsenals, drill halls and barracks, commanding the railway lines, overlooking the entire city, and flanking the gap eastward towards the sea.

He was prepared to allot a reasonable area there for the college requirements, but not for manoeuvring. This trouble with the college goes back for some years. The Federal Capital Commission tried to reach an agreement with the College between 1926, and, say, 1928, as to what land they should have there. We thought they were opening their mouths too wide. We pointed out to them that this site was selected for a national capital, not for a military college, and that if the military college interfered with the capital, the college would have to go. They could not believe that, of course. We said that in the Territory there was ample room for a large development of buildings for academic purposes, but not for rifle ranges and things like that, which should be in areas away from here. That would not prejudice the ordinary academic work at the college.

THE CHAIRMAN.- Do you think it would be wise to settle as quickly as we can the question of where the boundary should be?

MR. DALEY.- I think so.

THE CHAIRMAN.- Even if it meant some slight modification of the Griffin plan, some re-drawing of the boundary lines, do you think it would be advisable to do that now?

CALIFORNIA SENATE COMMITTEE.

MR. DALEY.- I am aware that modification of the Griffin plan in that area is essential because that is one of the areas to which Griffin did not give a great deal of thought because it was ribbon development and it would be almost impracticable to put in a lot of the roads there. We have had various trials of it before the Planning Committee when I was there and we know that area very well. As we have to devise a better approach to the aerodrome to replace the present approach, which is ridiculous, we have to scrap that road to Queanbeyan in any case, or re-plan it.

THE CHAIRMAN.- Would you agree that this Committee should make a firm recommendation so that that matter could be settled and there would be no dispute about anybody encroaching on anybody else's territory?

MR. DALEY.- I think it is a pity that there should be disputes about things like that. I discovered a most important and disturbing thing quite by accident. During the war we had allowed the people at Harman to erect more masts and extend into the Molonglo area. They erected those masts and used buildings there for housing staff and put a lot of things connected with their technical requirements underground, on the understanding that that was just a war time development. I discovered one day that a scheme was afoot to transfer that area permanently to Harman. I told the Harman people that this area had been selected for a national capital and not for a naval station and that if the naval station interfered with the capital out would go the naval station. They had not thought of that even though they were actually handling the affair, a very responsible officer of the Department of the Interior was conducting ^{the} negotiations. That officer nearly dropped when I told him he could not do it and that that area was required under the plan. The whole thing was dropped. The navy are always good people to deal with and they were reasonable. They switched their development in another direction. However, that land could easily have been taken and have caused an embarrassment in the future, so I think that these questions should not be allowed to drift.

CANBERRA SENATE COMMITTEE.

THE CHAIRMAN.- This Committee was responsible for summoning the Commandant and other officers of the Royal Military College at Duntroon as witnesses. After having heard their evidence we consider that we have to come to a firm determination on that matter but what it is will not come out until we have heard the full evidence.

MR. DALEY.- I think I have made my comment on that. I think there should be no difficulty in allotting the College adequate space without prejudice to either party providing they do not do the kinds of things which might be convenient for them but could quite as well be done elsewhere and, if done at Duntroon, would be an embarrassment to residents of adjoining areas.

THE CHAIRMAN.- I think it is a matter which could be adjusted. We had a reference the other day regarding the high school. One witness thought it had been put in the wrong place and although he did not specifically say so, he gave the impression that it had been put on land that had been taken from the Australian National University area. Would you comment on whether the placing of the high school in its present position was justified and whether its placing there in any way prejudiced the University?

MR. DALEY.- I was the person who put it there. That was the occasion over which the trouble occurred in Parliament. You will realise the position when I tell you that the objections that were made in Parliament were made at the instigation of a head master of another school who did not want the high school. On that occasion I was blocked from building the high school for five years. During that period the Government would not allow me to build a proper high school building, due to the representations made by interested parties, not on a national basis but on purely selfish grounds. So far as the high school is concerned, Griffin's layout of the University was diagrammatic to some extent. He did not plan the University in detail. He could not have done that in 1911. He showed this area for the university purely diagrammatically on his plan. In my opinion the area on which the high school was placed was not included in Griffin's university area except for a narrow

slice which I deliberately took off the university area for the re-alignment of Ellerlie Crescent. The reason for that was to give the high school a full playing ground on the island block without getting more elongation. But the amount taken off was negligible. That was difficult to explain to Parliament at the time. I was accused of having murdered the university area by taking off half an acre of ground from 300 acres. It was merely an adjustment of Ellerlie Crescent. There are some people who think the high school should not be near the university and that the university should have all that ground. I felt there was no real prejudice to the Griffin plan in that variation or I would not have done it.

THE CHAIRMAN.- I think it is a good thing for the high school to be near the university. I now turn to another matter. Do you think that a single authority under the control of the Government, with full power to do everything to carry out the plan and develop Canberra, would be desirable?

MR. DALEY.- I have had the singular experience of working under such ^{an} authority, after having worked in a period when Canberra was administered by two departments. Friction between these two departments was bad. It was so bad that the Government hurried up the establishment of the Federal Capital Commission. There is no question that it was a great advantage to have a body responsible solely for the development of Canberra instead of having a system by which as at present you could have half a dozen departments sharing the responsibility. As none of them has the whole responsibility their senior officers only devote part of their time to Canberra and the result is that the general policy of Canberra development is not co-ordinated and does not get the full attention of the best brains we have. It therefore lacks momentum. A lot of these problems people complain about are soluble by determined people if they sit down and stick to it. We had that at the Commission which, I think, should never have been abolished. I must blame the Labour Party for its abolition. It did not like commissions because it felt that they were too much of an in-road on ministerial responsibility. Another commission abolished by

CANBERRA SENATE COMMITTEE.

the Labour Party was the Northern Australia Commission. I do not think that a diminution of ministerial responsibility is inherent in the establishment of commissions. The Parliament can control a commission. The point is that by the establishment of a Commission you have a body devoted to a particular purpose. I notice that there was no criticism of the appointment of a commission to carry out the huge Snowy River undertaking. I can imagine what would happen if we tried to carry out that undertaking with a number of departments sharing the responsibility.

THE CHAIRMAN.- Was the Federal Capital Commission responsible to Parliament directly, or to a department or a minister?

MR. DALEY.- It operated under a minister but the Commission had statutory powers. One thing that we got over was the financial problem. In the earlier years frequently, from the 1st July to the middle of October, the Budget was finally passed, to be simply marking time, losing no momentum, because we did not know what money we were going to get for that year. That was an intolerable situation. In later years the Commonwealth Treasury has been more reasonable in allowing Canberra development to proceed pro rata into the next financial year so that you can have the surety of a certain amount of money. Under the previous circumstances it was impossible to enter into long range commitments. The Commission could do all kinds of things. It was not under the Audit Act. The Auditor-General was required to audit our accounts but we were not subject to Treasury regulations. The Commission immediately instituted a system by which it guaranteed to pay any person to whom it owed money within three days. We saved enough money on discounts by that system to pay for the whole cost of our Accounts Branch which included costing for a whole lot of day-labour work. We could make better business arrangements and make longer-term arrangements with builders. When a builder can have a long-term arrangement to cover three or four years he can incur with confidence more overhead expenditure than he could incur if you could give him only a short term arrangement. The activities of the Commission were not compartmented into financial years. It had

to get the consent of Treasury to borrow money when the Minister had approved of its schedule of major works to be carried out but it did not have a complete annual overhaul and have to go through the same procedure over and over again for the expenditure of money that it had not expended in any one year, as often happens now. The Seat of Government Act laid down that the Commission was to utilise to the extent practicable the services of the existing Works Department for designing buildings. At that time there was the greatest goodwill between the Commission and the Works Department, but the Department was in Melbourne and with the best intentions in the world the system did not work and the Commission had finally to engage a complete engineering and architectural staff which could study the problems on the spot, do what they were told immediately and keep up the designs ahead of the development. That was another advantage. The most important advantage of the Commission was the co-ordination of policy. There was only one policy. Everyone knew where he stood, and you got a direction on policy immediately you wanted it.

SENATE CANBERRA COMMITTEE.

SENATOR BENN. - You gained very wide knowledge of the Burley Griffin plan while you were Secretary of the Federal Capital Commission. Your responsibility extended to work associated with the plan?

MR. DALEY.- The development of the plan, yes.

SENATOR BENN. - So that you had then, and you have now, a wide knowledge of the plan?

MR. DALEY.- I also had the advantage of conferences and discussion with eminent planners, like Sir John Sulman, who devoted a lot of time to studying it.

SENATOR BENN. - Would you see certain weaknesses in the plan, as well as its good features?

MR. DALEY. - I have expressed the opinion that, fundamentally, this is a very good design. That opinion is shared by leading writers on town planning.

SENATOR BENN. - It is not a bad plan?

MR. DALEY. - One of its virtues is that it is reasonably adaptable. It was a sketch plan, after all. People have said to me, "Where did Mr. Griffin design the Methodist church?". My answer was that he did not design any church. He did not put a whole lot of detailed development in the plan, but he would have done so as time went on had he been the planner. We have a planning section that does that, of course, following the general principles of the plan.

SENATOR BENN. - Would you say that administrative work associated with construction projects differs from administrative work associated with permanent civic affairs?

MR. DALEY. - Under State governments, those things are usually in separate categories.

SENATOR BENN. - Let us take the Snow Mountains project. A Commission controls that, and one commissioner deals with the construction work?

MR. DALEY. -Yes.

SENATOR BENN. - At one period you had an administrative authority - the Federal Capital Commission - here, but that has disappeared and you now have departments functioning.

MR. DALEY. - Yes. The Minister for the Interior is generally responsible for the development of the capital and for general policy. I was his advisor for years, but there were sections of administration cut off from us and put under Works and other sections put under the Attorney-General's Department. There was a lack of co-ordination such as that which could be achieved under an organisation like the Commission. The Federal Capital Commission carried out administration at three levels: First, at the national level; that is, it looked after the national aspects of Canberra, feeling its responsibility to the nation and the Parliament to make this the capital and the home of Parliament and the administration. Secondly, we had a separate territory of 900 odd square miles, which was equivalent to a State. Therefore, it had to have all the legislative and executive machinery, perhaps not so great a volume but just as wide, as you have in the States. There had to be everything from dog registrations to motor registration. Thirdly, it was the municipal authority as well. It looked after the roads and bridges, collected the taxes, registered the dogs and did everything that an ordinary council does. You have an example there of the working of those widely divergent things, as you find them elsewhere, concentrated in one authority. I feel that there was no serious difficulty in co-ordinating those things. I think the advantages of having them under one authority are far greater than are the disadvantages.

SENATOR BENN. - When the Snowy Mountains project is completed, the departments will move in and take charge of the affairs that are appropriately theirs. Can you see that day coming?

MR. DALEY. - Theirs is a difficult problem because the activities are dispersed over a very wide area. I should say that the ingredients that are vital to the operation of that scheme must be under the control of one authority. Of course, you can have the Postmaster-General's Department running the post offices and you can vest as much ground as you can safely manage in the adjoining municipalities, without interfering with the catchments and so on,

SENATE CANBERRA COMMITTEE.

but the main area should be controlled by one authority.

SENATOR BENN. - After the whole constructional work is completed, will not the Department of Works move in if buildings have to be constructed there?

MR. DALEY. - I could not say. The position is very unusual. Normally, that land is in the State of New South Wales. The authority is a Federal instrumentality. Therefore, it is a matter of arrangement. I should say that the Snowy Mountains authority will have professional staffs available for maintenance and incidental works and that they may as well put up a few odd buildings if they want them. A better example of what is at the back of your mind is probably the Leeton irrigation area, where the Irrigation Commission had complete control at the beginning. I think that now, however, they have evolved certain control of municipal functions by a local government authority.

SENATOR RYAN. - Can you tell me the term of Mr. Griffin's commissionership in Canberra?

MR. DALEY. - Mr Griffin came to Melbourne in 1913. He was appointed in that year by Mr. Kelly, as Minister for Home Affairs, and his contract ended finally on the 31st December, 1920. He carried out a large amount of private practice in Australia. There was a lot of complication about that, but under the terms of his contract he was only required to devote half his time to the Federal Capital contract and had the right of private practice as an architect. He, therefore, engaged in that practice in both Melbourne and Sydney. He also designed and laid out the town of Griffith, the irrigation area and the suburb of Sydney known as Castlecrag.

SENATOR RYAN. - Was this temporary Parliament House mooted during Mr. Griffin's term? Did he have any knowledge of it?

MR. DALEY. - No, Mr. Griffin had no knowledge whatever of the temporary Parliament House, which was a suggestion made first of all by the Sulman committee in its first report in 1921. The actual recommendation is as follows:

SENATOR RYAN COMMITTEE.

On the 5th May, 1921, at the Minister's request, the Advisory Committee prepared and submitted a scheme for the erection of a conference hall in which a convention might be held and which could be enlarged later for use as a temporary Parliament House until such time as it might be expedient to provide a permanent building.

The Minister, Sir Littleton Groom, asked the committee to design that because Groom, being a lawyer, and being very concerned about the Constitution, had the idea of calling a constitutional convention, to be convened at Canberra. It was his idea to use that building for that purpose and afterwards to devote it to use as a temporary Parliament House.

SENATOR RYAN. - On the expiration of Mr. Griffin's term of office here, the Commission was set up?

MR. DALEY. - Griffin's term ended on the 31st December. It was at that stage that the Minister, Sir Littleton Groom, was unable to get through Parliament authority to appoint a Federal Trust Commission, but he did get this project put in the hands of the Federal Capital Advisory Committee, under Sir John Sulman. He got a body of expert people working on it.

SENATOR RYAN. - Was the Advisory Council set up prior to the establishment of the Federal Capital Commission?

MR. DALEY. - No. I admit that the sequence of events is confusing, because they range over many years. The Advisory Council, as we know it today, was appointed in Canberra in May, 1930. I was chairman of the first Council. The Committee which recommended the Parliament House was in 1921. It prepared this scheme for a temporary Parliament House in accordance with the special request of the Minister. The design was carried out for the Sulman Committee by J.S. Murdoch, the Commonwealth Chief Architect, and it was then referred by Parliament to the Parliamentary Standing Committee on Public Works, which made a lot of recommendations. That had the effect of enlarging the scheme very much and really altering the kind of building. Instead of it being a very temporary building, it was to be built in brick and to be embellished so as to make it a kind of exemplar of Australian materials. It came from the Public

SENATE PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE.

Works Committee a vastly different building from that which they set out to consider.

SENATOR RYAN. - There was a considerable amount of controversy associated with its design and construction?

MR. DALEY. - Yes. The report of the Public Works committee is available and makes most interesting reading. There was much discussion about the subject. As a matter of fact, Mr. Murdoch got out another scheme at the request of the committee, not only for a building on the top of Capitol Hill, but also for a building on what was called the Knoll. You will have noticed a lot of excavation going on around here to move a sandhill. Somebody in the committee suggested building a temporary Parliament House on that hill, and Mr. Murdoch was asked to design a Parliament House for that site. He did so, but the committee did not recommend it finally. The only advantage it would have had was that it might have been less of an incubus when we came to build the permanent Parliament House.

(continued on page 573)

SENATE CANBERRA COMMITTEE.

We selected this site because it was in the open vista between the two blocks for the administration building and below the site for Parliament House and actually in an open area on the Griffin plan. It does not respass on the site of any building.

SENATOR RYAN . - Do you know of any specific reason why a departure was made from the original intention and this was constructed as temporary premises?

MR. DALEY . - In essence it has never been departed from. This is still regarded as a provisional building. We did not like the word "temporary" so we invented the word "provisional". People used to laugh at us when we said it was a temporary building. The construction of this building is not first-class, as you know from the condition of the roof. It is not a building constructed in the manner that a monumental permanent building should be designed. It has a limited life.

SENATOR RYAN . - That being so would you express an opinion that it should have been erected on the site originally allotted by Griffin?

MR. DALEY . - I am aware that Griffin's opinion would have been in favour of building permanent buildings everywhere. Everybody thought when se started to build a new capital, that it would at least be a place where there would be no temporary buildings, and that all the buildings erected would be first-class and of a high standard, Australia doing its best to demonstrate ^{here} its capacity to build a fine city. But after the war, the Government said to the Sulman committee, "We have not get the money for monumental permanent buildings" and the committee had to come along with designs for buildings which were not of the same quality as our new administrative building here. The secretarial blocks where the PostOffice and West Block are may be considered poor structures, too, compared with the kind of building put up in Washington. They are of ordinary construction; they are not permanent buildings; they may have a limited life. They are useful structures but they are not buildings in which one can take a pride.

SENATOR RYAN . - Were they not built specifically as permanent structures ?

SENATE CLERICAL COMMITTEE.

MR. DALEY . - There is a scheme to bring departments up by secretarial representation only, not the whole departments. East Block was designed by Murdoch in units of 25 x 15 so that later on if those buildings on each side were not required for purposes of administration, they could become offices for members of Parliament. You are aware of the provision that is made for Congress men in Washington. Each member and each Senator has a room. Murdoch designed this building so that it could ultimately be sub-divided into units for that purpose. The second was put up. We started it for the purpose of a National Library. We made it of a bit better construction and put more concrete into it because we wanted to protect Mr. Binns' books plans and pictures. After we had started the building, the Government changed its mind again and decided to bring up more departments, so the Library has not got its building. Those buildings were really regarded as being en suite with Parliament House. They are not monumental buildings.

SENATOR RYAN . - But Parliament House is known as a provisional building, and those other buildings are known to the public as permanent buildings.

MR. DALEY . - They are good buildings but they are not monumental buildings. They are not built of stone. They would not last for 500 years.

SENATOR RYAN . - You designate the 1920's as the golden age of development in Canberra?

MR. DALEY . - From 1925 to 1930.

SENATOR RYAN . - How long did it take to construct Parliament House?

MR. DALEY . - Parliament House was only partly constructed in that period. Mr. Stewart made history by turning the first sod with a steam shovel in August 1923. We had it ready for Parliament on the 9th May 1927 when the late King was here as Duke of York. The building was started by the Works Department, and the Commission really took it over on the 1st January 1925.

SENATOR RYAN . - Was that period of four years a reasonable time for the performance of the work?

SENATE CANBERRA COMMITTEE.

MR. DALEY . - Considering the situation here and the difficulty of getting labour I think reasonable progress was made with the building. That included the furnishing of it.

SENATOR RYAN . - Manpower and materials were available?

MR. DALEY . - We had great difficulty in regard to labour. The building of Parliament House coincided with a period that is not unlike the present time when there is a revival of building in the State capitals. The war had caused delay in all sorts of programmes and tradesmen here were at auction. In order to get this building plastered we had to offer a plasterer 35/-d. a day compared with the ordinary wage of about £1.0.0. We brought plasterers here from all parts of Australia and paid their fares and gave them houses for 12/6d. a week. We brought their families here, and returned them to their homes after the job was done. We had to buy them in order to get the work done.

SENATOR RYAN . - In other words you gave them an incentive?

MR. DALEY . - Yes, because we had to get the job done. The opening of Parliament was the compelling reason.

SENATOR HANNAFORD . - I should like to place on record the appreciation of the very fine evidence that Mr. Daley has given. It shows his vast knowledge of the subject. I should like him to state his ideas on whether Canberra should be retained purely on administrative lines or developed as a regional centre for this part of Australia. We have evidence a few days ago from Mr. Rudduck pointing out the undeveloped state of large areas of south-eastern Australia.

MR. DALEY . - I appreciate Mr. Rudduck's sincerity and his interest in these matters. He is a very thoughtful and capable person, but I cannot agree with his view about Canberra. I recall that the Department of Post-War Re-construction had some doubts about the same matter. It cut across all departments. None of ^{us} knew where we were. Our officers were dragged away by this department and given higher salaries. I found out one day that that department was re-designing Canberra, on the plea that it was part of a region. I was asked

SENATE CANBERRA COMMITTEE.

to confer with the department and I took with me a young fellow named Tetaz from the Department of Works because I wanted somebody to stiffen my elbow. They displayed to us an enormous amount of work which involved Canberra being a centre for the whole of this district back to Wagga and down to Goulburn, and being a collecting centre with an outlet to the sea and other places, in order to develop this region. I said, "I must oppose this personally because you are denoting this place and making it a provincial town of New South Wales whereas it was selected as the national capital. If you tie this place up with New South Wales as is inevitable with your scheme, this place will be the focal point for every industrial dispute in New South Wales! The idea that George Washington propounded and others like Madison and Jefferson honoured was the selection of an independent area for a national capital. I consider that the national government should not be hampered by all kinds of provincial influences in the performance of the national work. Our first Prime Minister, Barton, could not attend the ceremony of naming this place on the 12th March 1913 but he sent a telegram which said, in effect, "Australia: will now be mistress in her own house, and there will be no suggestion of provincial influences in the pursuit of national aims". That epitomised the whole idea of having a separate capital. If you tie up this place with New South Wales industrial development although it may be physically convenient to do so, the effect would be to cut across the whole idea of having it isolated in the national interest. I do not mean by that statement that this place should not have a reasonable amount of development, but to make it a commercial centre would be to undo what has been done to date.

SENATOR HANNAFORD . - It would be incompatible?

MR. DALEY . - Yes, it would be incompatible with its high destiny.

SENATOR RYAN . - You mention the payment of high rates as an incentive to artisans who undertake government work. Should a similar policy be adopted for that purpose now?

THE CHAIRMAN . - That is a matter of policy. I do not think

U.4. 576. C.S. DALEY.

SENATE CANBERRA COMMITTEE.

that this committee could make a recommendation on it

MR. DALEY . - We were compelled to do so at that time because Parliament House had to be built by a certain date. If you feel that a similar urgency exists today, you will have to pay the price.

THE CHAIRMAN . - Thank you, Mr. Daley, for your interesting evidence.

(THE WITNESS WITHDREW).

At 5 p.m. the Committee adjourned to Wednesday, February 16th at 10 a.m.

CANBERRA: PLAN, PRACTICE, POSSIBILITIES

Submission to the Senate Select Committee on the Development of Canberra
by O. H. K. Spate, Professor of Geography in the Australian National
University

I greatly appreciate the invitation to express my views on the development of Canberra, the more so as (unlike the generality of those who have appeared before the Senate Committee) I am a relative newcomer not only to Canberra but to Australia. The specifically geographical contribution to the study of Canberra's problems is, I think, admirably presented by my colleague Mr King; my views are those of a layman without technical expertise in planning or architecture, but led by his own work to take a lively, and I hope intelligent, interest in these matters.

I have assumed the freedom of expression allowable to a private citizen but I hope that none of my remarks will be taken as derogatory to the country which I am glad to regard as my home and the city of which I am proud to be a citizen - or, in view of its lack of any body civic, at the least a denizen. Criticism is not denigration, and with all her faults I love Canberra still. I should love her more were she easier to live with.

I regard it as very significant that, with natural divergences of detail, there is a considerable consensus in well-informed non-official opinion, such as that of Messrs Molt, Musson, and Scollay, the Canberra Area Committee of the RATA and - on the official side - of Messrs Gibson and Rudduck. With the general tenor of their submissions I am glad to associate myself.

I. GENERALITIES

1. The Plan itself

I think it unfortunate that the Griffin Plan is regarded in theory as a Sacred Cow. It is NOT modern planning; it is the modern planning of forty years ago. Moreover the offset to Griffin's admirable thoroughness and tenacity was a certain rigidity of mind: the lines once fixed on his map were regarded as fixed for all time. His Plan has admittedly done good service in the past by maintaining standards; although in places - for instance, the circles of Forrest - I think it is definitely bad, on the whole it must be conceded to be vastly better than the runners-up and a good deal better than anything likely to have been produced locally, given the then Australian tradition of town design - i.e. the dumping down of a grid utterly regardless of local topography and needs (a tradition unfortunately not yet quite dead).

The result is that instead of firm general outlines of functional zoning coupled with flexibility in detailed execution (to cope with new needs and new technological opportunities), there has been a tendency to look at changes not on their merits as modifications but as deviations to be smuggled through. I think that major shifts of emphasis should certainly receive advance publicity, and major interests concerned (such as RMC, ANU, CSIRO) should have a formal voice, if not a vote, in their discussion. But what we might call the minor tactics of planning - such as the layout ~~and location~~ of shopping centres - might well be left in the responsible and skilled hands of Mr Gibson and his colleagues, men trained in their craft. I have little hesitation in saying that, with the major exception of the mooted elimination of West Lake, most changes which have taken place; place (whether 'naturally' in the process of urban growth or deliberately by planning executives) have been for the better. A main reason for this is that Griffin was obviously obsessed by political symbolism and relatively at least neglectful of mundane convenience for those who would have to minister to the business of politics, which (rightly) must always be the main business of Canberra. He was not alone in this: New Delhi, planned at the same time, is Canberra gone megalomaniac.

/2. Growth and density

2. Growth and density

It is taken for granted on all hands that we must expect a population of about 70-75,000 in about fifteen years; probably 100,000 or more by the end of the century, should Australia live up to her resources. If anything like the existing low densities of population per acre are maintained, this means that we shall have a most unholy sprawl from Queanbeyan to around Hall. The resulting traffic problem would be bad enough in any case, assuming of course that surface transport remains the norm; but given the notorious difficulties of the existing layout (which would be the centre of a large urban agglomeration) it would be fantastic

For this reason it seems to me inescapable that the traditional Australian policy of the small box in a large garden should be re-examined. Multi-storey flats appear to be the only real solution - not of course in the sense that they should be the only type of residence available, but that they should take in a large part of the added population. In Canberra, with its large (and probably increasing) proportion of people of urban and professional habits, many of them probably content to be tenants rather than owners, this might be easier to attain than in the more traditional Australian communities. Tenancy rather than freehold will be the norm anyhow, and the alternative to flats would seem to be the small box in a small garden - the worst of both worlds - as in some of the existing prefab areas; or else more dreary barracks given the courtesy title of hostels.

It should be noted that, even without going in for full-blooded modernism in the Le Corbusier manner, multi-storey flat development is entirely compatible with a generous allowance of open space and garden. Modern design in this field can combine reasonably high density with a high ratio of open space per resident and with services such as laundry, nursery, and small shops of the canteen type on the spot. The surrounding open spaces could probably be more adequately and aesthetically managed than a proliferation of private gardens, many of which are a constant drain on individual finances and energy, and indeed sometimes mere frustration.

Moreover, such a development would give real scope for harmonious and impressive architecture, and remove the not altogether unjustified reproach that Canberra is "a chaos of prettiness", a garden city in which the city is swamped by the garden to such an extent that it has been naively claimed as a virtue that the trees hide the houses. (It may often be a merey, but it is not a virtue since it implies that the builders are ashamed of their work.) The architecture of streets as a whole has never taken root in Australia, outside the cores of the State capitals, and with modern architectural trends the classic concept of the residential street ~~maxx~~ is probably dead anyhow. But it must be replaced by something if we are not to have mere anarchic suburbias, and residential housing in large multi-unit blocks offers scope for balance, massing, and building on the large scale; and without these (at present conspicuously absent) Canberra would remain provincial in aspect compared with urban development in other lands. This is neither necessary nor desirable but if we are to have a city we must think three-dimensionally and not just in terms of lines on the map.

Once more, this should be taken as supplementing but not excluding a wide development of single-family residential building. But with the expansion of the city beyond the present built-up area, there seems no reason whatever for slavishly following Griffin's outmoded cobwebs. Modern planning has gone far beyond Griffin's ideas in the provision of 'neighbourhood units' grouped round their own sub-centres (shops, primary school, churches, hall, &c) and separated from through roads, though adequately linked with them. The experience of the New Towns and other development in Britain should be considered: two- and three-storey

/family houses

family houses, and even short terraces of economic but very attractive design, would enable greater densities with no loss of amenity. The Australian prejudice against the terrace is legitimate enough, since most examples belong to a bad age of building and are associated with metropolitan slums; some experiment on these lines could however be usefully undertaken, and most feasibly in Canberra owing to its peculiar nature as being, in a sense, a great 'company town.'

At all events, since the increase in population is imminent, the time has certainly come for a complete overhaul of the plan as regards peripheral areas, preferably (as suggested by Mr Moir and the RATA) with the advice of leading town-planners from overseas.

We should not be afraid of variations in layout and in aspect from place to place; no small part of the character of the great cities of the world depends in fact on contrasts between one district and the next in the texture of the street-net, the general height and material of buildings, and so on. Without it we shall get nothing more than the present insignificant variants on dull standardised themes. It has already been pointed out to the Committee that we have too much of these already or, as it is put in the RATA submission, of "building sprawl without visual or social focus."

3. 'Balance' and regionalism

I have little to add to the memoranda on these difficult and complexly associated problems by the Department of National Development and by Mr King; I must confess indeed that I do not fully share their optimism. It seems to me that one does not make a regional centre in an already established region; they either grow naturally by long-term acquisitiveness or are planned as such at a very early stage of settlement, as (to take very diverse cases) with the mediaeval towns of eastern Germany or such Australian centres as Albury or Goulburn. This is because the essence of the case is the reciprocal link of centre and region, a plant of delicate growth at first but very tenacious when established: the interests are genuine and deep as well as vested, and changes in the local hierarchy of regional centres are likely to be cannibalistic. In our case they could be inhibited by the NSW government with little trouble and some show of reason. However the growth of Canberra, though motivated by the external factor of its role as federal capital rather than by inherent 'viability', will probably induce far-reaching adjustments, and in view of the political division between NSW and the ACT administrative arrangements are bound to be very complicated. Indeed I am not at all sure that any but ad hoc arrangements will be generally feasible for some long time to come; meanwhile exploratory study of similar integration problems elsewhere might well be undertaken.

But in any case it is urgent that Canberra's employment structure should be diversified. If more avenues of employment are not opened, we may be faced with a situation in which the brighter spirits betake themselves to Sydney or Melbourne, leaving the dullards to fill the lower ranks of the Public Service. More attractive employment in the immediate post-school years might result in a better reservoir of older adolescents to draw from.

I think that all the industrial possibilities canvassed in the memorandum on 'Canberra's Function as a Regional Centre' are worthy of consideration, but I would draw special consideration to the desirability of attracting small-bulk high-value industry such as the manufacture of radio, electronic, optical, medical, and scientific equipment. The need for going to Sydney or Melbourne for nearly all such goods is a serious handicap to the scientific schools of the ANU, and I do not doubt also to the CSIRO. The small but valuable local market is likely to increase, and in this sphere there is a distinct advantage to the manufacturer in being in close touch with such highly specialised customers, who may be able to help directly with the initiation of new lines. Such development should if possible be fostered; it also suggests a stepping-up of the opportunities for advanced technical education, which itself would be of significance in connection with laboratory employment.

/With reasonable

With reasonable control, there need be no fear of Canberra losing 'character' by industrial development. With some exceptions, the standard of industrial building existing is not high; but it is a matter of common observation that in many small country towns by far the best building architecturally is the recently established factory, and the quotation on p. 5 of 'Canberra's Functions as a Regional Centre' are very pertinent.

4. Administration

I would most heartily endorse the suggestions of Mr Moir and the RAAI on this matter. We do badly need (1) a more continuous, influential, integrated, and autonomous 'Canberra Development Corporation', perhaps on the lines of a Public Authority in UK administrative practice, and (2) broader and more influential public participation in the running of Canberra than is provided by the Advisory Council, useful as that body undoubtedly is. It must I think be recognised that the national capital function of Canberra precludes a completely autonomous municipal government for a long time to come, but meanwhile I think some consideration might be given to ~~the~~ specific representation for such interests as the ANU and the RMC, over and above the general elective element.

Incidentally such a Corporation might be the appropriate body to use Canberra's hitherto entirely useless, though ornamental and doubtless expensive, Coat of Arms.

II. THE FACE OF CANBERRA

1. Public and semi-public architecture

The following remarks are of course (like everything else in this submission) my personal opinion only; but, as with other points raised, I think they represent also the opinion of many people who ~~are~~ are acquainted with modern trends in architecture and town-planning.

The paucity of large buildings of any architectural value in Canberra is appalling. The most considerable building in size, the new administrative block, is comparable in style and temper with the buildings in Ankara erected by the Republic of Turkey some thirty years ago, when it had scarcely emerged from military disaster and political revolution; but it is not so imposing. The Commonwealth Avenue bridge would be more at home on some billabong in the outback. Except for the correct but cold Patents Office, most of the other public buildings, ~~in~~ at least the directly governmental ones, are decently null, Parliament House perhaps not even that. One of the best aesthetically is ironically enough the makeshift occupied by the Archives section of the National Library. Practically the only buildings with much character are the Institute of Anatomy, the Australian War Memorial, the American Embassy, and University House, and in none of them is that character entirely stainless.

With two exceptions ecclesiastical architecture is at best devoid of imagination and at worst terrible; the exceptions are St Christopher's, which I personally dislike but respect for its uncompromising courage, and St John's, in the opinion of many good judges still the most pleasing building in Canberra. The brightest spots in the architectural landscape are the newer schools, but we need at least one new one a year on the most conservative estimate of population trends, and we look like getting (with luck) about three in five years.

I do not think that this situation is nearly good enough for the capital of a great nation, and such I sincerely believe Australia is.

I do not say this as a devotee of the latest and slickest modernism: I can find much to admire in a Victorian building such as the Post Office at Goulburn, a building which, if heavy, at least has consistency and bold massing and imports dignity and solidity to its important site. It has also self-confidence, and it seems to me that at bottom it is /this which

this which most Canberra building lacks. The general impression that one gets that those responsible, over-awed by the grandiosity of Victorian public building, have been so afraid that the architects of fifty years on will laugh at our buildings that we have ensured that so far as possible they won't even look at them; forgetting that we are now finding new virtues in Victorian architecture (even in its exuberance) and that the one completely unforgivable sin in architecture is tameness (which must not be confused with modesty, where modesty is in place, as it is in a wide range of minor buildings).

There is no answer to this problem except a willingness to spend money and to take risks. There will be failures, but there is enough architectural talent in Australia to ensure that there will also be successes. To mobilise that talent we need competitions which shall be judged by those most competent to judge, that is by panels in which lay and official interests must certainly be represented, but in which the weight of authority should lie with trained architects of independent and eminent standing. To avoid an obvious objection, for major works some judges should be recruited from outside Australia. I disagree completely with the suggestion that competitions should be restricted to Australians; other things being equal we should undoubtedly support home products, and even give them a bit of an edge in competition; but deliberate inbreeding is the surest road to perpetuate our present mediocrity.

An expansive policy certainly costs money, but one cannot buy a national capital of which one can be proud at bargain-sale rates. Nations, like individuals, should have an occasional splash of non-productive spending if they are to realise their personality to themselves and to the world at large. Some dignity and display, not justifiable in a purely utilitarian view, are essential for morale and prestige and to provide a tangible and permanent symbol of national pride. Such at least has been the experience of all other nations, but the Commonwealth of Australia seems slow to learn it, though the individual Colonies were certainly well aware of it in the last century.

2. Private building

It is of course difficult to evaluate private building. No-one wishes it to conform to cut and dried patterns laid down by authority, but a certain decency is essential. One of the difficulties is that the varying, but usually great, width of the streets is coupled with almost universal one-storey building; in Northbourne Avenue, for example, the main entry to Canberra, there is a hopeless disproportion between the noble width of the avenue and the dumpy houses flanking it; the only two-storey house is even so not high enough to be in scale, and is in any case much more conspicuous than successful. Such routes should surely be kept as parkways, so that the introduction to Canberra should be a little more impressive than that to any small country town; the buildings at Civic, though scarcely grand, would at least give a rather more impressive note.

It is certainly good that there has been no attempt to inhibit the building of really modern private homes. Styles based on Australian colonial, the standard low-pitched weatherboard, well-designed pre-cut houses, modified Georgian, semi-Mediterranean, and modern glass-walled houses with skillion or butterfly roofs, all can co-exist harmoniously enough if they are good honest work in themselves and if there is some tact in their grouping rather than an attempt to marshal them stiffly as if on an identification parade. Some parts of Forrest and Deakin attain such harmony to a considerable degree; for an example of how not to do it, the quarrelsome group of six new houses just north of St Christopher's may be highly recommended.

The section headed 'Architectural Control' in the RATA memorandum is highly pertinent here.

/2. Ornament and amenity

2. Ornament and amenity

the work of
The praises commonly lavished on Parks and Gardens must be whole-heartedly endorsed. Here and there, perhaps, an overlush display of blossom recalls Walt Disney's more sugary fairylands, but on the whole the skill and care which have gone into this side of Canberra's adornment have been rewarded by a feature as admirable as it is unique.

However, since a pudibond police robbed us of Bellona, there is not a single piece of statuary worth looking at. It is, above all, passing strange that no Australian has been thought worthy of public commemoration in Australia's capital. Heaven forbid that we should litter the city with frock-coated politicians (or even poets or professors) in bronze or marble; but there are other ways of commemorating men and events, as is attested by (for example) the Lawrence Hargrave memorial overlooking Illawarra, or even by Queanbeyan's modest but not unworthy memorial to William Farrer. As it is, we have not even got beyond commencing the Commencement Column, which almost justifies the Sydney Bulletin's libel of 1920. It might conduce to civic pride if we at least added one course of masonry every twenty-five years, so that in course of time its name might come to be not utterly belied.

To descend, though not from the sublime, the inadequate provision of public conveniences is to be deplored. To quote Osbert Lancaster, "nobody would wish these reminders of human limitations to be too obtrusive; on the other hand they would belie their name were they completely hidden from view." Some greater provision of these essentials of modern urban civilisation, and some more adequate indication of where they are to be found, is surely desirable; many a motorist must have drunk an unnecessary glass in order to avail himself of the facilities provided by private enterprise. That such structures can be made at once readily identifiable and aesthetically pleasing (I speak visually) is shown by the remarkably good design of the new conveniences at Kingston.

III. TOURISM AND COMMUNICATIONS

The importance of tourism to Canberra needs no stressing, and it should be a matter of governmental concern that visitors should carry away a pleasing impression of the city whence Australia is governed. But in addition to material needs, such as that for more camping and hotel accommodation, there is really a desperate lack of anything to visit: just looking at buildings not notable for antiquity or artistic splendour is a thin diet. Apart from Parliament House, the Institute of Anatomy, and the Australian War Memorial, there is nothing to detain anyone more than ten minutes.

A national museum and art gallery is essential if Canberra is to attain the cultural importance appropriate to a national capital. It may be suggested that while such institutions in large centres of population are traditionally free, this need not apply when the bulk of the visitors would not be local inhabitants; by hypothesis visitors to Canberra could afford a small admission fee.

Finally there is the ever-acute problem of finding one's way, and not only for the pathetic foreigners brooding over their maps at every corner on holiday weekends. In this respect Griffin's plan is universally admitted to be utterly inadequate in modern transport conditions; the straight economic loss, in time and petrol, caused by the numerous intersections of lat curves (which cannot be accurately shown on small-scale maps) and the profusion of roundabouts and squareabouts, must be cumulatively very large.

The visitor, and even the resident, are very little helped by the inadequate signposting. The problem is admittedly very difficult, but the least which could be done - and this at least is easy - is to see that streets are ~~maximally~~ readily identifiable. Most street-names are placed well above headlight level, and those which are not are on ridiculous short posts, often obscurely located and lettered, which must be read sideways. Some of the details are simply silly: the sign for

Hovell Street can only be read by the few passengers coming from Narrabundah, while Srzelecki Street has no sign whatsoever (it once had one in the middle, where it is of least use) - and all but a few New Australians must feel some diffidence in asking for it. The arrows for one-way roads are very poorly designed. There is no provision for an adequate display of house-numbers, which could easily be enforced. All these may seem trivial details, but they add up to a considerable difference to the amenity of the city.

I should like to suggest that some attention should be given to the possibility of indicating two or three of the most essential tourist routes by centre-lines in the roadway in various colours, with a prominent key to them at Civic. Details would have to be carefully worked out, there might well be aesthetic objections, and the idea might not prove feasible, but I think it might be worth some consideration.

More important is the question of a bypass for heavy traffic to Cooma and other points south. There seems to be no reason why all through traffic should add to the hazards and the wear and tear on city roads. If possible such a bypass should be carried well outside the area likely to be built on, i.e. east of Majura, rejoining the Cooma road as far south as possible; a link with the Yass road would also be desirable.

Envy

I think I should emphasise that the views expressed above are entirely personal and independent of my position in the ANU; although this memorandum was drafted without any consultation, one or two details have since been checked with others. I think that these opinions, by and large, are shared by a considerable body of informed opinion, however ever.

Space limitations account in some cases for what may appear snap judgements, and I repeat that strictures are made in no condescending spirit. Were I simply a sojourner, some things might appear impertinent or ungracious; but remarks which would be rude in a guest may be permitted to a man who has moved into a new house and intends to stay. On the whole it is a good and gracious house, a commodious site, ~~and~~ a superb setting, and above all good neighbours; but some of the service details are distinctly odd. But I have now lived in Canberra for three and a half years, and so far have no desire to live anywhere else: my remarks should be read in that light.

O.H.K.Spate

12 2 55

SENATE SELECT COMMITTEE ON THE PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT
OF CANBERRA.

MINUTES OF EVIDENCE

Taken at Canberra

WEDNESDAY, 16TH FEBRUARY, 1955.

PRESENT :

The Chairman	(Senator McCallum)
Senator Benn	Senator Ryan
Senator Hannaford	Senator Wood.

OSCAR HERMANN KRISTIAN SPATE, Professor of Geography in the Australian National University, Sworn and examined.

THE CHAIRMAN.- Will you table the paper that you have prepared for the information of the committee?

PROFESSOR SPATE.- Yes, and, with your permission, I shall discuss it and explain the main points. I should like to add to my expression of appreciation of the invitation extended to me by the committee because what I have to say is, to a large extent, a minority opinion. I think it is shared by a number of well-informed people, though I may go a little further than they do, at least in the expression of it.

SENATOR BENN.- Were their opinions available to you before you compiled your paper?

PROFESSOR SPATE.- This paper was compiled without prior consultation with any of them. I have seen only the reports in the Canberra Times. However, my thinking on the subject in the three and a half years I have been in Canberra has been influenced by discussions with Mr. Gibson and Mr. Rudduck and at meetings of the Australian Institute of Town and Country Planning and things like that. In a technical sense only, I hope, I am irresponsible in this matter. That comment makes it essential that I should say a little about my credentials to speak on this matter.

I do not claim to be an expert in town planning, in architecture or in administration, but I do claim that my professional interests over some twenty years have led me to think

and to read a great deal about the growth of towns. I was born and brought up in the best planned part of London. I am acquainted with the three greatest plans in the world - Rangoon, New Delhi, and Amsterdam. Two of them I know very well. I know some of the older towns of England, such as Leamington and the original planned part of Birkenhead, as well as the towns planned at the turn of the century, which influenced Griffin a great deal I think, such as Port Sunlight, Letchworth, Welwyn and Hampstead Garden suburb. I also know a little about the new towns, which were not very definitive at the time I left England.

My first major work was a thesis on the development of London in the last century. It has not been published, but a world authority who is a professor at Liverpool is very anxious to have it published and would like to do it himself. I have written about two dozen major articles about Britain. Six of them were about towns of one sort or another, and these have been cited in standard works on British geography. I have thought a good deal about this subject and, whilst my opinions are entirely personal, I think they are at least worthy of consideration. I also regard it as very significant, as I have stated in my paper, that, although there are disagreements on detail, there is a considerable consensus of opinion amongst well-informed people that the time has come for an overhaul of certain aspects of the Canberra plan at least. Furthermore, many of the architects are not very happy about the architecture.

The plan is not modern planning. It is the modern planning of forty to forty-five years ago. It is very unfortunate that that phase was just before the introduction of the internal combustion engine, which has since revolutionised the problems of living in towns, so that Canberra got off to a bad start in that respect, not to mention the unaccounted for luck it had in running into the war and later into the depression.

I do not want to be understood as saying that Griffin was a fool or that the plan has not many very serious merits. I do not think I have any real complaint about the major structural

outlines of the plan - Griffin's idea of the three axes and the public side of Canberra considered as a political symbol. On that I think he did a very good job. He was very interested in that I think. But the other side of city planning, which I think is just as important - the provision of a place that is good to live in - was not done nearly so successfully I think. I think Canberra is good to live in, and I enjoy living in it, but that is largely due to nature rather than to art and I cannot help thinking that, in certain aspects, the Griffin plan makes the details of day to day life unnecessarily difficult. For example, I refer to the enormous spread of it compared to the size of the population, with pockets of denser population separated by wide open spaces. In many respects, I will admit, this is attractive and makes for good open living. Nevertheless it imposes those extraordinary bus routes and, for those who cannot afford cars, it places a serious extra burden in the journey to work.

I am inclined to think that some of the people who say, "The plan, the whole plan and nothing but the plan", forget that plans should be for people and not people for plans. I think it is a good thing that we have had the Griffin plan, which is probably as good a plan as we could have got in that day, but I do not think it is a good thing to allow ourselves to be slaves to it forever. Flexibility in its execution is essential. I think Griffin himself would have realised this, as is shown by the changes he actually made after he came to Australia.

After all, when we talk of planning a military campaign, the commander in chief of the planning staff does not lay down where every battalion is to be three months after the campaign has been initiated. He knows that there will be all sorts of unforeseen circumstances and that initiative will have to be exercised. That goes for planning of this sort also.

I cannot help thinking that much of the honest devotion to Griffin's plan on the part of those people who believe in the ideal of Canberra - which I believe in very strongly myself - is due to the fact that they have nothing much else to compare

SENATE CANBERRA COMMITTEE

it with except the standard Australian gridiron. If a little girl has no toys and you give her a doll - any doll - she thinks it is wonderful.

Once more, it was a good plan for its day in many respects - as good as one could have reasonably expected - but that day is not our day and, whilst it is true, as Mr. Shakespeare said when he appeared before the committee, that we have to be careful to preserve things for posterity, I think posterity will not thank us if we preserve nothing but inconveniences. In fact, the whole history of towns is full of the complaints of posterity about people who saddled them with inconvenient things that they had to get rid of at great expense later.

(Continued on page 582)

PROFESSOR SPATE speaking:-

One result is that, instead of having the firm general outlines, zoning and the major structural framework of the major route ways and so forth, with flexibility in the detailed execution of individual areas, what we have had is a tendency to regard changes as things that have got to be smuggled through. The result is that it started with smuggling through small things, and later on people may attempt to smuggle through bigger changes that certainly should not be made except very advisedly and after the maximum of public discussion. I am thinking of finding out late in the day that West Lake is not going to be there any more and is to be replaced by a ribbon of water or Lord knows what. I should like to keep as much of the Molonglo as possible more or less as it is now, but that is entirely a personal point of view and I should not like to press it too much. I think that Griffin, with his strong sense of political symbolism, such as he displayed in other places - for example, his building for the university of Lucknow, one of his later works - did rather tend to lose sight of mundane human factors.- such as the fact that you have to have shops and that public servants do not live on air. To be quite fair, I think that was part of the tendency of his day.

New Delhi is very much like Canberra except that it is incredibly bigger, more magnificent and more inconvenient all around. Human factors have been lost sight of. Political considerations apply in New Delhi that we do not have to worry about here, such as the fact that roads have to be named alternatively after Hindus and Moslems. Things like shops there are tucked away. They are of very shoddy architecture and obviously were not regarded very seriously. The great architects like John Nash, who designed Regent Street, were very careful to see that their planned areas were complete units, with all classes and all services grouped in a natural relation to each other.

THE CHAIRMAN.- The point about the variation of the plan is; who is to do it? I do not believe that anybody thinks now that the whole of the plan must be rigidly enforced. You say that you would

SENATE CANBERRA COMMITTEE

leave it in the capable hands of Mr. Gibson. But suppose Mr. Gibson said, "I am sick and tired of being pushed around by bureaucrats and scurvy politicians, I am going into private practice". Would you trust Mr. X, the unknown quantity, who took his place?

PROFESSOR SPATE.- I assume that Mr. Gibson was appointed by somebody. One is never free from error in human affairs, but I should think the responsible appointing body would see that Mr. X's qualifications were not entirely unknown.

THE CHAIRMAN.- It does not always work that way in the public service. The real point is that we want to get somebody who will determine what changes are necessary. The main trouble we have found is that changes are, as you say, smuggled in. They are usually made to suit the convenience of one department. I have just been out near Red Hill to inspect a gallows that has been put up there - I do not know for what purpose, but I shall try to find out. If anyone is hanged on it, I hope it will be the man who said it should be put there. Having regard to all the places at which the thing could have been put, why on earth did he pick that spot in one of the best parts of Canberra? It will be ugly and is probably the precursor of a lot of other ugliness. Would you think we were tying the hands of anybody too much if we said that all major departures from the plan should be submitted to a fine arts commission or some such body?

PROFESSOR SPATE.- This ties up with the whole question of administration, and administration is not a thing I am strong on. The administration of Canberra is not nearly so apparent as the actual layout of Canberra. It takes much more than three and a half years to unravel its mysteries. I certainly think that a fine arts commission or something of the sort is a useful idea. It would need very careful consideration as to just how it should be set up, what were its powers and so forth. I am also very much attracted by the idea that I think Mr. Moir was most explicit about - the idea of having some corporation or public authority of the type set up in the U.K. I think these people should be responsible for the recruitment of the technicians to carry the thing out. Anything of really vital

R.2 583 O.H.K.SPATE.

SINAI CARBONIA COMMITTEE

vital significance in the way of change should be referred to them, but as to the minor tactics, such as the way in which a particular area should be laid out, I really think that is a matter for delegation of authority. Otherwise we should get very cluttered up.

THE CHAIRMAN.- Do you think that in any big plan there should be a reasonable amount of freedom to make minor changes that would improve the plan and prevent it from becoming too grandiose and so forth?

PROFESSOR SPATE.- Indeed I do. New Delhi has a most tremendous avenue. You could dump the whole of the government area here in it. That avenue is saved from being completely soulless by the fact that there are two ruined mosques in it. They did not dare to pull them down because the Moslems would have been furious. They have saved the avenue from being entirely lifeless.

THE CHAIRMAN.- I think New Delhi is a most impressive city. You condemn it because of inconvenience, not because of the idea of trying to get a grand effect.

PROFESSOR SPATE.- The Government of India has to try for a grand effect because there is grandeur all around. As I said in print, I think New Delhi in many respects is very impressive and very successful, but that has been achieved at a high cost in, as it were, human relations. The area where the clerks live is not bad. It is well planned and it has decent houses and all the rest of it, but it is obviously tucked away and regarded as being rather indecent that it should have to be there at all.

THE CHAIRMAN.- Would you say that the Champs d'Elysee in Paris is a fine street?

PROFESSOR SPATE.- It belongs to an entirely different kind of the world. Griffin's plan would be wonderful if you had a Louis XIV with unlimited resources, unlimited authority and no damn nonsense about democracy to carry it out.

THE CHAIRMAN.- Suppose you altered the plan to suit the present day. You have used the word "outmoded" in relation to Griffin's plan. In forty years time the altered plan could be quite outmoded again.

PROFESSOR SPATE.- That is true. It is one of the limitations

of humanity . Nevertheless, in the foreseeable future, motor cars will be the normal means of transport. There is no doubt that modern developments in planning are more adaptable to an age in which motor cars are the standard means of transport than Griffin's were.

THE CHAIRMAN.- Griffin did allow for very wide streets.

PROFESSOR SPATE.- Yes, but very wide streets are not everything. Wide streets, if you put a residential area right on top of them, will be a monaco to the residents.

THE CHAIRMAN.- What are the defects of the plan with regard to traffic?

PROFESSOR SPATE.- The major defect is that it is almost impossible to find your way about. When I first came here, I thought that my first geographical article would be "Through darkest Canberra by star and compass" or "How not to get lost".

THE CHAIRMAN.- Do not you think that when definite landmarks have been established it will be quite easy to find your way about? The American war memorial and the Australian war memorial already give some landmarks. Once you get a few more substantial landmarks, I think you will be able to find your way about easily.

PROFESSOR SPATE.- That would help a great deal but there will still be far too many squareabouts as well as roundabouts.

THE CHAIRMAN.- Is it possible to alter them?

PROFESSOR SPATE.- It is not possible. We have got them and we have to put up with them.

THE CHAIRMAN.- You think might something might be done to avoid them in the newer suburbs?

PROFESSOR SPATE.- I do not think that future physical expansion should be limited by Griffin's ideas except insofar as it has to conform to the main route ways, which are not bad.

SENATOR WOOD.- You have said that you do not think the squareabouts and roundabouts can be altered. Have you studied that angle at all? I do not see why they cannot be altered.

PROFESSOR SPATE.- That is my impression, at any rate.

SENATOR WOOD.- Do you think that if they could be rectified

SENATE CANBERRA COMMITTEE

that would take a lot of the defects out of the Griffin plan?

PROFESSOR SPATE.- I think so, but I am not sure that it could be done without doing undue violence to the political symbol conception. We must admit that we have to sacrifice something for the sake of having a political symbol.

SENATOR WOOD.- With regard to the suggestion that the plan should be overhauled, do you think it might be better to get some outstanding town planner from outside - if possible an Australian - to do it? My own experience is that those who are close to the point of planning, living amongst the people concerned, are inclined to be influenced by criticism and abuse, whereas somebody from outside is not so much subject to that influence.

PROFESSOR SPATE.- I think it certainly would be an advantage if you had someone to take a really detached look at it. As in almost everything, I think you have to balance the advantages of the outsider seeing most of the game and the insider with the subjective feelings that are going to be very important for the people involved.

SENATOR WOOD.- I have in mind a point that you have stressed which I think is a very good one - that a town plan is never fixed in perpetuity and that there must be some flexibility. If we had some planner from outside consulting continually with the local town planner, that might be a good thing.

PROFESSOR SPATE.- I think something like that is almost essential as an adjunct to the fine arts commission, the corporation or whatever you like to call it. The only thing is that it might be desirable for obvious tactical reasons - although again there are disadvantages in this - if there were only that one person involved. I am rather inclined to think there is sufficient harmony amongst town planners for something like that to work - a advisory panel or consultative panel of, say, two or three men.

SENATOR WOOD.- In your written statement you have referred to sign posting, and I agree that that is very bad in Canberra. You think signposts should be more numerous and more closely spaced.

PROFESSOR SPATE.- That is a sort of minor detail.

SENATOR WOOD.- In conjunction with the squareabouts and

SENATE CONFERENCE COMMITTEE

roundabouts, inadequate signposting does make things more difficult.

PROFESSOR SPATE.- If you come along Northbourne Avenue to the shops at Civic, what do you see? You see an enormous board with about two dozen signs pointing to pretty well nearly everywhere in Canberra. A stranger may run his eyes up and down the sign and find the place he wants to go to. He may turn to the right, for instance, but he is quite likely to miss the next signpost, if there is a next one, pointing to his destination. That sort of thing presents a difficult problem. The actual streetnaming itself is an easy problem, and it is just too stupid that it is not done properly. I made an error in my statement which tends to prove my point. I said that Strezlecki Street - actually it is a Crescent - had no sign. I have been informed that there is a sign, but it happens to be in concrete on the kerb, which is even more difficult for a motorist to see than the little posts.

CANBERRA SENATE COMMITTEE.

SENATOR HANNAFORD.- Would you say that Griffin's plan was based on different modes of transport to those which are in use at present? It seems to me that he must have envisaged that motor transport would become more the vogue?

PROFESSOR SPATE.- I do not know what Griffin thought. He did envisage a much more important place for the railway than has come about. I believe that trams were considered. But I do not know that Griffin allowed those considerations to affect the actual lay-out of the streets. There was no particular reason why he should have done so. Although motor transport was obviously increasing when the original plan was prepared, it was not the norm at that stage. Whilst the main streets are fine for motor traffic, except where interrupted by circular roads, it is difficult to find one's way about because, in the street networks, particularly in the south, the flat intersecting curves make it difficult to see which is the left turn. These intersections cannot be represented accurately on a small scale map. They might be all right if one were driving a horse and buggy and had time to look about but they are not suitable for motor cars.

SENATOR HANNAFORD.- Do you agree with Mr. Gibson's modifications to the original plan to avoid the main road having a great number of intersections?

PROFESSOR SPATE.- I entirely agree with that.

SENATOR HANNAFORD.- And you are in favour of a much greater density of population in Canberra?

PROFESSOR SPATE.- Not a uniformly higher density; but, in order to prevent an open sprawl, some areas will have to be developed to a greater density than has hitherto been the case.

SENATOR HANNAFORD.- Would you agree that now is the time to develop a plan for the establishment of administrative buildings with Parliament House as a central focus?

PROFESSOR SPATE.- Griffin planned the sites for public buildings very well. His idea of long vistas with logical terminations was very good from the point of view of aesthetics and political symbolism. The area around Parliament House is the logical area for

the construction of public buildings, in view of the existing plan. Obviously, there is no alternative but to develop this area as a governmental building area.

SENATOR HANNAFORD.- You gave a rather grudging acknowledgment of the merits of the Patents Office?

PROFESSOR SPATE.- I had another look at that building yesterday. I would now put it somewhat higher up the scale than I did before. It is a reasonably good building but it lacks some final touch of inspiration.

SENATOR HANNAFORD.- Would you favour the construction of more buildings of that type or would you prefer multi-storey buildings?

PROFESSOR SPATE.- I think that we badly need some multi-storey buildings in Canberra, in order to break up the flat lines, and give some impressive visual focus. I do not say that such buildings should be disposed on any rigid, pre-conceived pattern. The appropriate sites would need to be chosen as the city grew. There is no reason why there should not be large blocks of buildings in parts of the city. When looking at Adelaide or Melbourne from a height one is struck by the fact that the tremendous array of buildings which catch the eye is confined to the city proper. It would improve Canberra to have one or two groups of such buildings although it would be a pity if any area were to be developed to the extent that it dwarfed the centre of the capital.

SENATOR HANNAFORD.- Although you have said that the abandonment of West lake might be regretted, I feel that you have not altogether supported the lakes scheme?

PROFESSOR SPATE.- I have never been able to make up my mind about the lakes scheme. I know clearly what I do not want and that is a little Torrens River. With a little tidying up here and there, the Molonglo River could be made to look very nice. It is undoubtedly the most Australian feature of the city.

THE CHAIRMAN.- It is a beautiful country stream; but do you think it is adequate as the central feature of a city?

PROFESSOR SPATE.- I can see the point of having a large lake through the middle of the city; but if any lake is to be

abandoned should it be the east lake or the west lake? If we are to have a big water feature, should it not be in front of the public buildings?

THE CHAIRMAN.- I do not think that the abandonment of the central lake scheme has been proposed.

PROFESSOR SPATE.- That is the key to the scheme. An ornamental sheet of water in the vicinity of Parliament House would provide a tremendously good view across to public buildings. But if too large an area of water is allowed to flow through the middle of the city it will result in a transport problem later on.

SENATOR HANNAFORD.- Would you agree that in some cities of Australia, particularly in Sydney, the gridiron system of road planning has not been rigidly adhered to?

PROFESSOR SPATE.- That is so. But, in making my previous remark, I was thinking of the average Australian country town. The gridiron system is the obvious plan to adopt on the drawing board. It is the oldest of town patterns. It is capable of indefinite extension. It is easy to understand why it was generally adopted. The great majority of small country towns of Australia have been planned on the gridiron system which is sometimes very successful. It can be made very successful in those towns which slope down to a river crossing, particularly if the plan is curved at each end. It is almost the only type of town pattern that has been used in Australia.

PROF. SPATE. - There are one or two things wrong with Adelaide, but in many respects it is a fine piece of planning. In many ways the straight line system has been effective. Of course the Canberra plan was modern in 1913.

SENATOR HANNAFORD. - Do you agree that the plan could be modified by crescents that would not be out of line with the general layout?

PROF. SPATE. - I do not like crescents unless they are carefully controlled. There is a modern tendency to try to get back to something between a rectangular pattern and a completely fluid pattern in which the streets follow the contour. . The latter system is very confusing at times. If there are reasonably gentle slopes you can arrange that there shall be a reasonable degree of regularity, and you can build with reasonable symmetry. The symmetry is not rigid and there is a certain amount of relief. Areas will then develop according to the lie of the land, but I should hate to see, for example, the hexagonal grouping around Jerrabomberra Avenue carried through. That will be terrible. Also, the enormous circular streets around the Molonglo River are unspeakably confusing, and really very dull. They are just as dull as fixed lines following a straight line pattern.

SENATOR BENN. - Is it correct to say that your summing up of the Griffin plan is this - the undeveloped portion of the plan is bad, and the plan as a whole was never very good?

PROF. SPATE. - Yes.

SENATOR BENN. - But we have now reached the stage when it should be condemned outright?

PROF. SPATE. - No, that is not quite what I said. The slavish following of the plan should be condemned outright in respect of the undeveloped areas. However, the centre of the plan in the public school respect is remarkably good. That part of the plan has undeniable breadth of vision, but since the central public portion has now been fixed, let us leave it there. For the exterior portion of the plan, which covers the residential, commercial, industrial and educational aspects of the city, that portion could be entirely overhauled.

SENATOR BENN. - Consider the second paragraph of your statement -

I think that major shifts of emphasis should certainly receive advance publicity. The major interests concerned should have a formal voice, if not a vote, in their discussion.

What have you to say about that?

PROF. SPATE. - If we had something like a development corporation, as was envisaged by Mr. Moir, it might be a good idea to have ad hoc representation of many public authorities. Those interests and authorities should be formally and publicly consulted.

SENATOR BENN. - Do you think that such institutions are not consulted now by the administrators of the Territory when they propose to make alterations of the plan?

PROF. SPATE. - The correspondence that I saw in connection with Mr. Rogers' evidence yesterday about the Royal Military College and the city lakes suggests that although consultation takes place it is sometimes of a cursory and belated nature.

SENATOR BENN. - There could be consultations of which you know nothing?

PROF. SPATE. - Of course, but in this case I think that I am right in saying that we simply received a letter saying that certain things were proposed to be done.

SENATOR BENN. - You would provide for representatives of certain institutions to have a vote about any proposal to change the plan?

PROF. SPATE. - That would depend on the general structure of the body which was to be set up. I think that consideration might be given to setting up something like a development corporation, which should have on it the Government officials charged with carrying out the work, representatives from the Senate and House of Representatives elected in the way that Parliamentary committees are elected, representatives of the electors, and a small number of nominees of the larger occupiers of land who are liable to be affected by projects such as West Lake. They might be called in ad hoc, or have a permanent place on the council.

SENATE CANBERRA COMMITTEE.

SENATOR BENN. - Do you think that the various interests in Canberra could be graded for that purpose?

PROF. SPATE. - Well, it comes to that. Consider the Port of London Authority. That has representatives on it of trade unions, employers, county councils, borough councils and dozens of other interests including the London Metropolitan Water Board.

SENATOR BENN. - We have such organizations in Australia also?

PROF. SPATE. - Yes, but the Port of London Authority is the one that I am familiar with .

SENATOR BENN. - They are not dealing with development?

PROF. SPATE. - Certainly, in a sense.

SENATOR BENN. - Most of their development work has been done?

PROF. SPATE. - Not the work of the Metropolitan Water Board.

SENATOR BENN. - You desire to have an authority set up to listen to suggestions and complaints and to decide them by vote?

PROF. SPATE. - I am not expert at administration but I do not see why they should not at least sit in on those discussions and have a voice in them. I would not like to say whether they should have a vote, but I do say that they should not have a decisive veto.

SENATOR BENN. - In your statement you said, "If not a vote" - you meant by that that they should have a vote?

PROF. SPATE. - No, they should certainly have a voice, and it might be considered whether they should have a vote. They should not have a veto. I should hate to think that one organization could hold up a whole project.

SENATOR BENN. - It is not consistent with public administration policy that they should have a vote. The administrative authority in the University would be consulted about any proposed changes of plan?

PROF. SPATE. - Yes.

SENATOR BENN. - There would be no smuggling in there?

PROF. SPATE. - We still do not know what will happen about West Lake?

SENATOR BENN. - You said that the plan is not modern at

SENATE CANBERRA COMMITTEE

present.

PROF. SPATE. - Yes.

SENATOR BENN. - If the Australian Government asked you to modernise the undeveloped portion of the Canberra plan, would you undertake to do it?

PROF. SPATE. - No, because I have not been trained to do it. But I am sufficiently trained to say that it could be done.

SENATOR BENN. - Would you say that your opinion of the undeveloped portion of the plan is an expert opinion?

PROF. SPATE. - It is the opinion of somebody who has studied towns for 20 years. It is not an expert opinion in that it is not an executive one. You do not have to write Shakespeare's plays in order to be able to criticise drama.

SENATOR BENN. - What is your objection to what you termed the "sprawl" of Canberra?

PROF. SPATE. - Canberra at present covers about five and a half miles in a north-south direction. If you multiply that by three you see that when it is developed it will sprawl 15 miles from north to south. The resulting journeys to work by the workers in the city will be needlessly colossal. In Sydney it is impossible to avoid taking perhaps an hour to get to work and an hour to get home, but here that would lead to frightful economic inefficiency. I have suffered from the distances in Sydney, although I was fortunate because I kept University hours and could arrive later at my work than most people. But there is no reason why that should happen in Canberra.

SENATOR BENN. - Have you an alternative in mind?

PROF. SPATE. - Yes, in certain areas the density should be greater by the use of multi-storey flats, and so on. That should not be done in all areas because we do not want to cram up the city. However, the sprawl is to be avoided if possible.

(continued on page 595)

SENATOR BENN . - Would not that be purely a matter of taste?

PROFESSOR SPATE . - It is not a matter of taste that it is more convenient to spend a quarter of an hour getting to your work than an hour and a quarter.

SENATOR BENN . - Is not that so in the case of an Australian who chooses to live on the 8th floor of a multi-unit building?

PROFESSOR SPATE . - Yes, but we are not saying that all Australians or any particular Australians will have to accept that any more than they have to accept living in sub-standard homes now, such as in some of the suburbs of Sydney. I think the flats should be there as one of the forms of housing available, and I think that some people will go into them.

SENATOR BENN . - Some people would be disadvantaged by living in a flat. Take a Mother of five or six children. Where are the children who do not go to school going to play?

PROFESSOR SPATE . - There are two answers to that question. One is that I do not think that people with large families should live in flats if it is avoidable. Also, there are not many families with five, six, seven or eight children these days. Secondly, even if you do have to have large families, modern flat design generally makes provision for ample play space under cover, if it is properly done. There is also a great deal of park way and that sort of thing, but there could be under cover playgrounds as well. I am really speaking of the construction of nice concrete areas which can be made very good-looking.

SENATOR BENN . - And the children could play there under the eye of a supervisor?

PROFESSOR SPATE . - They may or may not have a supervisor.

SENATOR BENN . - You would not like the children to be playing haphazardly, just any where, with the Mother up in the eighth floor flat?

PROFESSOR SPATE . - You cannot stop them from playing haphazardly anyway. You do not avoid hazards by living in a single unit

home.

SENATOR BENN . - What is a sub-standard house?

PROFESSOR SPATE . - I would not like to define a sub-standard house, but I have certainly seen a great many houses in Sydney which I considered sub-standard. I think it is not a good house for people to live in because it is dingy, dirty, horribly cramped, and unsuitably and clumsily designed for the housewife, and so forth.

SENATOR BENN . - You are aware, of course, that technically there is not a sub-standard house in Australia?

PROFESSOR SPATE . - I am aware that the New South Wales Government survey reports give the percentage of sub-standard houses in various districts and regions, and I was surprised to see what the percentage was. Actually I do not believe it, but it was 18.8%, 28.7%, and so on.

SENATOR BENN . - Do you know the percentage of what are termed sub-standard houses in Canberra?

PROFESSOR SPATE . - No. Canberra is not subject to the statistical requirements of the New South Wales Government.

SENATOR BENN . - Would you be surprised to learn that it is 20%?

PROFESSOR SPATE . - I would. I think that is taking a very rigid view of "sub-standard".

SENATOR BENN . - Let us get back to these sprawling dwellings. Do you not think that multi-unit flats have really come about throughout the world because of the shortage of building areas?

PROFESSOR SPATE . - That might, to some extent, be true.

SENATOR BENN . - And not to meet the demand of people who wish to be close to their place of employment at all?

PROFESSOR SPATE . - That, I think, is very possibly a factor in it. Nevertheless, there are increasingly large numbers of people who are not going to have a large family and who do ^{not} want the bother of looking after a house and garden.

SENATOR BENN . - You were born in London, were you?

PROFESSOR SPATE . - Yes.

SENATE HOUSING COMMITTEE.

SENATOR BENN . - You were accustomed to the multi-unit dwelling?

PROFESSOR SPATE . - I was born in a multi-unit. Most of my life, and certainly all but a year and a half of my adult life has been lived in a single unit home.

SENATOR BENN . - According to you, the average Australian was born in a small box with a small garden? He has never become accustomed to high blocks of flats. I do not like them, but apparently you are inclined to favour them.

PROFESSOR SPATE . - Yes, I entirely agree with that. There is a standard Australian tradition, and there are very good reasons for it. Nevertheless, times have changed, and people change with them.

SENATOR BENN . - You said also that these multi-unit blocks are to break up the flat lines. Would that be a substantial reason for giving up the present method of developing Canberra?

PROFESSOR SPATE . - Not in itself. I regard that as ancillary.

SENATOR BENN . - That would be only to satisfy the whim of some visitors to Canberra, would it not? Would it add to the beauty of Canberra?

PROFESSOR SPATE . - I think it would add to the beauty of Canberra, but I would not purchase the beauty of the city at the price of uncomfortable or unsuitable living conditions for a proportion of the population. I certainly regard that as ancillary to providing good housing and avoiding some of the inconvenience of a sprawl.

SENATOR WOOD . - Is not the modern trend in flat building to build flats in a central area of parkland and so give the children a much better playground area than does the small backyard?

PROFESSOR SPATE . - A very much better area in some cases. I do not think that this should be the only or the predominant method, but I think that some of it is necessary.

SENATOR WOOD . - Referring to your statement about the number of Australians who live in single unit homes, would not the percentage who live in flats in cities like Melbourne and Sydney be rather large?

PROFESSOR SPATE . - It certainly is an increasing one, and the flats are not always as good as one could expect to have here.

SENATOR WOOD . - For old couples whose families have grown up and married, flats are probably the ideal unit?

PROFESSOR SPATE . - That is certainly true in respect of elderly people in many cases.

In relation to balance and regionalism, I do not think I have anything to add to what has been said by other witnesses, but I do think that there should be somebody doing some very serious thinking on the question of the size at which you hope to level off Canberra; whether you want deliberately to attract industry, and the extent to which you want to develop the industrial and commercial area. I do not think that that is an urgent question here and now, but within a few years we shall have to cope with these longer term problems, and we need to think about them now. We need some forward planning and to do some research.

THE CHAIRMAN . - Do you not think that when all headquarters of the public departments are here, and we have also the National University, the University College and other educational institutions being developed, there will be sufficient population here to attract quite a lot of people and to provide diversified employment without the Government doing anything definitely to attract industry? When we have 50,000 people here, will that not in itself act as a magnet to draw other people?

PROFESSOR SPATE . - I think that is right. Some thought should be given, perhaps, to how far you want that to develop, and I think that some thought also should be given to the type of industry you want to develop and, of course, to the technical details concerning the terms on which it is to be allowed to develop. There will have to be some secondary industry here.

THE CHAIRMAN . - We have to make a recommendation on this point. Do you think we should recommend that, as far as the Government is concerned, the aim should be to have a Governmental administrative city, with encouragement to a large number of

SENATE CAMBERRA COMMITTEE.

educational institutions, and that there the Government's duty would end; it could leave it to the natural attraction of the market to bring industry here?

PROFESSOR SPATE . - That is a question to which I would not like to say yes or no.

The Committee adjourned from 11.15 to 11.30 a.m.

SENATE CANBERRA COMMITTEE

THE CHAIRMAN.- We shall deal next with the second part of Professor Spate's statement, which deals with public and semi-public architecture. Do you wish to comment on that section, Professor Spate?

PROFESSOR SPATE.- I noticed a report in the Canberra Times about the dating of public buildings. I do not think we should be afraid of buildings appearing dated in twenty or thirty years. I do not think that you could erect a building that would not date itself anymore than ^{one} could write a poem or a novel that would not be dated. You could, of course, as it were mis-date a building just as one could write a parody of Chaucer in Chaucer's English. You could mis-date it by copying a previous period of architecture, but you would still have to attach some sort of date to it. You would have to pretend that it was Georgian, or like that, and even then there are fashions in imitation. For example, to the history of Gothic revival, all of which purported to be fair copies of mediaeval architecture. Owing to changes in knowledge of that architecture and changes in techniques of masonry and so forth, one can distinguish periods amongst the buildings erected in the last century in careful imitation of mediaeval buildings. Because fashions change, the only way not to be caught out by changes in fashion is simply to wear no clothes at all.

I do not think you can avoid dating, and you should not be afraid of it. I think it would be a terrible thing if it did not happen.

THE CHAIRMAN.- Probably you have expressed what a previous witness wished to express. I have the feeling that there are certain things that are permanent and will always look right and certain things that are mere passing fashions. There have been good and bad buildings in every period. Although some witnesses have said that the new Administrative Building is of the fashion of twenty or thirty years ago, it does not appear to me to be incongruous today.

PROFESSOR SPATE.- I had a careful look at that building

SENATE CANBERRA COMMITTEE

yesterday. Although I think it lacks imagination, it looks to me on the whole to be a solid, impressive building. It is difficult to say yet, but I do not think it will be a bad building. There are very few really bad buildings in Canberra, excluding perhaps Parliament House. Most of them are just half hearted.

THE CHAIRMAN.- I think the new Administrative Building is better than any other public building, apart from the Institute of Anatomy, which is very fine.

PROFESSOR SPATE.- That is the best building in Canberra.

THE CHAIRMAN.- Have you seen Parliament House, Melbourne?

PROFESSOR SPATE.- I may have seen it, but I have not looked at it carefully.

THE CHAIRMAN.- That is, to me, the most impressive public building in Australia, and yet it is dated in that you would not erect a building like that now. It is more ornate than anything you would build today.

PROFESSOR SPATE.- That is what I mean when I say that some amount of display, dignity and baldness are necessary and that the Commonwealth has not done this. I am really thinking of some of the parliamentary buildings of the Colonies in the last century. Some of them are bad buildings, but at least they have some guts in them.

THE CHAIRMAN.- When you say that the Archives building in Canberra is aesthetically good, do you mean that it is not unpleasant to look at?

PROFESSOR SPATE.- I think it is a very nice building.

THE CHAIRMAN.- But, considering the iron roof and the other material of which it is made, it is not the type of building that we ought to have for an Administrative building?

PROFESSOR SPATE.- I do not think so. As well as the actual quality of the building itself, of course, you always have to look through its context. For example, the new Bureau of Mineral Resources building as a single building is very nice, but I must say that it always pains me slightly to find it next door to the Institute of Anatomy. That does not mean that buildings

adjacent to each other have to be of the same style, but I think they have to be in the same key or the same scale. To give an example, the Institute of Anatomy is a good building and the Bureau of Mineral Resources is a good building, but they clash because they are out of scale with each other. King's College, Cambridge, and the adjacent beautiful Georgian building, usually called "Jumbo", are 400 years different in style and everything else, but in scale they make one of the finest architectural groups in the world.

THE CHAIRMAN.- The original intention was to put another Administrative building on the other side of Parliament House from the building that is now being completed. Do you think that building should be similar to the one now under construction, or do you think it should be of a different type or broken up into a number of buildings?

PROFESSOR SPATE.- My own personal opinion, which is not an architect's expert opinion, is that you would want a building similar in scale but not necessarily in style. I do not think that a group of buildings would meet the case.

THE CHAIRMAN.- I am interested in your opinions on ecclesiastical architecture. I want to know what we can do to prevent a bad type of ecclesiastical building from going up. Obviously it would be quite wrong to dictate. Other considerations than those of architecture would be involved. As a Presbyterian, I consider that the Presbyterian Church has employed some very bad architects. Do you think that our Fine Arts Commission, if we set it up, should have the right to look at any plans and offer advice without dictating as it would in the case of a public building?

PROFESSOR SPATE.- I think it should have that right, and, if any dispute arose later regarding the merits of a building, I think its advice should be made known.

THE CHAIRMAN.- I am against any sort of dictation.

PROFESSOR SPATE.- I think in that respect one cannot lay down details.

THE CHAIRMAN.- People would favour different types of buildings. I think the right to inspect the plan and to give advice

would be satisfactory.

PROFESSOR SPATE.- I think that would be a very good half-way course.

SENATOR BENN.- According to your submission, Professor Spate, there is not a single building in Canberra, ranging from Parliament House to the public water closets, in line with your ideas of what is satisfactory.

PROFESSOR SPATE.- I do not think I said that quite, did I? The Institute of Anatomy would be a first-class building if somebody had not ruined it by putting the green and blue stuff in its windows, completely breaking up its nice clean lines. The Patent Office is quite good. The War Memorial looks terribly lumpy from a distance but looks very good close at hand. The mass of the pylons at the entrance is quite good at close quarters. I think parts of University House are very good. I also think there are some very good minor buildings, both public and private, here and there about Canberra.

SENATOR BENN. - But none of them are stainless, to use your own expression?

PROFESSOR SPATE.- The Institute of Anatomy could very easily be made stainless. The stains could be washed off with the greatest of ease by smashing its windows.

SENATE CONFERENCE COMMITTEE

SENATOR BENN.- I do not suppose you have had an opportunity to look at the plans of the commercial premises in course of construction at Civic Centre?

PROFESSOR SPATE.- I have not had an opportunity to do that.

SENATOR BENN.- What do you say is wrong with the residences here?

PROFESSOR SPATE.- There is an enormous amount of finicky variation of detail, and yet the general impression right the way through - at any rate with the brick houses - is one of heavy monotony. Aesthetically speaking, weatherboard and corrugated iron, well looked after, has its over the average brick house in Australia every time, but of course there are objections to that in a town like Canberra. I do not think there is much you can do about private architecture except to ensure that minimum standards are observed in certain areas. As to the houses that are built publicly and let or leased, the architecture there is in the hands of whatever authority builds them. There are some quite successful areas from that point of view. Take the part behind the Manuka shops.

I would not say the individual houses were perfect - probably no house in the world is perfect, but the development there is really very nice for that type of area - two storey houses.

SENATOR BENN.- You say there is not a single piece of statuary here worth looking at?

PROFESSOR SPATE.- That I would swear to. As a matter of fact I have sworn to it.

SENATOR BENN.- I suppose you have noticed on occasions that the tourists stop to admire the tulips at the corner of the streets?

PROFESSOR SPATE.- Yes, but that is not statuary.

SENATOR BENN.- You have noticed them, Professor, have you not?

PROFESSOR SPATE.- Tourists and tulips, yes.

SENATOR BENN.- You have noticed the tourists observing and admiring the tulips?

PROFESSOR SPATE.- Yes.

SENATOR BENN. - You have been in cities where statuary exists?
G.1 604 O.H.K.SPATE

SENATCAN
SENATE CANBERRA COMMITTEE

PROFESSOR SPATE.- Yes.

SENATOR BEHN.- Have you noticed tourists admiring the statuary

PROFESSOR SPATE.- Yes, including myself.

SENATOR BENN.- Would you say that the trend today is for people to pass by statuary and to observe things that are more in keeping with nature - flowers, trees, lawns and the like.

PROFESSOR SPATE.- No, I do not think that is so at all. Certainly one wants flowers, trees and so forth, but I think it would be just caving in not to produce statues that are worth looking at. Certainly I do not think one wants a profusion of statuary about the place. I think the time for portrait statuary of the Victorian sort is dead and gone. On the whole, the ~~statue~~ ~~is~~ ~~an~~ ~~awful~~ ~~and~~ ~~we~~ ~~need~~ ~~not~~ ~~weep~~ ~~about~~ ~~it~~. But I do think ~~it~~ ~~ought~~ ~~to~~ ~~have~~ ~~here~~ ~~and~~ ~~there~~, not actual statuary, but things to commemorate people and events. There is not a single Australian commemorated in this manner in Canberra, not one.

SENATOR BENN.- You think there should be?

PROFESSOR SPATE.- Yes, because I think that is one of the ways in which you build up a tradition.

SENATOR BENN.- There are some pieces of statuary in the King's Hall?

PROFESSOR SPATE.- Yes, but I was thinking of external public statuary. Some of the statuary in the King's Hall is not all bad.

SENATOR BENN.- Would you say that the public is greatly interested in the affairs of men who have passed on? Would you say the public is sufficiently interested in ~~the~~ ~~affairs~~ ~~of~~ ~~men~~ ~~who~~ ~~have~~ ~~passed~~ ~~on~~ to go along and observe statuary and read what such men have done?

PROFESSOR SPATE.- There are two answers to that. First, there are so few things to observe here that I think they would observe them. They would go and read the inscriptions to fill in their time. Secondly, I think that on the whole people are rather more interested in this matter than we tend to assume. In one sense, the average man here probably knows far more about

Australian history and traditions than, say, the average Englishman knows about English history and traditions. I think the people would be interested in these things and I think we ought to give them a chance to be.

SENATOR HANNAFORD.- I gather you do not agree with the previous witness that the job of preparing plans for future buildings here should be restricted to Australian architects? You think the opportunity should be thrown open to architects throughout the world?

PROFESSOR SPATE.- I think that is reasonable. I believe that other things being equal, preference should be given to Australian architects. But one has to strike a mean in this matter. I think that if we kept it only to Australian architects, new ideas would take much longer to come in.

SENATOR HANNAFORD.- Have you any idea where the schools of architecture are in Australia? Are they at each university? I know there is one at Melbourne.

PROFESSOR SPATE.- The one at Melbourne is very good; the people there are very good and keen. There is one in Sydney also, but I do not know about the other universities.

SENATOR HANNAFORD.- You have said that, whilst you do not personally like St. Christopher's, the Roman Catholic Church at Manuka, you respect it for its uncompromising courage. Just what do you mean by that?

PROFESSOR SPATE.- I find the lines of it somewhat harsh and angular, and I think it is too painfully symmetrical in a way. Nevertheless, I think credit must be given to the people who built it for at least thinking in different terms. St Paul's, the C. of E. Church across the road, constructed in red brick, is completely unimaginative and uninspired. It is a shocking business. St. Christopher's is in a different category. It is somewhat harsh and angular in my view, but nevertheless there it stands, confident, saying to itself "We are the Catholic Church", in a way that the others just do not, as far as I can see. It is self confident above all, I think.

THE CHAIRMAN.- It is a standard type. There is a Church at Maroubra, a mile from where I live, which is almost an exact replica of the one at Manuka. I do not like that style of architecture, but it is a good building.

PROFESSOR SPATE.- In the U.K., since the first war the Roman Catholics have been going in very much for ^{the} romanescque or Byzantine style of architecture. It is certainly extremely good. They are leaving the other denominations standing. This is a much simpler form of that style, of course.

THE CHAIRMAN.- Before he left us just now, Senator Benn asked whether you considered the bridge over the Molonglo River on Commonwealth Avenue to be beautiful. I do not know what answer th he expected.

PROFESSOR SPATE.- Frankly, no.

THE CHAIRMAN.- What do you think of the bust of Mr. Hughes in the King's Hall?

PROFESSOR SPATE.- Frankly, I find it difficult to dissociate it from my own views about Mr. Hughes. I think it is a good, honest and straight forward piece of work.

THE CHAIRMAN.- I remember Mr. Hughes at the age when the bust was made. I think if you had known him then you would say that it is a most remarkable likeness.

PROFESSOR SPATE.- It gives the impression of great vigour and of a very intense and powerful, but perhaps rather a narrow personality.

THE CHAIRMAN.- Do you think the whole question of statuary and ornamentation of that kind should be referred to a body like a fine arts commission?

PROFESSOR SPATE.- That is the business of a fine arts commission,

SENATOR HANNAFORD.- Do you agree that, as far as possible, the pastoral atmosphere should be retained in Canberra?

PROFESSOR SPATE.- It depends on what you mean by pastoral. If you mean that in certain areas of Canberra there should be a sense of space, with trees and perhaps even a few sheep in the picture, I thoroughly agree, but it should not be a dominant feature of the city.

SENATE CANBERRA COMMITTEE

SENATOR WOOD.- Apparently you feel that the tourist industry in Canberra could be built up considerably?

PROFESSOR SPATE.- It is important that it should be built up.

SENATOR WOOD.- What do you think should be done?

You pointed to the lack of buildings that might be erected here to make the place more interesting from the tourists' point of view. What else do you think is wrong? Do you think we need more hotels?

PROFESSOR SPATE.- I do not think there is anything positively wrong. I say that what there is, there is not enough of. This matter was dealt with quite ably, on the whole, in the memorandum that the regional development division submitted on Canberra as a regional centre. It dealt specifically with Canberra as a tourist centre and I do not think I can add very much to it.

SENATOR WOOD.- Do you feel that the Government should publicise Canberra as a tourist centre?

PROFESSOR SPATE.- A certain amount is done by the Tourist Bureau.

SENATOR WOOD.- Do you know of any publicity work that is done outside Canberra?

PROFESSOR SPATE.- That is a thing that might be looked into. One gets the impression that there is not publicity for Canberra in the other capital cities. You see various agencies urging you to come to Western Australia to see the flowers, to South Australia to see Adelaide and so forth and to Queensland to see the coral, but you do not see any "Come to Canberra" publicity.

(The witness withdrew)

Submission to the Senate Select Committee on the
Development of Canberra,
at Parliament House, Canberra, Wednesday, 16th February, 1955

I wish to thank the members of the Senate Select Committee for giving me this opportunity of presenting my opinions on the development of Canberra.

This paper is principally concerned with three questions which to me, as a geographer, seem to be closely related to the life and activities of Canberra in its present stage of development as a city. They are:

- (1) "How does the actual layout of Canberra compare with its planned layout?"
- (2) "To what extent is Canberra, as it exists, viable as a city?" and
- (3) "What standing has Canberra in its present stage of development attained as the national capital and as a local centre?"

A few general observations about the Canberra plan, and the way in which it has been implemented to date, are relevant to the inquiry of this Committee:

- (1) It is generally conceded by persons competent to judge that Griffin's plan, though it is perhaps not the best that might have been possible, is at least a reasonably good one. In the very important respect of being devised to secure the maximum advantage from the topography of the site in the building of the city, Griffin's plan is far superior to that of many other cities and towns. Full credit must be given to the designer for the meticulous way in which he studied the details of the topography of the city area and its surroundings in his office before adapting his plan to the site, also for the care which he took later in modifying his plan on the ground in Canberra.
- (2) Insofar as Griffin's plan relates to the internal traffic circulation of the city, it needs to be borne in mind (though it is often overlooked) that the plan is a blue-print prepared in a horse and buggy age now being applied in an age of automobiles: with the knowledge of his day it was quite impossible for Griffin to foresee that changes in land transport would be so revolutionary or that the existing traffic hazards and parking problems of Canberra would arise.
- (3) Since Canberra was planned in toto in advance of city building it was intended that in every stage of its growth even the minutest details of development should be drafted by its planners before being translated into urban realities, but though this has generally been done there are still some "temporary" spots in

the city that are all too plainly urban realities. Moreover, to meet the urgent needs of Canberra's quickly growing population and because of financial and other exigencies at different stages in its growth, the number of "provisional" and "temporary" structures in the city has multiplied greatly: taking the long-term view of Canberra as the federal capital and a source of national pride, this practice, which is against the best interests of the city, should be stopped without delay - specially so because the standards of many of these buildings fall far below those originally intended in the city (certainly far below those required by a city with the dignity of a planned national capital).

- (4) Space causes many of the difficulties in the daily life of the people of Canberra, also some of the problems encountered by those responsible for administering and servicing the city. Large areas of open spaces in the city are a direct result of the plan to some extent, but, more importantly perhaps, of the sequence adopted in the building of the developed parts of the city. In consequence of its scattered layout, Canberra stands out in sharp contrast from most Australian cities and towns with a standard grid layout and a central urban core of closely agglomerated buildings. Canberra's "open heart" and the dispersion of its small commercial cells, which do not possess the varied shopping facilities of the central business core usually found in population centres of a comparable size, or even smaller, add greatly to the expense and time needed for shopping. Extensive open spaces in the city are also responsible to a large extent for the uneconomic operation of buses on long routes, that are also devious because of the plan, and the need for new suburban expansion in areas remote from the city's centre, thus increasing the cost of providing public utilities and general urban services for them.

Canberra's Actual Layout in relation to its Plan

(a) The Main Features of the Plan briefly re-stated

With considerations of the topography of the city site and its surroundings in mind, Griffin used the western boundary ranges of the Territory as a scenic background for the city; the rounded residual hills encircling the natural amphitheatre of the city site as the end points of vistas within the city; and the lower knolls in the city area as sites for public buildings, and, because they are all gently sloping, as the terminal points for major city roads. To fulfil the requirements of the competition for a city design, demanding a major water feature as an ornamentation to the city, Griffin planned for a chain of lakes and water-basins in the open Molonglo valley in the centre of the city site. The whole concept was bound together by the three axes: from Red Hill he

projected his Land Axis (which served as the major city axis) northeast to Mount Ainslie, passing through Capital Hill (near the site of a proposed, permanent Parliament House, and, therefore the focal point of the city). Across this he projected two minor city axes - a Water Axis projected southeast from Black Mountain to intersect the major axis at a point about halfway between Red Hill and Mount Ainslie, and a parallel Municipal Axis, projected northwest from Mount Pleasant to pass through the civic centre.

(b) The Actual Layout of Canberra

Griffin's plan has been varied most significantly by the abandonment of his proposals for a city railway and for railway marshalling yards and an industrial area at Dickson; also by changes that have been made in his projected lake system, the re-designing of the layout of some of the newer residential suburbs and the reductions in the widths of a few streets, such as Majura Avenue, reduced from 200 feet to 100 feet. Though these changes strongly affect some parts of the city, they do not depart radically from the main features and principles of Griffin's plan, except for the proposed major changes in the water features of the central area.

The differences that do exist between the planned and the actual layouts of the city result mainly from the way in which city building has progressed to date, and from several urban developments that might be regarded as natural, in that they were corollaries of certain phases of Canberra's growth. Thus the true axis of the city's life has become, and will probably always remain, the north-south road between Civic Centre and the governmental centre. To the north this is continued by Northbourne Avenue, which by leading to the Yass road and the Federal Highway is the land entry from all State capitals; to the south it is continued with a southeasterly slant, towards Queanbeyan, and through the commercial centre of Kingston and the industrial centre near the railway station at Causeway, where development has been rapid during recent years. This pull of the north-south axis of the

/city's

city's business life and activities towards the southeast is likely to become more marked in the future, because most of the industries at Kingston and Causeway are to be transferred to Molonglo, about halfway between Canberra and Queanbeyan.

To date, Griffin's water and municipal axes have no significance except for planning purposes; modifications of the city lake scheme that have been gazetted do not ostensibly interfere in any way with a series of central water-basins projected for future development between an East Lake and a West Lake originally planned. The municipal axis is even less realistically related to city life, for, Canberra, administered as it is by the Department of the Interior with its headquarters at Acton, may be said to have no municipal existence. The Civic Centre that has developed is an administrative-commercial cell, built north of the open spaces of Vernon on Griffin's municipal axis.

Though Griffin planned for an industrial area and railway marshalling yards at Dickson, on what was to be the City section of a Yass-Queanbeyan railway, industry has not developed on his planned site because the city railway scheme has been abandoned. Instead, a small industrial area, or perhaps more correctly a service area, has been established just north of Civic Centre in the residential suburb of Braddon, and a more important industrial concentration has grown up at Kingston and Causeway beside the existing railway terminus (itself an ugly fester on the fact of Canberra!). There was no provision for this in Griffin's plan, but it is a normal building development that is a natural response to the railway transport arrangements of the city. The city's planning authorities have recognised the need for an industrial area of its type in Canberra, and the projected transfer of the Kingston and Causeway industries to Molonglo is intended to prevent it from interfering unduly with the planned development of the administrative and residential areas.

Canberra's Viability as a City

In considering this topic the fact is recognised that Canberra is firmly established as the national capital, and no doubts
/are

are raised about the city's growth being maintained in the future: that, also, is taken for granted if only because the Commonwealth has invested so much capital in its building that it cannot clearly do anything else but continue to promote its development.

In posing this question of viability, however, two further questions immediately arise: "Just how viable is Canberra as a city, as it now exists?" and "How does its viability compare with that of other population centres roughly equivalent in size and status?" To answer them we might, perhaps, compare Canberra with its nearest civic neighbour, Goulburn, which matches it in city status though now smaller than the capital by nearly 10,000 people.

The viability of a city (its ability to exist as a city) hinges largely on its urban functions: first, the general function of the city as a whole, and secondly, and still more important, the degree of functional balance in the city, as between commerce, administration, industry and so on.

Classifying the two centres on a functional basis we find that Canberra is primarily an administrative city, then a city with a minor function as a resort centre for tourists attracted by its national buildings and gardened landscapes, while Goulburn is dominantly a regional service centre for nearly all the Southern Tablelands. These differences in their general urban functions account to a large extent for the better balance between the various functions that combine to make Goulburn a service centre, than is the case in Canberra (with one outstanding function, one of a minor nature and a few others that are insignificant). In consequence, Goulburn is more viable than Canberra as a city.

Looked at in another way this means that Goulburn merely by virtue of the fact that it succeeded in being established as a regional service centre, had to develop a multiplicity of functions (administration, wholesale and retail commerce, manufacturing and educational and medical services and the like) in order to be able to cater for the variety of needs that existed in the urban field over which its influence extended; Canberra, on the other hand, was

not a natural urban growth, in that it did not grow up in response to the needs of the local environment, and from the outset it has been developed primarily as a centre of government, with little regard being given to the developing of any function other than federal administration. Though some subsidiary functions have been grafted on to the city while it has been growing, all except tourism have been indifferent "buddings", and the city still lacks the degree of functional balance needed to make it really viable as a city: as one example that it is not, I need merely point to the lack of opportunities for the employment of the children leaving school in Canberra, except in the public service or the building trades in the city. This practice can be continued only up to a certain point, after which the life of the city must be affected inevitably, even if only by the migration of families to other areas or centres where suitable forms of employment can be obtained for the younger members.

Canberra as a National Capital and as a Local Centre

Though it ranks far below many other capital cities in status, ^(x) Canberra's standing as a political capital has improved to some extent since it first began its existence as a skeleton city in 1927.

Much of its executive authority still remains delegated away from it in the government departments that have not yet been transferred from Melbourne, but it is anticipated that the city will have a stronger identity as a centre of government in the near future (when the new administrative block near Parliament House is completed): this, no doubt, will hasten the city's growth towards maturity as a political capital, a growth that has been continuing

/slowly

(x) Quite apart from the big discrepancy in the size of Canberra compared with the sizes of many other capitals, the city fails to measure up to capital city status in other respects; for instance, it does not serve as a major repository and channelling house for external cultural influences which Professor Spate ("Factors in the Development of Capital Cities", Geographical Review, Vol.32, 1942, pp.622-631) has claimed is an important characteristic of a capital city.

slowly for some years past. Signs of this maturing process first became evident during World War II largely because of the interest that came to be focussed on the federal legislature during that national emergency, when the people of Australia felt impelled to take a greater interest in the actions of their parliament than they had ever done previously.

In the later war years, and since then, Canberra has also gained some political prestige in consequence of the number of ambassadorial and diplomatic links in and from the capital being increased, while further signs that the city is maturing as a capital in the political sense have been manifested by the setting up in Canberra of the central secretariats of bodies like the Associated Chambers of Commerce, the Associated Chambers of Manufacture and industrial unions and organisations.

Considered as an urban centre related to its local environment, however, Canberra presents a completely different picture, for, while it is the largest population centre on the Southern Tablelands, its field of local influence is much smaller than that of several towns only a small fraction of its size, and in many respects it lies within the urban field of Queanbeyan a town less than one-fourth its size. In consequence, the city must now be ranked as an urban anomaly on the Southern Tablelands.

The special circumstances surrounding Canberra's establishment and the way in which it has developed up to the present time have doubtless been responsible for its inability to impose commercial and administrative suzerainty over neighbouring areas and centres and so acquire an urban field for itself, commensurate with its size, in the way that Goulburn and all the service towns on the Southern Tablelands have done. In the first place, Canberra's field of local administration has been narrowly circumscribed from the outset by the boundaries of the Australian Capital Territory, which run close to the city and cut it off from the relatively closely settled Yass-Gunning area; secondly, in the initial stages of its growth the city was forced to depend absolutely on Queanbeyan for

/its

its existence; and thirdly, in consequence of its specialised function and because of severe "growing pains" (expressed, for instance, in an inadequacy of commercial facilities and other services for its own rapidly growing population) the city has not been able to compete effectively against the other towns as a local service centre.

As it now is, the city functions hardly at all as a district service centre, though there are some exceptions; for example the Canberra Community Hospital equipped with modern facilities draws some people requiring medical attention from surrounding areas beyond the territorial boundaries. On the other hand, however, some of the settlers in Canberra's own field of territorial jurisdiction, as in the Tharwa, Williamsdale and adjacent districts, still maintain their commercial allegiance to the shops of Queanbeyan, not the capital.

Conclusions

In the light of what is expressed above I submit the following conclusions for consideration by this Committee:

- (1) The Canberra Plan. To me, as a geographer, Griffin's plan is a reasonably good one, whose imperfections are more than outweighed by the ways in which it uses the topographical advantages of the city site to their fullest extent.

The building of the city accords on the whole with the general principles of Griffin's plan though some ad hoc adjustments have been made, and, no doubt, more will be necessary in the future. It is suggested, however, that any but minor changes of a technical nature should be publicly notified in Canberra well in advance of the proposed date of gazettal, in recognition of the fact that the citizens of a community are the best watchdogs of its interests: this, of course, also raises the problem of the completely undemocratic nature of Canberra as an urban community with no measure of local autonomy at all.

Though the general principles of the plan have been followed the actual layout of the city does not conform in all respects, partly because of unforeseen developments (such as industrial developments at the railway terminus) and partly because of the order in which the various stages of city building have been undertaken. The location of the city's activities ancillary to its political function does not at all conform to that which Griffin envisaged for it, and there is every indication that this divergence will become greater in the future: this is normal, and as it should be.

In many details of layout, space could be conserved and at the same time provide greater convenience for the inhabitants: for example the miscellany of service units in Lonsdale and Mort Streets, resembling a sort of disintegrated 20th century Paddy's Market, could be grouped more effectively in a few buildings occupying a fraction of their present area.

The point has been admirably put by Lewis Mumford, a World authority on urbanism: ".....The fact is that a city is not primarily a way of providing a vegetable garden for every inhabitant; above everything else, it is a means of providing a maximum number of social contacts and satisfactions. When the open spaces gape too widely, and dispersal is too constant, the people lack a stage for their activities and the drama of their daily life lacks sharp focus. Like every other amenity, public open spaces and private gardens must be scaled to the whole for which they are planned. Because the new planners were mainly in revolt against congestion and squalor, rather than in love with urban order and co-operation, the New Towns do not yet adequately reveal what the modern city should be." But they have provided experience on the road which Canberra might well use.

- (2) Canberra's Viability as a City. Canberra lives, and will continue to do so, but not in the way that a normal city of its size should - i.e. of its own resources. Its future growth seems to be assured, but since the city's progress and prosperity depend so heavily on its governmental function, its growth is abnormal, and in a sense spurious. Greater functional variety is needed to make Canberra live as a city in the way that cities of its size normally do.
- (3) Canberra as a National Capital. Evidence seems to indicate that the city is evolving slowly as a political capital, very much along the lines that it was intended it should develop, though it still lacks some of the characteristics of what is generally accepted to be a capital city.
- (4) Canberra as a Local Centre. For several reasons Canberra has failed to develop as a local service centre in the way that smaller centres around it have done. It is suggested as desirable that attempts should be made to develop the city as a service centre in the interests of its own inhabitants, since this would involve more varied functional activities on the part of the city, and hence more varied avenues of employment for its population.

Because Queanbeyan is fast becoming an appendage of Canberra, in a physical sense, the time appears to be ripe for a realistic appraisal of what form the general urban relations between them will be in the future.

H.W.H. King,
Department of Geography,
Australian National University.

HERBERT WILLIAM HENRY KING, Research Fellow in Geography,
Australian National University, sworn and examined.

In the paper that I have submitted to the Committee, I have confined myself to the discussion of a few questions which are of interest to me as a geographer who has been engaged in a study of the urban geography of the Southern Tablelands for the last three years. Concerning paragraph 1 on the first page of my paper I should like to say that I feel that a plan for a town can only be regarded as a working draft which has to be modified from time to time. That is particularly so, since the plan itself deals with what might be called the inanimate aspects of the city, whereas the city itself is made up of living human beings whose wishes and activities ~~are~~ ^{influence} ^{its growth} in a somewhat different way.

In relation to paragraph 2 on page 1 of my paper, I should like to mention that another example of failure to foresee changes in land transport is provided by the Pacific Highway which runs north from Sydney and which was completed in the early 1930's. Despite the fact that all the resources of the New South Wales Department of Main Roads were available in the construction of that road, it is hopelessly out of date for modern transport requirements. It was designed for cars of the 1930 vintage. In those days they lacked the technical skill for cutting and filling which was more expensive work than it is now. As a result, one of the major highways of the Commonwealth is hopelessly out of date. An indication that Griffin ~~failed~~ ^{was not able} to foresee the revolutionary changes that would take place in transport is provided by the fact that he advocated the building up of the levels of that part of State Circle running from West Block to Prime Minister's Lodge in order to have a gentle gradient. I think ~~that~~ the fact that he wanted gentle gradients showed that he had no conception of high powered motor cars.

In referring to buildings which fall far below the standards originally intended for Canberra, in paragraph 3 of my paper, I had in mind the prefabricated structures at Narrabundah and the workmen's quarters at the Causeway and Westlake as well as many other temporary buildings that have arisen from time to time.

In my fourth paragraph I have dealt with a subject to which Professor Spate referred this morning - the urban sprawl and its influence on the cost of services.

THE CHAIRMAN.- Do you think that it was undesirable to reduce the width of Majura Avenue?

MR. KING.- I cannot answer that question definitely but, in view of the traffic needs of the present, I think not.

THE CHAIRMAN.- Do you think that the main roads should remain 200 feet in width?

MR. KING.- I think that a width of 200 feet is a prime essential for a main artery entering a city.

SENATOR HANNAFORD.- You acknowledge that there is a bottleneck on Commonwealth Avenue?

MR. KING.- Yes.

SENATOR HANNAFORD.- That would be the most serious bottleneck in Canberra?

MR. KING.- I imagine so, especially when the Molonglo River is in flood and the alternative road across ^{Langford and} Scotts Crossing ~~is out~~ out of action.

SENATOR HANNAFORD.- There is a bad traffic hazard at the junction of Commonwealth Avenue and the road which comes in from Acton?

MR. KING.- I ~~should~~ say so. Another result of the Burley Griffin plan is a number of blind intersections at which the vision of on-coming traffic is obscured.

SENATOR HANNAFORD.- You contend that transport is gravely handicapped and that if public transport charges are made comparable with those of other cities it must operate at a loss?

MR. KING.- At the present stage of the city's development - yes. When the open spaces in the centre of the city have been filled in the bus services might operate more economically than they do now.

SENATOR HANNAFORD.- And the same would apply to other services?

MR. KING.- To ^{some} extent. It will be impossible to continue the urban sprawl indefinitely without increasing the cost of public services.

SENATOR HANNAFORD.- The Griffin plan is bad from an economic point of view?

MR. KING.- Yes. - insofar as it ^{now} meets the present needs of Canberra. The plan in its entire conception is reasonably good. It certainly was the best offering at the time of the competition.

SENATOR RYAN.- How does the density of population of Canberra compare with that of other towns?

MR. KING.- I have no exact figures but perhaps a comparison might be made with Goulburn which has about 10,000 ^{people} ~~more~~ people than Canberra. I imagine that the density of the residential parts of Goulburn would be greater than that of Canberra at its most densely settled points. The main points in relation to planning have been stated previously by me in two papers which have been drawn to the attention of the Committee. Pages 2 and 3 of the paper that I have just submitted to the Committee relate to the actual layout of Canberra as at present developed.

SENATE CANBERRA COMMITTEE.

THE CHAIRMAN. - Perhaps you may now go on to the next section of your statement?

MR. KING. - Yes, I believe that the question of Canberra's viability is not academic, even if we merely consider the lack of different types of employment for the people of the city. I emphasize to the committee the last paragraph on page 6 of my statement. The main part of that paragraph is a comparison between the viability of Canberra and the viability of Goulburn. It is my opinion that Goulburn is more viable than Canberra. Canberra is growing rapidly, and its future progress and prosperity seem to be assured, but since the city depends so heavily on its governmental functions, its growth is abnormal and to some extent spurious. My statement brings out the various points that I want to put before the committee.

THE CHAIRMAN. - Would you regard Goulburn and Canberra as rivals in the same region, or is there sufficient scope for both towns?

MR. KING. - Canberra is not in the race with Goulburn in the competition for regional services. Goulburn stands supreme as the regional centre of this district.

THE CHAIRMAN. - Do you believe that governmental action should be taken to put Canberra in the race with Goulburn?

MR. KING. - I do not think that governmental action will achieve that. The question of developing Canberra as a regional centre is beset with all sorts of difficulties.

SENATOR WOOD. - You consider that Canberra will have to develop naturally?

MR. KING. - Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN. - Do you not think that the Government should be content with bringing public servants here, and should then let private enterprise do the rest of the development work?

MR. KING. - Yes, I believe that private enterprise should be encouraged by the Government in certain ways.

THE CHAIRMAN. - Can you give specific instances of such ways?

MR. KING. - Yes, I believe that the Government might form an effective liaison with organisations such as the Associated Chambers of Manufactures, which has an office in this city, and

bring to the attention of such organisations the possible avenues through which they could develop industry in the territory, and the kinds of opportunity for industrial development that are now available and are likely to be made available in the future through leases and industrial facilities.

THE CHAIRMAN. - Is there any reason to develop industry in Canberra except to provide diversity of employment for the people?

MR. KING. - I believe that industry broadens the basis of the whole economy of a city.

THE CHAIRMAN. - There are many single function towns. Canberra is a governmental town, and I think that it will become an educational town. Do you not consider that those functions are a sufficiently good basis for the development of the city?

MR. KING. - Yes, but even so the ~~question of the~~ greater variety of function is beneficial to any town.

THE CHAIRMAN. - After a city has reached a certain size I believe that it will continue to grow. After the Government has brought all the public servants here that it desires to bring, perhaps there will be a danger of Canberra growing too large rather than remaining too small?

MR. KING. - Yes, I agree but I believe that private enterprise to some degree should be attracted to Canberra by Government publicity.

THE CHAIRMAN. - Would you allow some isolated shops to be built at convenient places, even in the area in which the Government offices have been erected?

MR. KING. - The corner shop does perform a ^{useful} service in any town. I believe that Canberra suffers from a disability of having its commercial enterprises widely dispersed. Kingston and Manuka are about a mile apart and both shopping centres are about three miles from Civic. Because of the small size and lack of facilities in those areas sometimes a shopper may have to travel from one centre to another in order to get what he wants, or he may have to search through all three centres?

THE CHAIRMAN. - Which residential area do you consider is worst served by shops?

MR. KING. - Narrabundah at present. Yarralumla has its own small community shopping centre, and the same may be said of suburbs on the northern side of the river.

SENATOR WOOD. - Do you not consider that the proper siting of the community shopping centres will avoid the necessity for corner shops?

MR. KING. - To a large degree, but it is always a great convenience to housewives to be able to buy close at hand the articles that they need from day to day. The corner shop does serve a real need in any modern urban community, although it is only a makeshift in many cases.

THE CHAIRMAN. - Corner shops could be built to suit the locality?

MR. KING. - Yes, the corner shop could be blended with the landscape quite effectively. I now bring the final section of my statement to the attention of the committee. That is the section from page 6 onwards. Canberra is evolving more slowly than many other political capitals perhaps, but there are strong evidences that it is growing as a political capital. The next point I borrow from Prof. Spate, and that is that Canberra lacks many important characteristics of capital cities, particularly with regard to the provision of channels for external cultural influences which may come into the country. As a local centre Canberra is particularly interesting, and I draw attention to paragraph 3 of page 7 of my statement. In many respects the small village of Gunning on the Hume Highway has a larger effective urban field than Canberra. The whole matter is tied up with the submissions of the Department of National Development regarding the development of Canberra as a regional ^{centre} ~~city~~. Some efforts should be made to examine that matter. A regional centre normally grows naturally, but I think that the time is ripe to explore ways of giving Canberra a greater functional variety than it has at present. On the educational side perhaps Canberra could be developed much more than at present. One thing that suggests itself to me is that University under-graduate facilities could be broadened

SENATE CANBERRA COMMITTEE.

greatly. Some investigation should be made of the possibility of combining into one central academic institution all the undergraduate educational facilities provided by the University College, the ~~National~~ ^{Commonwealth} Forestry School and the Royal Military College. In the Royal Military College students receive engineering and science training to about the second-year University standard, scientific training is given at the National Forestry School, and the activities of those institutions could be combined, and together with the activities of the Canberra University College could provide a broader ^{undergraduate} basis for education in the territory. In developing Canberra as a tourist centre, I believe that the matter of the Government giving publicity to its tourist facilities is relevant. In addresses that I have given to Rotary clubs outside Canberra I have dealt with certain aspects of the city, and have used colour slides and films to illustrate my lectures. Many of those who heard my talks were particularly interested in them, and some of them have approached me and told me that they must come and look at the city. I believe that a concerted drive ^{in this sense} to publicise the attractiveness of Canberra, particularly through colour slides and films, would do much to popularise the capital as a tourist centre.

I do not want to say any more than what has already been mentioned by Prof. Spate and the Department of National Development about Canberra's industrial possibilities. However, I believe that there are possible ways in which Canberra can be developed through its educational and tourist services.

SENATE CANBERRA COMMITTEE.

THE CHAIRMAN . - Do not you think that the fact that the area in which Canberra is situated is a pastoral one militates against the development of the area as a whole? I suppose there will never be very much development in the area around Canberra?

MR. KING . - I think that Canberra's situation militates against ^{such} its development. The city is located close to the north-eastern boundary of the Australian Capital Territory, and the rest of the Territory is made up, very largely, of rugged and virtually uninhabited country.

SENATOR WOOD . - Do you think that one of the advantages of encouraging tourists to come to Canberra would be that it would stimulate their minds towards beautifying the areas from which they came?

MR. KING . - Yes. I think also that external statuary around the city itself would appeal to visitors. It is only necessary to consider the statue of King George V, outside Parliament House, to see how the tourists react to statues. I think that if we had an extension of that idea and were able to erect things in the nature of the Archibald Memorial fountain in Hyde Park, Sydney, they would have considerable charm for the tourists. I think it would be found that each of those points would become popular with tourists, that they would look closely at the inscriptions on the plaques, take photographs of each other standing in front of the statues, and so on.

SENATOR HANNAFORD . - Dealing with the functional development of Canberra, as outlined by you, it appears to me that there is some degree of State resistance to some of the things you mentioned?

MR. KING . - Yes.

SENATOR HANNAFORD . - You refer, I think, to expansion of the educational facilities here, particularly in regard to the University. I have heard resentment expressed by fairly well-informed people about what they claimed to be unnecessary expense entailed in the establishment of a University which is engaged entirely on post-graduate work. I gather you would not agree that there is any substance

SENATE CANBERRA COMMITTEE.

in that argument?

MR. KING . - The post-graduate work is being undertaken on a national or an international basis, rather than on a State or territorial basis.

SENATOR HANNAFORD . - Do you suggest that that form of education and research is being neglected by the State Universities?

MR. KING . - That post-graduate training is a field into which the State Governments have not entered in any part of Australia, except for limited post-graduate training facilities within the State Universities. However, those Universities are devoted primarily to undergraduate study.

SENATOR HANNAFORD . - Do you suggest that, because of that, there is a lack of research opportunity throughout Australia and that the need is being met by the National University here?

MR. KING . - Yes. I think the National University is performing a very important function. It is a grand and a noble experiment. On the question of undergraduate University education, however, the development of the University institutions in Canberra involved their competing for students with the State Universities. Those Universities are reaching their absorptive capacity. The mere fact of the establishment of the New England University College would seem to indicate that some decentralisation of University education is required.

In conclusion, I refer the committee to the closing paragraph on page 9 of the statement that I have submitted. As I point out there, because Queanbeyan is fast becoming an appendage of Canberra, in a physical sense, the time appears to have come for a realistic appraisal of the form that the general relations between them will be in the future.

THE CHAIRMAN . - Would you recommend that Queanbeyan should be included in the Australian Capital Territory?

MR. KING . - At this stage, I think a full investigation should be made and recommendations formulated in the light of that investigation.
of urban development and trends in the two centres

(THE WITNESS WITHDREW)

LINDSAY DIXON PRYOR, Superintendent of Parks and Gardens, Canberra, Sworn and examined.

THE CHAIRMAN.- Do you wish to submit a statement to the committee?

MR. PRYOR.- Perhaps I can make a summary of some of the more important things which I think, from a landscape point of view, are related to Canberra development. At the outset, I should explain that I am in charge of the Parks and Gardens Section, which is part of the Planning and Development Branch of the Department of the Interior. In that position I am responsible for the design, construction and maintenance of parks and gardens, sporting areas, street plantations, and landscape work in general. In that respect Canberra is perhaps a little different from most other towns in that all of the landscape work is under the control of one authority. It is usually divided amongst three or four authorities in other cities. This arrangement is of considerable advantage to Canberra in many ways.

Landscape work has been considered, since the beginning of Canberra, to be an essential part of the city's development. One of the most important factors in landscape development is the provision of a definite plan, sufficiently detailed to allow the execution of the main earth moving works which are an essential prerequisite to any planting programme. The value of long-term, though not necessarily very detailed planning, is felt perhaps more keenly by tree planters than any others connected with Canberra development because the best trees take so long to grow.

We do not expect trees to reach their proper form and shape for about thirty years, and when they have reached that stage they can be expected to live from eighty to one hundred years longer or even more.

SENATOR WOOD.- The slower the grower the longer the liver?

MR. PRYOR.- Yes, in general terms.

THE CHAIRMAN.- To what types of tree are you referring?

MR. PRYOR.- To trees in general. Nevertheless there is

scope and need for temporary planting and, in addition, to what we might call the permanent planting, some work is carried out with a view to fifteen or twenty years, which we call temporary planting.

There are certain sections of the city where it has been clear that no final development can take place for quite a long time, and temporary planting has been carried out there.

The rate of development of parks and gardens in Canberra could increase considerably if the limitation on the number of employees that we have at the moment, which is due to the fixing of a ceiling for policy reasons, could be modified. I realise that there are many good reasons for that ceiling, but nevertheless it does limit the amount of work that we can do. Still more importantly, there is no mechanism for increasing the number of employees as the city grows. If that restriction could be overcome, our work could be expedited.

The landscape in some important parts of the city cannot be developed until a more precise plan is developed and road forming and other earth works carried out. The areas I have in mind are Capital Hill, the main axis from Parliament House to the War Memorial, and the margins of the ornamental lakes. These are three important areas not related to the domestic and the suburban side of Canberra but to Canberra as the national capital. It would be very desirable for planting to be carried out, considering the time that it takes to get good effects, but this depends upon a plan sufficiently precise to allow the earth movements to be done. You cannot put your trees in until the earth is shifted.

The main avenues, which also define the structure of the city according to the plan, are in a rather similar position. There are a lot of earth works there that are still incomplete, and avenues such as Adelaide Avenue and Melbourne Avenue cannot be proceeded with.

A development that would be of benefit would be the dedication of parks. There are no parks dedicated in Canberra. I do not think that this has held up work to any extent up to the present, but there would be benefits if that could be carried out in future.

SENATE CANBERRA COMMITTEE.

I should like to refer generally to the matter of water supply. Canberra is a dry area. It is almost arid. Unless there is an abundant water supply in future, the gardening work and the tree planting work will not be as good as it should be in the city. In short, the planning of Canberra's water supply should make liberal allowance for the park and garden requirements. We should try to avoid the marginal position from which we are now suffering.

I think an important adjunct to the development of the city, again from the landscape point of view, is the treatment of the lands in a zone, say three to five miles wide, surrounding the city. I might call it a green belt. There has been little active development in this area since the first ten or fifteen years of the development of Canberra, when a great deal was done. I think that area should be developed in the interests of the city as a setting for it and also for the use of the people who live in Canberra. In view of the length of time it takes for trees to grow, it would be desirable to start some work designed to produce a satisfactory landscape in that area at an early date. That can proceed only if certain innovations are made to the present policy in order to facilitate the work. It could not be carried out effectively as things stand at present.

I come now to two smaller matters to which I think I should refer. The forming of streets ahead of the building of houses would improve efficiency a good deal. It is beyond the control of a single department and therefore would represent an advance over what has already been done.

MR. PRYOR speaking:- As it is now, in many cases street plantation has to follow the building of houses. That is a much more costly job than would be the case if it could be done ahead. There is another thing that may become important. There have been some modifications of cross sections of the streets - that is the cross section design. If that becomes more common - and it may well do so - the planting of trees by the public authority inside the block line would be of considerable benefit. In one or two areas this has so far not been possible, but in cases such as Bidwell Close and one or two ^{other} places it would certainly be a benefit. There are certain specific projects under way which I think will add a good deal to Canberra in future. The most important are the botanical gardens and the flora reserve. That covers a few of the items that I think it worthwhile to mention.

THE CHAIRMAN.- What is the general principle with regard to the planting of trees and shrubs. Is it the idea to have trees along every street?

MR. PRYOR.- Generally. There has been little variation of that.

THE CHAIRMAN.- In general, whether it is a business, civic or residential area trees are planted?

MR. PRYOR.- Yes. There are variations in spacing and the precise position of them, but there are very few cases where the design does not allow a space for trees, and in almost all cases trees have been planted.

THE CHAIRMAN.- What tree do you think is best for lining a street?

MR. PRYOR.- That depends on the size of the street, its location in the plan, the emphasis you want to give to it and whether it is in a residential area where shade in winter would be detrimental *or not*.

THE CHAIRMAN.- What would be the best tree for a country road for instance?

MR. PRYOR.- That depends on soil and other conditions. I think there is scope for using both exotic and native trees.

I think there should be a combination of both. I should not like to see either excluded. I think, generally speaking, a group of species must be used in any section.

THE CHAIRMAN.- I assume that all that is carefully attended to; none of the work is done in a haphazard way?

MR. PRYOR.- I think the selection of species in Canberra, which started in about 1911, has been very well done, largely by my predecessor.

THE CHAIRMAN.- You have trees from every continent?

MR. PRYOR.- Pretty well.

THE CHAIRMAN.- Are there any peculiar to South America?

MR. PRYOR.- We have some shrubs from there, but we have not got a good tree from South America.

THE CHAIRMAN.- With regard to parks, has any definite plan been worked out for trees and shrubs?

MR. PRYOR.- Some of the parks are fairly well developed. The planting in Telopea Park, which goes back many years, is quite well done; there is a pleasant variety. There has been later development with grass sowing and certain kinds of ornamental work to make it up to what I hope will be the standard to aim at in most suburbs.

THE CHAIRMAN.- In a short street, should you keep to the same type of tree or should you vary them?

MR. PRYOR.- Generally, I think, the same species should be used between any two points which terminate a street. That may be varied a little if the street is not straight. If there is a winding street, you can change your species more easily. But, generally speaking, mixed species are not successful.

THE CHAIRMAN.- One witness referred to what he called the anomaly of big trees in little streets and little trees in big streets. Do you think there is anything in that criticism?

MR. PRYOR.- There have been a few mistakes, but very few considering the amount of work that has been done.

THE CHAIRMAN.- As a principle, you have little trees in little streets and big trees in big streets?

MR. PRYOR.- As a general rule.

SENATE CANBERRA COMMITTEE

THE CHAIRMAN.- There has been some criticism of some tree planting. People have said that there is little landscape work, What is your opinion on that?

MR. PRYOR.- I am not quite sure what they mean. You might say that the whole of Canberra is one landscape project. In many ways, it combines into a fairly satisfactory whole. There is perhaps a lack of what is regarded as the conventional suburban park in Canberra. I think that is a reflection of the age of the city.

THE CHAIRMAN.- What do you think of the general effect of lawns in streets? Is that too costly, and does it take too much water?

MR. PRYOR.- I think some form of cover must be provided and some sowing must be done. It does not matter whether it keeps green all the year round. A street plantation must be level so that it can be maintained with mechanical equipment. That having been done, there must be some sowing, even if it is not lawn grass. If the residents look after the strips and keep them green, that is all to the good. I think the water supply for Canberra should be geared to allow for that possibility.

THE CHAIRMAN.- In general, do people look after the front strips?

MR. PRYOR.- I should say that the majority of people do.

THE CHAIRMAN.- Has the decision of the Department of the Interior not to cut hedges led to a diminution of the cutting of hedges or a refusal to cut them?

MR. PRYOR.- At the moment most residents are cutting their hedges, although I do not think the result will be as good as if the Department were cutting them.

THE CHAIRMAN.- After all, it is a good thing to leave something to the individual, is not it?

MR. PRYOR.- Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN.- The next point is important, because I have heard criticisms in relation to it outside, but usually, I think, it is criticism from people with prejudices. Do you think we have a proper balance between Australian and exotic trees?

SENATE CAMERON COMMITTEE

MR. PRYOR.- In general, yes.

THE CHAIRMAN.- Take the area along Commonwealth Avenue, where you have almost a forest of Christmas trees. Do you think that effect is good?

MR. PRYOR.- I should not like to see that as the final effect ~~of~~ Commonwealth Avenue. Those trees are quite young. I think that when they are old they will give a satisfactory appearance to Commonwealth Avenue. The juvenile form of those trees is a conical Christmas tree, but the mature form is quite different.

THE CHAIRMAN.- Trees live to various ages. Have you a regular plan for replacing trees as they grow too old?

MR. PRYOR.- As a policy, yes. From time to time the programme for any year must be reviewed, because it is not possible to forecast precisely when a particular street will need treatment.

THE CHAIRMAN.- As a tree becomes old, you cut it down and replace it?

MR. PRYOR.- Yes. There is an astonishingly large programme going on which is not ordinarily apparent to the average citizen.

THE CHAIRMAN.- The differences in the lives of trees are very considerable. Some kind of conifers would be old in fifty years, but an oak tree would be still young at 500 years.

MR. PRYOR.- The range is very wide.

THE CHAIRMAN.- I do not think we have any elm trees.

MR. PRYOR.- Elms sucker from the roots and are not good in residential areas. There are some in Corn^{er} and Park Street, Reid. There are one or two streets with American elms in them. Grant Crescent in Griffith is a case in point. There are quite a number of elms in the parks.

THE CHAIRMAN.- Now let me deal with timber as distinct from trees for ornament. I know there are some forests here, because I have seen them. What is the policy there? Does that come under you or under the forestry people?

MR. PRYOR.- There is a forestry section of the Department of the Interior. Commercial forestry, catchment forestry and so on are under their control.

SENATE CANBERRA COMMITTEE

THE CHAIRMAN.- Do you think there is plenty of timber growing round here, or could we grow more?

MR. PRYOR.- I feel that, particularly in the lands immediately surrounding the city, which I have referred to as a green belt area, it is extremely important that steps be taken now to have young trees coming on. The position is that we have the trees that were left following the initial ringbarking. They were good mature trees at that time, but they are now becoming quite senile. There is no regeneration, because of sheep grazing. The loss of the trees takes perhaps twenty, thirty or fifty years, but this rather insidious process is going on all the time, and we shall find suddenly one day that big areas are treeless unless steps are taken to plant now.

THE CHAIRMAN.- Is it necessary to do much planting for firewood?

MR. PRYOR.- I believe that in the zone surrounding the city a very effective result could be achieved both in regard to landscaping and the economics of running the city by planting firewood and other trees.

THE CHAIRMAN.- What would be the best tree to plant for firewood?

MR. PRYOR.- Certain species of eucalyptus.

THE CHAIRMAN.- How great is the fire hazard in the timber round about Canberra?

MR. PRYOR.- The fire hazard is roughly equal to the amount of grass that is present on the ground. The grass fire is fast moving and difficult to control. Probably a pine plantation is the most fire resistant, followed by plantations of other species, depending on the density with which they cover the ground. The most dangerous form of cover and the most susceptible to fire is long dry grass.

CANBERRA SENATE COMMITTEE.

MR. Pryor (speaking) - In short, the fire hazard could be reduced by planting trees.

THE CHAIRMAN.- Have sufficient precautions been taken against fires in Canberra?

MR. PRYOR.- I think that fire control has been kept well to the fore.

THE CHAIRMAN.- Do you think that a solemn public dedication ceremony should be held when parks are dedicated?

MR. PRYOR.- Perhaps it would be difficult to focus attention on such matters in Canberra. I can appreciate the importance of such a ceremony for a reserve such as Lamington National Park but I do not think that such ceremonies would help us very much in Canberra.

THE CHAIRMAN.- What steps should be taken to ensure that park areas are not whittled away as they have been in other cities?

MR. PRYOR.- It is a matter for legislation.

THE CHAIRMAN.- But legislation can be undone.

MR. PRYOR.- Perhaps I spoke too soon in saying that a formal dedication ceremony would not have value. I think that it is important to develop in the population a proper feeling towards reserves.

THE CHAIRMAN.- That is what I had in mind in suggesting a formal dedication. Would you enunciate the types of park that are needed in Canberra?

MR. PRYOR.- There is scope in Canberra for almost the entire range of parks. We need flora reserves, parks through which people may stroll, parks which people may visit occasionally and in which there could be seats and parks in which fairly large trees could be planted, simply for the purpose of building up the general scene.

THE CHAIRMAN.- Would you agree that, in general, there should be very few buildings in a park and that they should be as inconspicuous as possible?

MR. PRYOR.- I would agree with that in general terms but it is difficult to say precisely what buildings should be permitted.

CANBERRA SENATE COMMITTEE.

The Golden Gate Park in San Francisco has one or two very large buildings but it covers one thousand acres and the area covered by the buildings is small in relation to the total area of the park.

THE CHAIRMAN.- Do you agree that the building which has been dumped on Hyde Park, Sydney, should have been placed somewhere else?

MR. PRYOR.- That sort of thing happens in many parks. In a highly built up city such as Sydney it is a common experience.

THE CHAIRMAN.- It would have been better to have put the building underground and to have had a lawn on top?

MR. PRYOR.- Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN.- What would be the biggest area that could be spared in Canberra for the purpose of providing a big park?

MR. PRYOR.- The area immediately to the south-west of Constitution Avenue could provide some hundreds of acres.

SENATOR HANNAFORD.- Is that Central Park?

MR. PRYOR.- What is called "Central Park" is only a portion of that area.

THE CHAIRMAN.- I understand that Centennial Park, Sydney, has an area of 600 acres and that does not seem to be too big for a big city?

MR. PRYOR.- No.

THE CHAIRMAN.- Hyde Park, London, must be much bigger.

MR. PRYOR.- I think so. Central Park, New York, is a very large area.

THE CHAIRMAN.- In addition, do you think that each suburb should have a park of its own?

MR. PRYOR.- Yes. I think that the parks should be graded in size, according to the population. From the point of view of maintenance, it is possible to have too many small areas. It may be better to have fewer fairly large areas.

MR. CHAIRMAN.- But there should be a park within reasonable reach of most residents?

MR. PRYOR.- Yes.

CANBERRA SENATE COMMITTEE.

THE CHAIRMAN.- There would be a margin all around the proposed lake system which would be park land?

MR. PRYOR.- I think that that would be essential. It has always been mentioned as part of the plan.

THE CHAIRMAN.- Is there any idea of having a national park in Canberra - a park in its native state?

MR. PRYOR.- I know of only one proposal, which I do not think has been adopted to reserve a portion of the Cotter catchment area as a wild life reserve.

THE CHAIRMAN.- What is your opinion about the establishment of zoological gardens?

MR. PRYOR.- I think that one devoted to Australian animals would be very desirable.

THE CHAIRMAN.- The animals in such a park would be more or less free?

MR. PRYOR.- I think that some skilful effects have been achieved in enclosing them.

THE CHAIRMAN.- But the old idea of the cage has been discarded?

MR. PRYOR.- Yes. San Diego Zoo is an outstanding example of good treatment. One difficulty that we would experience would result from the fact that Australian native animals are ~~not~~ usually nocturnal.

THE CHAIRMAN.- You don't think there is any necessity for the traditional type of zoo?

MR. PRYOR.- I do not think so. Such a zoo would only be a repetition of those which exist in Sydney and Melbourne.

THE CHAIRMAN.- Do you think that the hills around Canberra should, as far as possible, be left in their present condition - covered with natural flora?

MR. PRYOR.- I should like to have more trees planted on them. They have been thinned out.

THE CHAIRMAN.- Would you like to see Black Mountain covered with eucalyptus trees?

MR. PRYOR.- Yes.

CANBERRA TREE COMMITTEE.

THE CHAIRMAN.- Do you confer with the National Planning and Development Committee?

MR. PRYOR.- No. Any proposal ^{for conference} has to be initiated by that body. ^{or for so I am concerned} I conferred with the members of the Committee a long time ago on one or two occasions.

THE CHAIRMAN.- But some collaboration would have to take place with regard to building?

MR. PRYOR.- That takes place between my colleagues in my branch and myself.

THE CHAIRMAN.- I believe that the cost of development and maintenance of gardens in Canberra last year was £220,000?

MR. PRYOR.- Yes, *approximately*

THE CHAIRMAN.- The rate of expenditure appears to have increased since then but the rise is probably due to inflation?

MR. PRYOR.- Yes. It is mainly due to uncontrolled ^{able} factors such as marginal rates.

THE CHAIRMAN.- Do you consider that you have an adequate budget?

MR. PRYOR.- We have an adequate budget for the number of men we are able to employ. The budget is related to our ceiling figure of employment. But the city is growing and it has not been possible to vary the policy that has fixed the ceiling for 2½ years.

THE CHAIRMAN.- Apart from beautification, what advantages can be derived from trees?

MR. PRYOR.- The most important effect of trees is a reduction of wind velocity. That has a direct effect on evaporation and, to some extent, on temperature. By reducing wind velocity, the climate is generally made more equable and pleasant. Trees also keep down dust.

THE CHAIRMAN.- Would it be ^a good idea to have lines of trees around the city as wind breaks?

MR. PRYOR.- Yes. I think that there should be a high proportion of tree planted area in the surrounding land.

SENATE CANBERRA COMMITTEE.

THE CHAIRMAN. - Is the Canberra water supply adequate for the present number of trees in the city?

MR. PRYOR. - Barely. In seasons such as the one we have just passed through, it is necessary to restrict the application of water.

THE CHAIRMAN. - Do trees need much water?

MR. PRYOR. - Not much, but some is necessary, and the amount needed depends on the species of tree.

THE CHAIRMAN. - Grass and flowers need water?

MR. PRYOR. - Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN. - How shall we increase Canberra's water supply?

MR. PRYOR. - Well, that is an engineering matter.

SENATOR WOOD. - Do you not consider that planting one type of tree in a street gives a better massed affect than a number of types?

MR. PRYOR. - Yes, only very few mixed plantings have been successful because usually one species dominates the others.

SENATOR WOOD. - I notice that there is only one type of tree in Torrens Street, which is a most beautiful thoroughfare.

MR. PRYOR. - Yes, the policy has been to plant one type of tree in each street, that is, not ^{necessarily} in the whole street but in each particular section of the street, which may be demarcated by a bend or a narrowing or some such thing.

SENATOR WOOD. - In order to introduce variety, have you considered having a central row of garden plots in streets or business centres?

MR. PRYOR. - I think there is a good deal of scope for variation in street design, particularly in the more intimate residential streets. I have referred to planting trees inside the block line. That would allow a good deal of scope for variation. There is also scope for planting a single line of trees in the centre of a street, but the ^{maintenance} Department makes it difficult for us to plant certain types of plants in central locations. However, there may be certain methods of doing that. The trees in Lonsdale Street, Braddon,

SENATE CANBERRA COMMITTEE.

SENATOR WOOD. - Do you raise in Canberra all the plants required for the Parks and Gardens of this city?

MR. PRYOR. - Yes.

SENATOR HANNAFORD. - Of what University are you a graduate?

MR. PRYOR. - The University of Adelaide.

SENATOR HANNAFORD. - How long have you been superintendent of Parks and Gardens in Canberra?

MR. PRYOR. - About ten years.

SENATOR HANNAFORD. - Are you in charge of afforestation?

MR. PRYOR. - No, the Forestry and Timber Bureau is a separate unit of my department. ^{G. S. Ridge} Mr. Roger is the head of that Bureau. He was also ^{joined University of Queensland} ~~concerned with forestry~~ in South Australia.

SENATOR HANNAFORD. - The natural trees around Canberra seem to be scrubby and poor, and when you suggest that artificial watering is not particularly needed by the park trees, it seems that the cultivated trees must be more suitable to this part of the Territory than the natural trees.

MR. PRYOR. - There are two points to be considered in your remarks. The trees ^{which} that we have planted have been established by cultivation which prevents the competition of grasses and other plants for the water that the trees need. Secondly, the length of life of the cultivated trees is much less than that of the natural trees. The cultivated trees will grow better for a shorter time than the natural trees, which may live for two or three hundred years.

THE CHAIRMAN. - The life of natural eucalypts round Canberra would be some hundreds of years?

MR. PRYOR. - Some of those trees would be as much as 400 years old. They have very wide spreading root systems, indeed, the radius of the root spread in some of them is up to a half times to twice the height of the tree.

SENATOR HANNAFORD. - You would like to see Black Mountain retained in its natural state?

MR. PRYOR. - Yes, I would like to see the upper slopes, which are now well-timbered, retained. I would like to see no more clearing done on the mountain.

SENATOR HAINFORD. - Those slopes on Black Mountain would lend themselves to the type of park mentioned by the Chairman?

MR. PRYOR. - Yes.

SENATOR HAINFORD. - Some of the trees around Canberra appear to sucker badly. In central park there is a certain thorny type of Acacia that is suckering freely?

MR. PRYOR. - Yes, that is a false Acacia, Robinia.

SENATOR HAINFORD. - Do you not think that that tree should be eradicated?

MR. PRYOR. - It does not grow vigorously in this climate and the rate of spread of the suckers is not great. Moreover, ^{it is} fairly easy to contain. The mowing of the grass will keep those suckers in check.

SENATOR HAINFORD. - I have had great difficulty with that type of tree in my own private garden.

(Continued on page 635)

SENATE CANBERRA COMMITTEE.

MR. PRYOR . - ~~Suckering~~ : trees have their place in certain areas. They can be used quite safely, but their use must be avoided in other places. I would not like to see every tree that suckers from the roots eliminated from Canberra, because we would lose some of our best trees. The silver poplar, for instance, is a beautiful tree, although if you have it close to a garden it is a nuisance.

SENATOR HANNAFORD . - The Lombardy Poplar ~~suckers~~: rather freely, does it not?

MR. PRYOR . - Yes. In general the American poplars do not ~~suckers~~ as much as the Lombardy poplar. The American poplar - ~~Populus monilifera~~ - is a beautiful poplar, and the Chinese poplar - ~~Populus yunnanensis~~ - ~~suckers~~ very little

SENATOR HANNAFORD . - Do you think that sufficient encouragement is given to residents to plant trees on their properties?

MR. PRYOR . - Very effective encouragement is given. Quite a wide range of plants is issued from the nursery free of cost, provided that the plants are planted in Canberra.

SENATOR HANNAFORD . - Is there an Arbor Day in the schools?

MR. PRYOR . - No, that has not been done, although a lot of planting is done round the schools. I think that perhaps that would be a good thing to have as a ceremony.

SENATOR HANNAFORD . - Is there any provision in the parks for equestrian activities?

MR. PRYOR . - There is virtually nothing at the moment.

SENATOR HANNAFORD . - Would you recommend that such provision be made?

MR. PRYOR . - It could well be done. That is a good policy in general terms. It certainly would be fairly easy to arrange and would be a useful thing in Canberra.

SENATOR HANNAFORD . - If the area in which the present riding school is located were developed into a parklike area, that would be suitable, would it not?

MR. PRYOR . - You could provide a track for riding as well as for walking and driving near the lakes, and it would be an advantage to have it in such a place.

SENATE CANBERRA COMMITTEE.

SENATOR HANNAFORD . - I do not see any evidence of jacarandas here?

MR. PRYOR . - It is frost tender and will not grow here. The Canberra climate is several degrees colder than that of Adelaide and a number of trees that do well in Adelaide cannot be grown here.

SENATOR RYAN . - Do you assess the cost of the trees when you plant them?

MR. PRYOR . - Yes. That varies a good deal, of course, according to the kind of tree that is planted and where it is put in. For example, a one year old tree in a tube would be worth say sixpence before it is put in the ground, and perhaps one shilling in the ground; but a large street tree, a large deciduous transplanted tree, might cost £3 or £4 to get into position.

SENATOR RYAN . - I was concerned more with the maintenance costs of the trees?

MR. PRYOR . - It is rather hard to put that down at a particular figure. There are so many variables. If we say we have 2,000,000 trees and shrubs in Canberra, and the efforts of perhaps 200 men are required for nine months in giving attention to various aspects of maintenance of them, you have some idea of what it costs.

SENATOR RYAN . - You referred in your evidence to a green belt. Had you in mind a green belt similar to that which encompasses the city of Adelaide?

MR. PRYOR . - Broadly; a zone that is not built on, which surrounds the formally developed city; that is, the lands immediately outside the defined city area.

SENATOR RYAN . - In your opinion would it be possible to accomplish such a design here?

MR. PRYOR . - Physically, it would be quite possible.

SENATOR RYAN . - You also referred to watering the street lawns. I understand that the position is that the occupiers of premises here now maintain the watering of the plots immediately in front of their premises?

SENATE CANBERRA COMMITTEE.

MR. PRYOR . - They are not obliged to do so, but many of them do. Some people actually establish the lawn in front of their houses. There is a good deal more of that work to be done, and unfortunately the majority of the streets have still rough plantations and are without grass. In a good many cases where it has been put in, the residents look after the grass in front of their houses.

SENATOR RYAN . - In view of the fact that water rating will be imposed in the near future, would you be in favour of householders being exempted from water rates associated with the watering of those plots?

MR. PRYOR . - If that would persuade them to continue to look after the plots, I would certainly ^{be} in favour of it.

SENATOR RYAN . - Has any thought been given to the setting up of a national reservation in the capital to cater for large scale picnics?

MR. PRYOR . - There is only the tourist camp. So far as I know that is the only thing that exists or is planned. That is essentially a matter for the town planner.

SENATOR RYAN . - I understand that a central park will be established to provide those facilities?

MR. PRYOR . - Camping facilities are not envisaged.

SENATOR RYAN . - I do not suggest that it should include camping facilities but facilities for large scale picnics.

MR. PRYOR . - Yes, the things which go with that central park will certainly provide those. There will be areas of turf, plenty of shade, and the ordinary and obvious facilities such as a restaurant, toilets, and so on. The swimming pool is already in that area.

SENATOR RYAN . - Could a central park be provided on the area originally designed in the plan to feature the water basins?

MR. PRYOR . - Yes, because the soil in the lake areas is quite good. It could certainly be done, irrespective of whether that is a desirable or an undesirable thing.

SENATOR RYAN . - If you had the task of supervising and setting

SENATE CANBERRA COMMITTEE.

it up, would you undertake to do the job?

MR. PRYOR . - Yes, the department could do that, if it were decided as a matter of policy. That is, putting aside for the moment the question of whether a lake there would be a good thing or not. It would certainly be possible.

SENATOR RYAN . - Has any thought been given to improving the land adjacent to Westlake, behind the Hotel Canberra?

MR. PRYOR . - In the past, that area was lake margin, until the elimination of Westlake. That was regarded as public domain round the margin of the lake. A certain amount of planting has been done in the last few years to help improve it as a lake margin. Since the lake has been eliminated from the plan, as far as I know, that area has not been committed for any particular use.

SENATOR RYAN . - It could be beautified and used as a public park for reservation?

MR. PRYOR . - Yes, it would be a very good area for that.

SENATOR RYAN . - Is the Golf Course at Westbourne Woods completed yet?

MR. PRYOR . - That is not quite the position. At one stage a proposal was made to establish a golf course in Westbourne Woods, and a design was prepared and certain clearing along the fairways done in the course of that design. At that stage, ~~that~~ ^{the} fitted in with the management of the Westbourne Woods, whether it was to be a golf course or a public park, because many of the trees had become old and certain re-arrangements had become necessary. For instance vistas had to be opened up. Therefore, irrespective of whether it was to be used for golf or a public park, that was a good piece of development. Nothing has been done beyond that stage. Since the decision was made to prepare it as a golf course, the Red Hill golf course has been developed and proposals have been made for the expansion of the city along the Cotter Road ^{east-} west of Westbourne Woods. I do not think it would now be a wise thing to proceed with a golf course in Westbourne Woods. Nothing has really been done by way of expenditure of money to make it a golf course. There are

SENATE CANBERRA COMMITTEE.

no tees or greens, nor is there water reticulation, or anything of that kind.

SENATOR RYAN . - If the present golf course were abandoned would Westbourne Woods provide a suitable substitute?

SENATE CANBERRA COMMITTEE.

MR. PRYOR.- I do not think so. I do not think that would be now the best way to find a substitute because it would bring two golf courses close together in the same section of the city. We are now aware that the demands for golf in wide fairways are such that they would be considerably to the detriment of the trees that are growing in the woods. The extension of the city to embrace Westbourne Woods, I think, makes it important that the area should be retained for more general public use rather than for the restricted use that a golf course implies. In short, it should be more of a general park and less of an exclusive area.

SENATOR RYAN.- If it became necessary to establish another golf course, the area could be used as a golf course?

MR. PRYOR.- It is a piece of land on which, certainly, a golf course could be made, but at considerable sacrifice of good trees, and I do not think it would be the best place now for a substitute golf course to be made. I would much rather see another golf course put elsewhere in a better location where the sacrifice of established material would not be so great and where, perhaps, the course could be constructed more cheaply. Physically, of course, you could make a golf course there, as you could make a golf course in front of Parliament House.

THE CHAIRMAN.- You have declared yourself to be definitely in favour of the retention of West Lake?

MR. PRYOR.- Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN.- What is the total acreage at present under use for park land?

MR. PRYOR.- The area at present under use for park land and subject to regular maintenance, not just nominally park land, is about 1,600 acres.

THE CHAIRMAN.- Do you think that is enough?

MR. PRYOR.- For the size of the city at present, yes. In fact, that area really relates to a plan which would accommodate more people than there are in Canberra now.

THE CHAIRMAN.- It would be far better to retain too much at this stage than to give away too much?

SENATE CANBERRA COMMITTEE

MR. PRYOR.- Yes. In addition, I feel, new areas must be continually added as the city increases.

THE CHAIRMAN.- Can you give the committee a rough idea of the total area that should be retained for park land?

MR. PRYOR.- I think it is best to express it as a percentage. I suggest about 10 per cent. That leaves out of consideration the fairly large sections around the governmental area .

THE CHAIRMAN.- That refers to the city, not to the whole of the Territory?

MR. PRYOR.- That refers to the city.

THE CHAIRMAN.- You are concerned only with the city?

MR. PRYOR.- Not entirely. I am concerned also with the Cotter River recreation area and one or two other areas.

THE CHAIRMAN.- How many acres does the Cotter River recreation area cover?

MR. PRYOR.- There is no area precisely defined, but the area used is about 400 or 500 acres.

THE CHAIRMAN.- Should there be a picnic type of park right in the city - not just a place where people can sit on benches but where they can take their lunch and have billies of tea and so forth?

MR. PRYOR.- Yes. I think the area which adjoins Central Park would be suitable.

THE CHAIRMAN.- You mean part of Central Park but not the whole?

MR. PRYOR.- Not the area now described as Central Park, but the vacant area adjoining it.

THE CHAIRMAN.- Thank you Mr. Pryor. You have given the committee most useful information.

SENATOR HANNAFORD.- Does the caravan park at Black Mountain come within your province?

MR. PRYOR.- No. It is managed by the Canberra Services Branch, which is the local municipal branch of the department.

SENATOR HANNAFORD.- Caravanning seems to be increasing. Would you be in favour not only of extending that park but also

SENATE CANBERRA COMMITTEE.

of establishing other caravan parks elsewhere in the city area?

MR. PRYOR.- Yes. I think there is scope for at least an additional area of that kind. Provision should be made so that when the demand becomes sufficient, as it undoubtedly must in the future, a new caravan park can be constructed.

THE WITNESS WITHDREW.

At 3.20 p.m. the committee adjourned to Thursday, February 17, at 10 a.m.

Supplementary Evidence Submitted by Department
of National Development

ROADS AS A FACTOR IN PROMOTING CANBERRA'S FUNCTION AS A
REGIONAL CENTRE

In the principal submission, the point has been made that Canberra's efficient functioning as a regional centre for south-eastern New South Wales would depend largely on the provision of improved road communication between Canberra and various parts of the region. This improved road communication would enable Canberra to function as a centre for the collection and distribution of goods and industrial products, and for other purposes as mentioned below.

This supplementary submission and the accompanying sketch map are intended to suggest the sort of principal road undertakings that would need to be contemplated by the responsible authorities (or authority) if Canberra were to be developed as such a regional centre.

Three important routes which might be scheduled for early development are :-

- (i) the road to Cooma and thence to Bega;
- (ii) a new direct road to Tumut;
- (iii) the road to Bateman's Bay and Moruya via Braidwood.

(The precise locations shown for these roads on the sketch map should be taken as exemplary only, and not as representing a considered view.)

Canberra-Cooma-Bega

The Commonwealth Government has a direct interest in the Canberra-Cooma road, as it is along this route that quite a large volume of goods for use by the Snowy Mountains Authority passes. The rapidly increasing population in the Snowy Mountains area is also increasing the volume of service and tourist traffic between Canberra and Cooma. Interstate tourists often include the Snowy Mountains Scheme and Canberra together as part of their itinerary in this area. It can be expected that as Canberra develops further and the Snowy projects proceed towards a working maximum, the volume of tourist, service and goods traffic will increase considerably. If and as Canberra's functions as a regional centre increase an additional outflow of goods from Canberra to the Cooma area will develop. Certain work on the reconstruction of this road is already under way.

The road from Cooma to Bega via Nimmitabel is also an important link in the regional network. The provision of a first class road right through to Bega would expedite the movement of primary produce from the Far South Coast area both to Cooma and to Canberra. The present poorly surfaced, narrow and winding nature of much of this road from Cooma onwards is not conducive to the free movement of primary produce and tourist traffic. Fish (both canned and fresh), milk, butter, cheese, bacon and ham, vegetables and timber would constitute the main primary produce traffic. Additional tourist and holiday resorts would also be made more accessible to both the interstate and regional population. The total distance by road from Canberra to Bega is 143 miles.

Canberra-Tumut

A new direct road link between Canberra and Tumut is also suggested. There has been, we believe, some

investigation of such a proposal. If this road were built the present total road distance from Tumut to Canberra would be approximately halved. The existence of a first class road direct to Tumut would not only make the primary produce of the rich Tumut valley much more accessible to Canberra but would provide a through road link between Canberra and the Riverina, thus ultimately fitting in with the general plan for Canberra's growth as a regional centre. The potentiality of this road for tourist traffic would also be considerable. Regional seaside holiday resorts would also be brought closer to the population of the Tumut and Riverina areas. Fruit, vegetables, dairy produce, processed foods and timber would constitute the principal items of primary produce traffic emanating from the Tumut area.

Canberra-Bateman's Bay

The improvement of the road between Canberra and Bateman's Bay has for several years occupied the attention of those served by this road. Under a scheme for the regional development of the area centred on Canberra, this road would form a vital link, connecting Canberra with the Bateman's Bay-Moruya and Braidwood areas. There is already a steady flow of holiday and tourist traffic between Canberra and this area, whilst the rapidly increasing population of the national capital provides a readier output for the sea foods, dairy produce, vegetables and timber of the coastal and tableland areas. The distance from Canberra to Bateman's Bay via Bungendore is 95 miles. An alternative route between Queanbeyan and Braidwood via Hoskinstown if suitable for improvement, would shorten this distance by ten miles.

The south-eastern section of New South Wales is served by only one trunk railway and hence the region is very much dependent on road transport for the marketing and distribution of its produce.

CANBERRA.

14th February, 1955.

SENATE CAMBERNA COMMITTEE

On page 4 - matter dealing with density and planning, numbers of units on Section 52, the development on Section 52, Braddon, results in a density of 101.3 persons per acre. That is all.

THE CHAIRMAN.- I am wondering whether it would be better for us to take this in sections or as a whole. What would you prefer?

MR. URE.- As you wish.

THE CHAIRMAN.- We shall take it in sections. The first deals with functions of the office. Do you feel that you are restricted in any way by not having sufficient delegated authority in matters of finance?

MR. URE.- No. I have answered that question, I think, quite clearly in so far as that with the present subdivision of Design and Construction, it is not necessary for me to have direct financial responsibility which usually concerns, say, the letting of contracts or any adjustments to contracts. If the system was altered, I would say, "Yes, I should have more", but in the present system it is not necessary for me to have financial responsibility although during the development of drawings, there is a tacit financial responsibility in that all proposals have to be vetted by myself and my officers so far as being economic results of client requirements. We attempt to produce the answer in the most economic way so that if we were not careful of our responsibilities in the Design Section, we could actually allow projects to get far more expensive and complex than really would be necessary. So that responsibility exists. A decision may reduce a scheme, by say, one quarter.

THE CHAIRMAN.- Have you authority to make alterations to plans that are already approved?

MR. URE.- Yes, with the concurrence of my senior officers, certain amendments to plans may be found necessary. A very simple illustration would be that, say, test holes may have been taken of a site that we were developing for a project and certain assumptions made on where rock may be found. When the trenches were opened up we might find the rock in a different position from where we anticipated, and we would ~~just make those~~ ^{make the necessary} amendments.

Other amendments may be made as the result of the unavailability of materials, and they may be initiated from the Director or by our head office. Certain projects may be designed in one structural medium and, due to shortages when the time comes to build the project, we may have to redesign or we may suggest substitutions when the job is in progress due to shortage of materials. So there is a certain amount of flexibility, and I consider sufficient flexibility to make any necessary alterations.

THE CHAIRMAN.- Would you have to get the authority of an officer in Melbourne to such variations?

MR. URE.- No, once the project is designed *it is a branch responsibility.*

THE CHAIRMAN.- The architects actually working on the project would have delegation of authority to make necessary alterations from time to time?

MR. URE.- Yes, actually they would probably find or detect any desirable variations and refer them to myself or to my supervising architects.

THE CHAIRMAN.- You would not have to go to a higher authority?

MR. URE.- No.

THE CHAIRMAN.- That is all I have to ask about functions. I pass now to the next section which is relationship with head office. Have you any further statement on that?

MR. URE.- No, I think our relationship with head office has been stated by the Director of Works, and my statement here is in line with it.

THE CHAIRMAN.- Do you find that there is a tendency at any time to interfere with your own work by head office? Perhaps "interfere" is not the appropriate word, but do you find that there is ever a tendency for head office to question you?

MR. URE.- Actually, I am in rather a peculiar position in that I was a designing architect in head office prior to coming here, and as far as I can see it, firstly from my experience in head office and secondly from the other end of the argument, the position is that head office consists of very skilled specialist

SENATE CANBERRA COMMITTEE

architects and I think that many projects *should* have an expert opinion, and that ~~it~~ is an advantage to have those specialised people to obtain an opinion from.

THE CHAIRMAN.- So any reference to Melbourne would not be merely to an administrative officer? It would be to ask for an opinion?

MR. URE.- Yes, we have our Directorate of Architecture which is more or less our section of head office.

THE CHAIRMAN.- Any such reference to Melbourne would more likely be on your own initiative?

MR. URE.- Quite often.

THE CHAIRMAN.- Have there been any cases where plans have been drawn up very carefully from your branch, which you considered to be good plans and which have been put aside by head office?

MR. URE.- Not since I have been here. Perhaps I should explain that I have been here for approximately a year; but I think it would be quite true to say that certain proposals that have been viewed by head office - and I may say that I reviewed them in head office as a head office officer - were considered to be not quite on the right line of solution and, in those circumstances, they may have been ~~drawn~~ withdrawn. But head office always attempts to get at the projects at the early stage. No one likes altering drawings which architects have been working on for months and months, but free hand sketches - the very first thought - that is the time to alter sketches, and head office attempts to get the sketches at that stage.

THE CHAIRMAN.- And you consider that any discussion between head office and the branch here on these matters is beneficial and not obstructive?

MR. URE.- Very efficient.

THE CHAIRMAN.- In other words, you think that the fact of head office being situated away from Canberra is not having a delaying effect on the carrying out of plans?

MR. URE.- I would say "No" to that question, although following the procedure the fact is that there is delay in mail

and a delay in week-ends intervening, and a delay in priorities of attention. Head office gets a lot of work to deal with. There is resultant delay of quantity, and ^{the} intervening time *in dealing with a specific project*

THE CHAIRMAN.- Apart from mail delay and that sort of thing, do you think that matter often stays there waiting to be dealt with?

MR. URE.- Not unduly, and we always have the opportunity to telephone so as to hurry any particular project along. If it is urgent, we send priority memos, telegrams and impress on head office the urgency of any particular project. But the urgency is not ~~usually~~ ^{usually} great with the ordinary run-of-the-mill projects.

THE CHAIRMAN.- It is one of the stock criticisms of the departments. I know it is true of some departments. I was for ten years in a head office of a department, and I know of the types of delay which occurred. You say that there is no real substance in that criticism so far as your department is concerned; that is, that head office becomes a bottleneck and holds up things, so far as you can compare it with private enterprise of a similar size.

MR. URE.- I would say that it does very well.

THE CHAIRMAN.- If you were detached from the head office in Melbourne and had final responsibility without any right even to confer with people, do you think that the work here would go on quicker.

MR. URE.- I doubt if it would in the present circumstances. I shall explain that statement. Our staff position is the most critical item of getting work out and even if head office and we ourselves were dissociated, we could still do only a certain amount of work, because of the number of architects we have at our disposal. If we had a full staff, we would be able to do much more work much quicker, and I do not think it would affect production if we were separated from head office, associated with head office, or were a completely separate entity in Canberra.

THE CHAIRMAN.- While you have been with the department, do you know whether it has lost many architects to private practice?

SENATE CANBERRA COMMITTEE

MR. URE.- Yes they have.

THE CHAIRMAN.- Is it a real problem for the department to
get and keep good men?

MR. URE.- Yes it is.

CANBERRA SENATE COMMITTEE.

THE CHAIRMAN.- Do you think the relations between your Department and the Department of the Interior are entirely satisfactory?

MR. URE.- That is a very broad question. Could you be specific about any particular section of the Department of the Interior?

THE CHAIRMAN.- Suppose you get from the Department of the Interior a specific plan. You are asked to put up a building on a particular site. If you do not like the type of building or the site what happens?

MR. URE.- We can write back - without very much authority - drawing attention to our thoughts on the matter and expressing the hope that the Department of Interior will consider it further.

THE CHAIRMAN.- Suppose they persist; what is your next step?

MR. URE.- We usually keep our head office informed if we feel there is a technical matter about which we feel very strongly. This gives us a check and another thought on the matter so that we will know whether we are on the right track. Head office may intervene. In some cases, head office men have come to Canberra and had a round table conference with the Secretary of the Department of the Interior.

THE CHAIRMAN.- Would you ever report it to the National Planning and Development Committee?

MR. URE.- Most projects are referred to that Committee *by the Dept. of the Interior. We would not refer differences of opinion direct to that body* but we have not actually referred them, the reason being that we do not always know whether projects have already been reviewed by that Committee.

THE CHAIRMAN.- I should like some further information about the post office building in front of the Hotel Kurrajong. The impression I got from one witness was that the Postmaster-General's Department originated it. The proposal then went to the Department of the Interior, then to Planning, and Works accepted it?

MR. URE.- The position as I know it is that the site was selected by the Department of the Interior and the type of

building was selected due to shortages of local materials. At that time we were importing Riley-Newsome houses. There were no materials and this building was an "off the shelf" job. It was the only sort of building they could get out in time, in view of the material shortages.

THE CHAIRMAN.- Were you the officer here at that time?

MR. URE.- No.

THE CHAIRMAN.- It is said that requisitioning departments often ask for rush designs near the end of the financial year to get work started while money is available. Do you think that is so?

MR. URE.- We attempt to commit all the approved works of any particular programme. If the programme has been approved by the Parliament and so much money has been allotted, the essence is to commit the projects not to spend the money.

THE CHAIRMAN.- The suggestion is that a plan may be approved without adequate consideration and that later the plan may be altered?

MR. URE.- I should not think that.

THE CHAIRMAN.- You do not know of any instance in which that has happened?

MR. URE.- I do not.

THE CHAIRMAN.- There has been a good deal of criticism of the present method of annual budgeting and some people have made the suggestion that a system of what they call project budgeting should be introduced. Do you think it would be practical to ensure that you had all the money to carry through a particular project to the end?

MR. URE.- We do, theoretically. It is difficult to estimate clearly what is going to happen to a project with, say, rising prices, but allowing Xs and Ys for say margins and cost of living and all the increases that may affect a particular project when we obtain the funds from a client department we really feel those funds are sufficient. That is for any specific job. Your question suggests that a bulk sum could be allocated to Canberra.

THE CHAIRMAN.- I think that is what some people have in mind.

MR. URE.- I think that, in the case of housing, it would probably be more workable. It would be quicker to work from a bulk requisition which provided for so many million pounds worth of housing. We could then finance any particular group of houses. That would probably short circuit a lot of the procedure of developing a specific number of houses, estimating a specific number of houses and getting approval for that number, rather than saying "our potential in Canberra in a year is one thousand houses"; allocating so much money for them, and using that money as the tenders work out on particular types of houses or flats that are produced for the Department of the Interior.

THE CHAIRMAN.- Apart from the Department of the Interior, is there any other department with which it is necessary for your Department to have relations in order to carry out your plans here?

MR. URE.- Yes. So far as the quantity of work in the A.C.T. is concerned, probably the Department of the Interior would take up about half. But we have many other clients. We do a lot of work for the Army, the Navy and the Air Force. There is also the C.S. & I.R.O., Parliament House - a very important customer - and various other smaller departments which make small demands on us usually for alterations or additions to existing office accommodation. Generally, all departments in Canberra have a works requirement of varying financial extent.

THE CHAIRMAN.- Does the responsibility for design rest on the shoulders of the department that requisitions you or on your shoulders?

MR. URE.- On our shoulders.

THE CHAIRMAN.- If you get an unsuitable design you could throw it back?

MR. URE.- We really do not get unsuitable designs. We get planning requirements. If a design is unsuitable it is our fault. We are expected to vet the requirements of a client. If a

CANBERRA SENATE COMMITTEE.

client asks for something that we know is very much over scale, we have a responsibility to quote agreed standards of accommodation. There are scales of accommodation laid down for the Army and the Navy and we actually plan within set scales so far as possible.

THE CHAIRMAN.- The Royal Military College has a number of small wooden buildings. Can you tell me why they have such buildings instead of a large permanent structure?

MR. URE.- That was well before my time but I think that the buildings were forced on them because there was no finance for a decent structure. They were able only to build a lot of small cheap places rather than a more suitable type of structure.

THE CHAIRMAN.- When a plan is put up to you, what standards do you apply in considering it? Do you consider the aim that Canberra should be a fine city or do you simply say "this is a suitable building for this purpose" and not worry about how it looks or fits into the general design?

MR. URE.- We take as much care as possible but our aesthetic consideration of a project would vary with the type of project. For instance, in undertaking an individual project for the Department of the Interior we would be just given the site and in due course we would evolve the requirement. A client department may not know particularly what it wants. It may merely inform us that it wants an office building for one hundred people. We know what goes with the provision of office accommodation for one hundred people. We would be given the site and we would do the planning. But we would consider it in relation to other buildings and as a complete unit in itself.

As far as housing is concerned, it is not quite so easy to consider each project, because we have bulk housing. Unfortunately, we have the sub-divisions already provided, and we have no opportunity to do other than what is given to us.

THE CHAIRMAN. - On the top of Red Hill there is an erection which yesterday I referred to as a "gallows". I am concerned about it mainly because I think it may lead to a further extension. Do you know its purpose?

MR. URE. - I have not seen that structure, but I think it is the ^{Receiver} ~~reservoir~~ head. It has been built by the Postmaster-General's Department as a direct project. It was not built or designed by us.

THE CHAIRMAN. - If it has been built by the Postmaster-General's Department, I take it that there will be no big building there?

MR. URE. - Yes, but there may be a bit of a shed.

THE CHAIRMAN. - The transfer of town planning to the Interior took place in May, 1950. Did you think that a good idea?

MR. URE. - I do not know the circumstances that caused that transfer, but I think it was rather a retrograde step. I consider that the planning of the type of structure that is going to be put up, and liaison with our engineering services, should be all in one cell, ~~because~~ I feel that there are definite weaknesses in the present arrangement under which we receive sub-divisions without any consideration ^{having been made to the ultimate development.} ~~at all~~. As I mentioned previously, we have referred some of the matters back to Interior, although we know that it is not our business.

THE CHAIRMAN. - You think that town planning and architecture are so intimately related that it would be better for the town planner and the architect to be in the same department?

MR. URE. - Yes.

SENATOR HANNAFORD. - You would not suggest that there are no competent men in the Department of the Interior to carry out this work as effectively as officers of your department?

MR. URE. - No. I would suggest that the present staff, consisting of Mr. Gibson and his officers, should be transferred. Town planning is a specialised study. We have no town planners in our office at present. We all know something about town planning, but we have not developed our skill, because that work is being done by someone else.

SENATOR HANNAFORD. - You think that it would be more effective if that branch were transferred to your department?

MR. URE. - Mr. Gibson's cell went over to Interior, and I think it should not have gone over.

THE CHAIRMAN. - When you say it is a specialised study, I take it that some training in architecture is a necessary part of that study?

MR. URE. - Yes. Normally, that is a particular skill which has been developed.

THE CHAIRMAN. - The best town planner would be a fully trained architect who has studied these other things as well?

MR. URE. - Yes, that is always the case.

THE CHAIRMAN. - Is your staff engaged on design and forward planning adequate?

MR. URE. - Most inadequate in numbers.

THE CHAIRMAN. - Have you tried to encourage staff by giving scholaraships to the University, or offering special inducements?

MR. URE. - Yes, we do that. Our organisation consists of a certain number of cadet architects.

THE CHAIRMAN. - What is the qualification for admission?

MR. URE. - Matriculation, and the desire to be an architect. Having matriculated, they apply for a cadetship in architecture. They usually come from lads who have already started a course,

THE CHAIRMAN. - Is it a requisite of their continued employment that they take a course in architecture?

MR. URE. - Yes. They take it at one of the universities, either in Sydney or Melbourne, and they work in our office during the vacations.

THE CHAIRMAN. - How many universities in Australia have

schools of architecture?

MR. URE. - Three - Sydney, Melbourne and Brisbane.

THE CHAIRMAN. - Would inadequacy of numbers on your staff give rise to the delay?

MR. URE. - Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN. - Does that lead to work being done in head office that could be done here?

MR. URE. - Yes.

SENATOR HANNAFORD. - Are there any circumstances in which the department goes outside its own staff and employs an outside architect?

MR. URE. - Yes.

SENATOR HANNAFORD. - Could you give me details of any project that had been done in that way?

MR. URE. - Yes. In my evidence I referred to one project which is fairly current - schools at Turner and Griffith.

THE CHAIRMAN. - Have any of the architects in the department the right of private practice?

MR. URE. - No, it is strictly forbidden.

SENATOR WOOD. - Who has authority to engage outside architects for jobs?

MR. URE. - The branch architects have full authority.

SENATOR WOOD. - This office in Canberra would have such authority?

MR. URE. - Yes. We actually send out proformas asking private architects in Canberra, Sydney and Melbourne whether they desire to do work for us.

SENATOR WOOD. - Do you confine yourself to those cities?

MR. URE. - We usually ask the recognised practicing architects who have a reasonable establishment. We probably would not ask, say, a one-man architectural firm outside the capital cities.

SENATOR RYAN. - Is a general standard of liaison laid down for visits from officers of the head office in Melbourne?

MR. URE. - Liaison takes place in so far as selected projects are referred to head office, but if necessary, an officer from this department will go to head office to discuss a project rather than write a voluminous report. In many cases the various designing architects who are looking after sections of client department work in head office come up here to discuss specific jobs. For instance, if we were doing work for the Army, the Army designing architect would liaise directly with Army headquarters, and he would come up here and we would have a round table conference.

SENATOR WOOD. - When you give work to outside architects, do you only give it to firms of architects and not to individuals?

MR. URE. - Yes, because they are usually major projects and we want a bit of speed.

SENATOR WOOD. - But an individual architect may have a staff, and after all, there would be probably ^{only} one architect working on the job?

MR. URE. - We know the names of the big firms of architects in the cities. I was in private practice, and most of the architects in the office know other architects and their potential. We usually prefer to employ a bigger firm because our projects are of a considerable size. We may let out a job which would be worth £200,000. A one-man firm, which might have a couple of draftsmen working for it, might take six months over that, and we might have only six months to get the work committed in the financial period. We would prefer a bigger firm which was more accustomed to that type of work. Some architectural firms specialise in major projects. For instance, there are firms that specialise in hospitals, and there would be only three or four firms that would be capable of doing a hospital. Architects usually specialise in particular types of work. An architect may specialise in ecclesiastical architecture, whilst another may specialise in hospitals or city office buildings. We know the kind of work they have done and have a rough idea of their establishment. We are interested in knowing how much of their establishment they will allocate to our projects and how quickly they will do them.

SENATE CANBERRA COMMITTEE.

SENATOR WOOD. - On the other hand, you may get no more brilliance or better results from a big firm than from an individual architect?

MR. URE. - We ask for a statement from all sorts of firms. We say to them, "Here is a project worth so much. We will give you the sketch drawings on such and such a date. How many men will you allocate to the project and how long will you take to do it?". We find that out first.

SENATOR WOOD. - So that there is nothing to prevent an individual from competing, provided he has the staff to do it?

MR. URE. - No.

THE CHAIRMAN. - Do you have some architects who design constructions and others who see that the design is carried out?

MR. URE. - That is correct.

THE CHAIRMAN. - Would it be better if the man who did the design also watched the construction?

MR. URE. - With limited staff, I would say No, and recent reviews from our Director-General on an overseas visit proved by comparison that constructors similar to the Department of Works work on precisely the same lines.

THE CHAIRMAN. - Where you have a big project let out on contract, is it the practice that one man will design the building and the architect who watches it will be another man? Take, for instance, this big administrative building in Canberra. That is being done by private contract?

MR. URE. - Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN. - They have an architect of their own watching it?

MR. URE. - No, we have our architect ^{supervising} watching it. Actually, we have a project architect for that job. The constructing firm ^{usually} ~~has~~ ^{does not employ an architect.} ~~no architect watching it.~~

THE CHAIRMAN. - The men who actually do the designing are sufficiently cognisant of all the facts concerning it to draw up a sensible design? For instance, you would not get a man who had never seen Canberra and did not know anything about the lay-out drawing a design which had to be altered because of his lack of knowledge?

MR. URE. - I should think not. If head office is doing any work for us, we give them all the information necessary. They actually work for us.

SENATE CANBERRA COMMITTEE.

THE CHAIRMAN . - You do not think that it is necessary for a man concerned to know the lay-out of Canberra?

MR. URE . - No.

THE CHAIRMAN . - If it is a really fine building that will fit into the general landscape, would it not be an advantage for the man to know what Canberra looked like?

MR. URE . - Possibly it would be an advantage, but if anyone who is away from Canberra is doing work for the Government, the work is always to our approval. ~~They~~ ^{We} do not ~~do~~ ^{accept} anything that we do not like.

THE CHAIRMAN . - An ambassador told me that his Government was determined to erect a building that would fit into the Australian landscape, and that it would bring an architect to Canberra to study the locality before the building was designed.

MR. URE . - That is usually necessary. He would be referring to the designing and constructing authority who would have to see the place, but as we are supervising the work, we keep an eye on those items.

SENATOR WOOD . - I presume that the architect designing a building would be supplied with information about the wind flow and similar details so that he could site the building properly?

MR. URE . - Yes, we would supply a report on desirable and undesirable aspects, details of levels and planning requirements and maybe an example of something similar.

THE CHAIRMAN . - When the man concerned has drawn up the plan and sent it to you he has no further interest in it?

MR. URE . - That is so.

THE CHAIRMAN . - We have had complaints that some houses are badly sited. That applies particularly to some of the new areas. Do you think that is a just criticism of some areas?

MR. URE . - Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN . - How did that occur?

MR. URE . - It resulted from the gradual decrease of the frontages. We have been expected to maintain a steady flow of housing

SENATE CANBERRA COMMITTEE

designs of reasonable variety, economical in plan form, attractive in appearance and the types we had were suitable for 60 ft. frontages. In many cases, frontages were up to 70 and 75 ft. Now there are a number of 50 ft frontages. The only way to fit the houses into them was to turn the houses end on.

THE CHAIRMAN . - Would it not be better to get a totally new design?

MR. URE . - It would be, if we had the time and the staff. We realise that we should have more and better types, but staff and time have been against us.

THE CHAIRMAN . - Are there not now a large number of fairly standardised designs for allotments of any size or shape which could be fairly easily adapted?

MR. URE . - Since Canberra was begun, mention has been made of 400 types of houses. I do not know whether that number is correct. In the early days when utility houses were built, they were constructed rather in the grand manner. They had ten feet ceilings, bedrooms 15 x 10 feet, a fuel stove, an electric stove and outside porches. They were bigger houses. Since the War, everyone has learnt to understand what a square means in relation to houses. Before the War, we did not talk of squares. After the War everyone talked of squares and that meant how much you could cram into 100 square feet. We believe that we have developed better plans although they have to serve the rank and file of residents. In the effort to keep costs down, we have been reducing some of the items. The policy is to put in only an electric stove. Previously both fuel and electric stoves were installed. Now we have plenty of types with fuel ^{stoves} ~~stoves~~ and electric stoves but we cannot use them because it is not the policy to instal both. If there are changes in policy and economic generally, the available types of houses instead of being 400 might be reduced to 25.

THE CHAIRMAN . - Do you not think that other things being equal, it is far better to have a building that does not require too much upkeep? For that reason, do you not think that a good brick house is an advantage and that plaster cast buildings that

require painting every year or two are laid?

MR. URE . - I consider that maintenance should be studied very closely. I do not agree with your reference to cast plaster.

THE CHAIRMAN . - I mean anything that requires painting.

MR. URE . - I would say that a timber house must be painted every five years.

THE CHAIRMAN . - Surely plaster places must be painted?

MR. URE . - Those that you see being painted now were built ten or fifteen years ago. We do not cement render, but we do a Tyrolean texture finish that does not have to be painted.

THE CHAIRMAN . - What about Parliament House?

MR. URE . - It is cement rendered, and has to be painted regularly.

THE CHAIRMAN . - Do you not think that a good brick house has the advantage of not requiring much repair?

MR. URE . - Yes, definitely.

THE CHAIRMAN . - There is a good deal of criticism of the colours used for painting houses. A distinguished lady in Canberra told me that she did not like the khaki houses that are being built.

MR. URE . - I think that the khaki houses to which the lady was referring are those of rather drab colour which have been treated with the Tyrolean finish. That is the natural sand, which is a brown colour, mixed with white cement. The result is rather a khaki colour. We consider them rather drab, too.

SENATOR WOOD . - What do you intend to do about re-painting the khaki houses?

MR. URE . - They will never be repainted. The finish is an integral mixed colour, and that is why they get a little dirty.

SENATOR WOOD . - Are you still building that type of home?

MR. URE . - No, probably the projects that have been mentioned are some of the flats that we erected.

SENATOR WOOD . - You have discontinued them?

MR. URE . - I would not be certain. The houses of Tyrolean finish depend on the number of projects that require that type of treatment. I believe that if we reduced the number of houses of that

SENATE CANBERRA COMMITTEE

particular colour they would not look so bad, but we are limited. We can have the khaki colour, pink or white in Tyrolean finish. It has many advantages in that it will not show craze marks like a ~~concrete~~ ^{concrete} building. It is a good finishing medium. I think the khaki colour is ~~all right~~ ^{all right} if discretion is used. They do not look so bad if they are placed alongside some white or pink buildings with trees around them, but they are not attractive when six or seven are placed in a row.

THE CHAIRMAN . - There are a number of questions I have been asking all architects and they are not intended as a criticism of your department. Would you impose any aesthetic restrictions on residential buildings?

MR. URE . - Yes. This is a personal opinion and has no departmental backing. I believe that it was a ~~wise~~ ^{wise} step when the decision was made that houses need not be ~~designed~~ ^{designed} by architects. Previously, such a provision was one of the best features of Canberra. One of the reasons for the multiplicity of designs in the capital cities is that everybody has a different idea of what a building should ^{look} like. Anybody who can hold a pencil considers his ideas are as good as anyone else's. Architects vary in ability, just as other professional men do, but the worst architect is better than the best layman. Buildings that are designed by architects are better than most jobs that are designed by persons other than architects. One of the advantages of Canberra was that every project was vetted by a professional man, and a standard was maintained.

THE CHAIRMAN . - When was that decision made?

MR. URE . - About a year ago.

SENATOR HANNAFORD . - You would agree that even under the previous circumstances where all buildings were vetted by architects, the picture is not wholly a good one?

MR. URE . - That is quite true.

THE CHAIRMAN . - Do you think that designs for public buildings should be referred to a body outside your department or the constructing department such as a Fine Arts Committee?

MR. URE . - The Department of Works has some very able men
n 1

SENATE CANBERRA COMMITTEE.

and I think they are capable of doing the work *without reference to such a house*

THE CHAIRMAN . - Are there not considerations other than those of pure architecture. We have a plan and a natural setting. When it comes to big buildings, do you not think that such matters, as well as architecture, should be taken into consideration?

MR. URE . - Yes. For example, in Stockholm there is a committee responsible for all civic architecture. Every project has to be referred to it. Actually, it is facade architecture *control*.

THE CHAIRMAN . - Would you object to that?

MR. URE . - The Department of Works would be one body affected, but I think it would have a good effect in that it would develop a standardised approach to aesthetics.

SENATE CANBERRA COMMITTEE.

THE CHAIRMAN.- Do you think that people other than artists and architects -/mem like Darryl Lindsay - might well be on that committee?

MR. URE.- Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN.- Darryl Lindsay's advice would be very good.

MR. URE.- Yes. I think that people skilled in aesthetics can be drawn from other than ^{the} architects ~~architects~~ *usual profession*.

THE CHAIRMAN.- Do you think that large buildings such as business premises, shops and structures constructed by voluntary bodies should be subject to some kind of supervision by a fine arts committee or a board of architects? I do not suggest a veto, but an advisory body that could make recommendations and point out that a building was lacking in certain respects?

MR. URE.- I think it would be very good for the overall aesthetic aspect of Canberra if you had very competent men, but they would have to be very competent men who would be respected by other people.

THE CHAIRMAN.- Do you think that an international competition for the designing of the largest and greatest buildings would be desirable?

MR. URE.- It is usual. Other countries call for world wide competitions for some of their major projects. Such a project as Parliament House should be the subject of a world-wide competition.

THE CHAIRMAN.- We have had a direct contradiction of opinion on some matters. One witness told us that public architecture should not date, that you should try to get something that would still look acceptable in many years' time. Another witness stated that that was the wrong point and that building should be in the idiom of the day, which is just as likely to be respected in the future. What is your opinion?

MR. URE.- I am glad that you have asked that question. There seems to be a lot of wolly thinking about the term "contemporary architecture". I think it all hinges on just what contemporary architecture is. Contemporary architecture is

SENATE CANBERRA COMMITTEE.

not the appearance of a building. That is the last thing that matters. Contemporary architecture is the careful analysis of a need, careful and economic planning, simplicity of construction, good facilities of light, circulation and ventilation, and last of all, something that clothes the resultant form which provides the *fn* light and all the other factors that are necessary, and which looks like something. To say, "I do not like contemporary architecture" - you could put a contemporary facade on Parliament House, but it would not change the function of the building. An architect that is worth his salt can plan in a contemporary way, and he can plan a dignified facade, whether it be in glass or any other material. It can be dignified.

THE CHAIRMAN.- The fact that a building is to be contemporary does not prevent your building in what resembles some former style that you like? Would you, as a modern architect, say that it is quite wrong - some architects have said this - to construct a building such as the American Legation? Would you say that you could construct a functional and useful building in that style?

MR. URE.- Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN.- You have clarified many things. Is there any distinctive present-day Australian school of architecture or is Australian architecture just part of a world-wide trend?

MR. URE.- That is rather a difficult question to answer. I think that many architects are possibly influenced unduly by what they see in American magazines. They probably do not approach the problem in the right way. They have a tendency to say, "I like that. I shall do something like that." They work back to front from the contemporary appearance to a plan that fits. That was the way the old architects used to work. They would have a Queen Anne front and it did not matter whether the rooms had any light or were big or small. *The plan* That had nothing to do with the appearance.

THE CHAIRMAN.- I had a lot to do with watching the planning of the National Library. They worked the other way. They started with the function. Functionally it was quite satisfactory, but I was not satisfied with the appearance. My criticism was that

SENATE CANBERRA COMMITTEE.

it looked like a factory. Modern factories are marvellously improved compared with older factories. Architects have succeeded completely there. They have built fine looking buildings for factories. A library or administrative building or a Parliament House, even though it is planned functionally, as it should be, should have dignity and beauty.

MR. URE.- Yes. I think that a good architect can combine both.

THE CHAIRMAN.- It is really a question of getting good and bad architects. That is what it boils down to.

MR. URE.- Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN.- Do you consider the quality of the public buildings already existing in Canberra worthy of a national capital? You can specify some of the buildings if you like, to make it easier. Do you think that the Parliament House is worthy to be the Parliament House of a great Commonwealth?

MR. URE.- No.

THE CHAIRMAN.- That is quite enough. I agree with you. We must not go too deeply into Parliament House, or we shall be touching upon parliamentary privilege where the House of Representatives is concerned. Do you think that the East Block and the West Block administrative buildings are worthy of administrative buildings?

MR. URE.- I do not think any of them are really world beaters.

THE CHAIRMAN.- They are inoffensive?

MR. URE.- They are inoffensive.

THE CHAIRMAN.- That is the criticism that we heard yesterday, and I think it is good criticism. Is the School of Anatomy building a good building in its appearance?

MR. URE.- I should say that it is better.

THE CHAIRMAN.- What do you think of the High School? That is a solemn looking building.

MR. URE.- I should say that it is inoffensive also.

SENATE CANBERRA COMMITTEE

THE CHAIRMAN.- It is inoffensive, but it is too grim for a high school. I think it looks more like a model prison than a high school.

MR. URE.- The essence of a lot of the buildings in Canberra is symmetry, and in some instances it has been forced symmetry. Parliament House is very symmetrical. From the rear entrance you see one stack here, another stack there, four windows here and four windows there. That was one of the features of the designing period. They thought that if you had one thing here, you ought to have another there to balance it. Symmetry develops into rather a monotonous ^{& uninteresting} pattern.

THE CHAIRMAN.- We have heard some discussion about whether buildings should be large, and about the skyline of the city. Do you think the city requires a number of very tall buildings?

MR. URE.- I do.

THE CHAIRMAN.- Do you think that the tall buildings should be mainly in the centre - the famous government triangle - or that they could be in the suburbs and other parts also?

MR. URE.- I cannot make a statement on ^{whether} ~~whether~~ I think they should be. My general feeling on Canberra and also on the accusations of monotony has been the subconscious fact that they feel that everything is monotonous because it is all flat.

I think the people that say "Monotonous" in a very woolly way and cannot say why it is monotonous subconsciously feel that it is all the same - there are hills and houses and all cottages. This aspect of the third dimension is very important.

THE CHAIRMAN.- Do you think that could be better done by certain traditional types of structure such as church spires, domes and the like, or by blocks of flats?

MR. URE.- I think that blocks of flats are more likely to be built than church spires, and I feel that we ought to do it as soon as possible. I feel that some of our flat structures would be functionally desirable and also aesthetically desirable as vertical accents.

THE CHAIRMAN.- Do you think that careful consideration

SENATE CANBERRA COMMITTEE

should be given to their position?

MR. URE.- Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN.- You would not put a block of tall flats within a couple of hundred of yards of St. John's Church?

MR. URE.- No.

SENATOR HANNAFORD.- Do you favour multi-storey flats in the central administrative area of Canberra?

MR. URE.- Yes.

SENATOR HANNAFORD.- That would lend colour?

MR. URE.- I think that the selection of a multi-storey building should not be just "I like a multi-storey building".

SENATOR HANNAFORD.- I do not suggest that.

MR. URE.- It should be functionally desirable and aesthetically desirable insofar as producing some vertical accents is concerned. Possibly the future Parliament House will not be a very high building. I do not know. You can visualise that the Parliament House would be at the centre and there may be some of these rather slab types of buildings, but higher than the buildings around, so as to give a foil and the leadup on the axes to Parliament House. It would be very dramatic. If you have a lot of little buildings terminating in a bigger little building, it loses punch.

THE CHAIRMAN.- The term "multi-storey" is a little vague. Does it mean eight storeys or fifty storeys?

MR. URE.- We should have to be reasonable.

THE CHAIRMAN.- You would not favour the New York skyscraper?

MR. URE.- No. There would be no reason for it, and it would complicate road access and population. All those items would have to be considered before you say "This is a good spot for a multi-storey, because it ~~is~~ ^{must be} very efficient. *from a good many angles*"

THE CHAIRMAN.- Would you say that at the present stage eight storeys is about the limit?

MR. URE.- Sydney may be an example that is worth considering. It has developed very extensively over the last 20 years.
E 5.

SENATE CANBERRA COMMITTEE

THE CHAIRMAN.- Up to twelve storeys.

MR. URE.- They went up to 150 feet, but they have now brought it back.

THE CHAIRMAN.- There are twelve-storey buildings.

MR. URE.- Within the 150 feet regulation, which was enforced prior to its being reduced now to about 120 feet, you could get thirteen storeys. Melbourne was a little less than that. I think about 100 feet was about the height limit in Melbourne.

THE CHAIRMAN.- The highest building in Melbourne is the insurance building in Collins Street.

MR. URE.- The M.L.C. building at the corner of Elizabeth Street and Collins Street would go up to the limit height.

THE CHAIRMAN.- Do you consider it a good building in appearance?

MR. URE.- I rather like the appearance, and I think it is rather efficient in its lighting and its present form.

SENATOR WOOD.- I understand that you have designed some of these eight-storey flat units?

MR. URE.- Yes.

SENATOR WOOD.- How many families do you propose to house in them?

MR. URE.- There are actually three blocks in the multi-storeys, in rather a zig-zag form. The three ~~of them~~ ^{blocks} will contain 212 flat units.

SENATOR WOOD.- What do you propose in these multiple flats? Do you propose to set them in the centre of a park?

MR. URE.- Yes,

SENATOR WOOD.- With what area of ground would you surround them?

MR. URE.- I can quote those figures. The total net open space is 65.3 per cent of the development. Of the area available, we shall leave 65.3 per cent open space for parklands and tree planting.

SENATOR WOOD.- In other words, the buildings will occupy

about 35 per cent of the available area?

MR. URE.- Yes.

SENATOR WOOD.- That is the modern trend overseas?

MR. URE.- It is.

SENATOR WOOD.- From the point of view of :
playgrounds for children it is probably more effective than are
individual back yards?

SENATE CANBERRA COMMITTEE

MR. URE.- Australia seems to favour the small house probably more than other countries in housing development but the proportion of these multi-storey buildings, we feel, should be kept fairly low. We still feel that the family requires a house and a garden, and that the flat dwellings are not suitable for all people with children. But we feel that there is a proportion of the people who prefer to have flats rather than houses. We are producing two schemes at this stage, but no others are envisaged.

SENATOR WOOD.- It provides a much better economic utilisation of the land?

MR. URE.- Yes.

SENATOR WOOD.- And it has been definitely been decided to go ahead with the project?

MR. URE.- It has been approved by all concerned.

SENATOR RYAN.- Does the Department of Works design and construct the roads here?

MR. URE.- Yes.

SENATOR RYAN.- Did the department design Adelaide Avenue?

MR. URE.- If I may define the word "design", the actual selection is not done by us. That has been set down by, say, the Griffin plan. ^{But} ~~So~~, on an ^{approved} alignment, the Department designed a pavement....

SENATOR RYAN.- Do you know that Adelaide Avenue is not in conformity with the Griffin plan?

MR. URE.- I do not know. I do not know whether our department would have been responsible for that, because we often receive variations to the Griffin plan without any reference to our department as to whether it is a good thing or a bad thing.

SENATOR RYAN.- You admit that it is a major highway?

MR. URE.- Yes.

SENATOR RYAN.- And is not capable of coping in its present condition with existing traffic, much less traffic in the future?

MR. URE.- A lot of the road systems are not fully developed. They are designed as two-lane roads, but only one lane has been ^{built} ~~made~~ at the present time. For example, Limestone Avenue

from the Ainslie Rex Hotel ceases to be a two-lane roadway and becomes a one-lane roadway, as you are aware. The intention is that the two-lane roadway shall go right through ^{to the Memorial} ~~past the Memorial~~.

THE CHAIRMAN.- I wish to ask you some questions largely because they have been asked of other witnesses and we should like to have your opinion. What is your opinion of the new administrative block?

MR. URE.- I think it has had a rather unfortunate birth and execution. The plan was dictated by a winning design in an open competition about 20 or 30 years ago. Foundations were put in which dictated the actual profile of the building, and subsequent redesigns - I think by architects from our department - ~~had to be~~ ^{have} ~~were~~ made in the light of maintaining ~~the~~ ^{these} footings ~~of the~~ profile. Also the aesthetic content of the building was maintained without any reference, I feel, to the functional efficiency of the building, and the result is that I do not think that it is an efficient office because visually it is a monumental type of building. You may notice that the corners are very strong and solid. There is a lot of solid work. Where you see solid work it means that there is shadow behind. The electric light must be used. More windows mean more light and more light means a modular external facade and offices of varying dimensions.

THE CHAIRMAN.- Would it be better if each department were in its own building? A number of departments will be housed in the administrative block.

MR. URE.- I feel as far as inter-relation of public service sections is concerned that the fact of being in the same building may be conducive to short circuiting laboratories ^{administration procedures}.

THE CHAIRMAN.- It is good rather than bad.

MR. URE.- I think it would be good.

THE CHAIRMAN.- That brings me to the question of the other building, which was designed to have a building opposite it and from the point of view of town planning it was thought to be necessary for balance. Do you agree with that?

MR. URE.- It may be necessary to maintain the balance on

SENATE CANBERRA COMMITTEE

this fairly strong axis, which is probably the strongest axis in Canberra - the Memorial, Ainslie, Parliament House and Capital Hill. I should think a symmetrical balance would be maintained.

THE CHAIRMAN.- Is it possible to have a building of the same mass which was functionally much better?

MR. URE.- Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN.- One witness has said that there is too much sameness in the designs for government owned houses. Do you think that criticism is true?

MR. URE.- It is very difficult to produce a lot of houses from a repetitive design and not to have the similar, particularly when the designs have been ^{developed} proved to a fairly economic planned shape. The most economical plan shape is rectangular. You have probably noticed that most of the building in Canberra of the latest period is rectangular. It has the least amount of external wall and, by comparison with some houses ^{separately built} the average critic might prefer, you will notice that they ^{do not} have terraces, ^{or} an attached garage, pergolas ^{and} little nick-knacks which make them look more attractive. All those ^{additional items} nick-knacks mean more money and with our present difficulties of finance, we just cannot afford to put on those ^{luxury} little items which, in effect, will make houses look different but will increase the cost.

THE CHAIRMAN.- Another criticism is that there are not enough sites for private buildings. Is that so?

MR. URE.- I think that is true. I speak as a private citizen who has been through this laborious procedure of getting a site. I was rather naive when I first came here. I thought you could just go to the Interior and say, "I suppose you have some sites, and you know I am a fairly responsible person and I want a good site." However, no sites were available at that time, but some sites were to become available in the near future. The "near future" was within four months or five months. In essence, I was prepared, if I could get a site, to get started on my working drawings and I felt that at the end of five months I would have been well on with the job. I had to wait for five months. Then, the procedure is that a certain limited number of sites are put on the market. I think

SENATE CANTERRA COMMITTEE

I was interested in about seven sites in an area to which I wanted to go and which were of the size I wanted to obtain. I understand that eighty people were interested in those choice sites. In other words, eighty people were prepared to ~~pay for the sites.~~ *build their own homes*

CANBERRA SENATE COMMITTEE.

MR. URE (continuing).- But they probably were not prepared to bid for some of the less favourable sites.

THE CHAIRMAN.- Would you say that the prices are high?

MR. URE.- They are ridiculously high. The issuing of sites in dribs and drabs has created a demand which should not exist for those choice sites. I understand that some of the blocks have brought as much as £2,500 above the figure considered by the Department of the Interior to be reasonable.

THE CHAIRMAN.- And that is only for a lease?

MR. URE.- Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN.- Is the money paid in a lump sum?

MR. URE.- The arrangement is this: The Department of the Interior puts a value on each block. In some of the better areas a block may be considered to be worth £7,000. This is the figure on which the land rent of 5% is based. In addition, the occupier has to pay rates. When the Department has placed its value on a block, one of two systems is followed. There is a bid system under which a prospective lessee offers what he considers the block to be worth in his estimation. Obviously, if there are lots of blocks valued at £750 available he will offer £750. But if there is only ^{one} good block and he is very keen to get it he may decide that it is worth £2,750. That means that if his bid is successful, he has to pay the Department of the Interior £2,000 in cash, the balance between the Department's valuation and his own bid.

SENATOR WOOD.- That is a premium?

MR. URE.- Yes.

SENATOR HANNAFORD.- Then he pays 5% on £750?

MR. URE.- Yes.

SENATOR BENN.- It is a form of racketeering.

MR. URE.- My own case indicated that there were 80 customers ready to build houses if they could get good sites. If land had been available for them, there probably would have been 80 families ~~fewer~~ awaiting Government houses because failure to get a good site to build privately usually means that a person will live in a Government house.

CANBERRA SENATE COMMITTEE.

SENATOR WOOD.- The Department is causing these high prices by not releasing enough land at one time?

MR. URE.- Yes. This forcing up of values means that people who previously obtained blocks of land but have not built on them, in effect, obtained their blocks for nothing whereas people now purchasing blocks have to pay a premium of £1,500 or £2,000 for them.

THE CHAIRMAN.- Can the Department of the Interior withdraw blocks that are not being used?

MR. URE.- Yes. The Department is now following a policy of telling people that if they do not build their blocks will be withdrawn.

THE CHAIRMAN.- The whole purpose of the leasehold system was to prevent speculation in leasehold land. You say that the root evil is that not enough blocks are released at the one time?

MR. URE.- Yes, and not having a store of blocks. If we want to build up the housing content of Canberra, people who will do it for us should be assisted. There is plenty of land in Canberra. Why not give people blocks of land so long as they are prepared to put their money into the building of houses here?

THE CHAIRMAN.- Thank you for your evidence, Mr. Ure.

THE WITNESS WITHDREW.

the Bulletin

MANAGEMENT, ADMINISTRATION AND OPERAT.

of the

TRANSPORT SECTION, DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,

AUSTRALIAN CAPITAL TERRITORY

by

W. HAPMAN, M.C.E., D.Eng., M.I.C.E., M.I.E.Aust., M.Inst.T.

L.A. SCHUMER, F.I.C.A., F.C.A.A., F.C.I.S., M.Inst.T.

COPY.

The Hon. W.S. Kent Hughes, M.V.O., O.B.E., M.C., E.D., M.P.,
Minister for the Interior.

Sir,

We beg to submit for your consideration the attached
Report on the Management, Administration and Operation of the
Transport Section of the Department of the Interior, Australian
Capital Territory.

We have the honour to be, Sir,

Your obedient servants,

(SGD). W.D. CHAPMAN.

(SGD). L.A. SCHUMER.

14/ 1/53

A.C.T. ADVISORY COUNCIL, 15th September, 1952.RESOLUTION:

THAT this Council recommends to the Minister that, in view of past losses and the many problems associated with the Canberra Omnibus Service in meeting the spread of Canberra Development, the services of a transport authority be secured to report on the service with a view to making recommendations for its future operation, to the satisfaction of the Government and the people.

TERMS OF REFERENCE.

To enquire into and report upon the management, administration and operation of the A.C.T. Transport, including goods and passenger transport as well as omnibuses and in particular with respect to the following matters :-

- (a) Service as to present and future traffic, routes, passenger convenience, availability and frequency.
- (b) Roads as to capacity, and sufficiency, including short cut routes.
- (c) Vehicles as to number, capacity, condition, and suitability, including "one-man" and small buses for light loading.
- (d) Operation as to control, driving and efficiency, manning and morale.
- (e) Maintenance as to depots, servicing, capacity, adequacy and efficiency of workshops.
- (f) Capital and operating costs, including vehicle mileage, passenger mile and ton mile costs.
- (g) Fares and hire rates.
- (h) Stores and supplies.
- (i) Safety.
- (j) Current special matters -
 - (i) Effect of recent awards prohibiting shift work on cost of operating and to users.
 - (ii) Losses on week-end buses.
 - (iii) Railway buses and luggage.

C O N T E N T S .

- I. GENERAL CONSIDERATIONS.
1. Activities.
 2. Extent of the organization.
 - (a) Vehicles.
 - (b) Capital investment.
 - (c) Profit and loss from operations.
 - (d) The transport task.
 - (e) Personnel.
- II. OMNIBUS SERVICES.
- (a) Service. (Note.- Sub-paras. as per Terms of Reference.)
 - (b) Roads.
 - (c) Vehicles.
 - (d) Operation.
 - (f) Capital and operating costs.
 - (g) Fares.
 - (j)
 - (ii) Week-end buses.
 - (iii) Railway passengers' luggage.
- III. MINISTERIAL AND GENERAL PASSENGER CAR POOL.
- IV. SPECIAL DUTY VEHICLES.
- V. GOODS SERVICES.
- VI. COMMON SERVICES.
- (d) Operation. (Note.- Sub-paras. as per Terms of Reference.)
 - (e) Maintenance.
 - (h) Stores and Supplies.
 - (i) Safety.
 - (j) (i) Effect of recent awards on cost of operation and to users.
- VII. SPECIAL FUNCTIONS OF THE TRANSPORT SECTION.
- VIII. RECOMMENDATIONS.
- IX. ACKNOWLEDGMENTS.

I. GENERAL CONSIDERATIONS.1. Activities.

The activities of the Transport Section cover the following :-

- (a) Scheduled and special omnibus services.
- (b) "Ministerial" and general passenger car pool.
- (c) Special duty vehicles.
- (d) Goods services.
- (e) Services common to the foregoing, viz. depots, service stations, workshops and stores.
- (f) Special functions.

2. Extent of the organization.

- (a) Vehicles. The total number of vehicles at October, 1952, was 550, made up as follows :-

<u>Omnibuses.</u>			
A.E.G. 39-passenger	65		
Bedford 31-passenger	2		
Panel vans, school	8		75
<u>Cars.</u>			
Under 10 h.p.	20		
11-20 h.p.	33		
Over 20 h.p.	108		161
<u>Utilities.</u>			
Under 10 h.p.	78		
11-20 h.p.	60		138
<u>Panel vans</u>			16
<u>Motor cycles</u>			6
<u>Goods vehicles.</u>			
1/3 ton	37		
4 ton	11		
5 ton	57		
7 c.yd.	14		
Semi-trailers and Monarchs	14		
Timber jinkers	3		
Water carts	4		
Pole raisers	3		
Truck buses	2		
5 c.yd. tippers	5		
Breakdown vehicles	1		
Pantechnicon	1		
Miscellaneous	2		154
TOTAL			550

In addition to the 550 vehicles in the Transport Section, 44 vehicles from other Departments are regularly serviced and maintained by the Transport Section.

248 other local vehicles and 83 interstate vehicles were repaired between 11/ 8/51 and 8/10/52.

- (b) Capital investment. At 30/ 6/52 the tangible assets employed in the undertaking were valued for Balance Sheet purposes as under :-

	£.	s.	d.
Land	5,730.	11.	11
Buildings	78,918.	1.	10
Vehicles	453,113.	13.	9
Other plant and furniture	7,183.	19.	5
Stores	46,808.	11.	1
Clothing	6,000.	0.	0
Work in progress	3,756.	2.	8
TOTAL	£611,511.	0.	8

(c) Profit and loss from operations. From 1/ 5/30 to 30/ 6/52 the financial results of operations were shown as under :-

	From 1/ 5/30 to 30/ 6/51.	1951-52.	Total.
	£	£	£
City buses	Loss 246,287	Loss 62,617	Loss 308,904
Other transport	Profit 83,059	Profit 9,168	Profit 92,227
All operations	Loss £163,228	Loss £53,449	Loss £216,677

The total cost of operations in 1951-52 was £456,718.

In viewing the financial results, consideration must be given to the following matters :-

- (i) The undertaking is not charged with interest on funds employed nor required to make any contribution to sinking fund for the redemption of capital.
- (ii) As an activity of the Commonwealth the undertaking is free from taxes and duties of any kind and therefore in a favourable position as compared with similar transport undertakings operated by States or private enterprise. The advantage over a privately owned undertaking could be up to 20% of the operating costs.
- (iii) The city bus section of the undertaking is the only activity assuming the character of a business depending upon the recovery of costs from independent customers whose ability to pay charges may be limited. The other activities consist of transport services rendered to other Departments of the Government, and the charges are inter-departmental distributions of cost according to a scale of charges intended to represent cost. Profit or loss in these latter activities has little significance because the undertaking is not required to compete for the work and the surpluses or deficits arise from the practical inability to assess costs exactly in advance.

(d) The transport task. During the year 1951-52 with 530 vehicles on strength, the following vehicle mileage was accomplished :-

<u>Service.</u>	<u>No. of vehicles.</u>	<u>Mileage.</u>	<u>Aver. miles per vehicle.</u>	<u>Passengers.</u>
Omnibus -				
Panel vans	8	112,977	14,100)	4,218,094
AEC and Bedfords	68	872,211	12,900)	
Cars	63	798,345	12,500	
Special duty	280	2,089,770	7,500	
Goods	111	1,074,587	9,700	

(e) Personnel. The personnel engaged in the year 1951-52 was as follows :-

Supervisory and office staff	..	10
Workshops staff	..	79
Omnibus service and car service	..	164
Goods service	..	88
		<u>341</u>
Accountancy (Dept. of Interior)		<u>19</u>
TOTAL		<u>360</u>

II. OMNIBUS SERVICES.

(a) Services as to present and future routes, passenger convenience, availability and frequency.

(1) Present routes. Routes number 8 on the South side and 5 on the North side, and many runs are combined to between 30 and 40 overall routes (see map). Some routes are devious in order to serve a greater number of passengers. Over certain sections as many as five routes are combined.

Consideration has been given from time to time to changing requirements and to extensions to new areas as housing proceeds. *

* Memorandum from Mr. C.E.F. Roach, Transport Officer to Assistant Secretary, Canberra Services Branch, 14/3/51.

Adjustment of routes was made in March, 1951, and revised timetables in October, 1951, and in March, 1952.

The objective has been to provide services based on routes and pick-up points with an access distance of half a mile. Steps are in hand to provide shelter sheds for the new pick-up points.

Referring again to devious routes, the outstanding examples are :-

Turner - Reid combined route (ATR-BTR).

These routes operate only occasionally on off-peak periods, viz. 5 buses per week day, 1 on Saturdays and 20 on Sundays, mainly for church-goers.

This devious route is to economise in bus running but should be examined in the light of smaller one-man buses.

Narrabundah - Kingston - Manuka.

Routes Nos. 3, 4, 5 and 8.

Nos. 3, 4 and 5 routes .. 4.9 miles 33 buses on week days.
No. 8 route .. 2.65 miles 18 buses on week days.

The deviation of 3, 4 and 5 routes is to serve Railway-Causeway and Kingston interests. The extra mileage per year is 19,240 bus miles for week day traffic at a cost of £3,300, but brings little extra bus revenue and wastes passenger time for through passengers.

No. 8 route was instituted in October, 1951, and is being availed of. Consideration should be given to some increase in No. 8 buses and a reduction in Routes 3, 4 and 5. No. 6 route is also available to and from Northward and Kingston.

Other routes.

There are a few other minor deviations which might be considered, but without close knowledge of local requirements no recommendations could be made at this stage.

One such minor deviation will be made in Routes 3, 4, 5 and 8 between Narrabundah and Griffith when Koctara Crescent now under construction is completed.

(ii) Future developments. Future traffic requirements will not require an increase in route mileage or bus mileage in proportion to the increase in population. The present route mileage is about 27 miles of which less than 80% is through residential areas.

Any increase will only be occasioned by such new residential areas as are opened up outside a radius of half a mile from existing routes, possibly a few miles all told. The relative cost trend should be downwards excluding normal cost-index increases, as the average number of passengers would increase per mile of route.

This is without allowance for possible further increase in the use of private motor cars. The number of cars per head of population in Canberra is now one for 6.3 persons which is considerably higher than the average for Australia, viz. one per 8.6.

(iii) Passenger convenience, availability and frequency.
Peak loading. There are in general, as common in most similar services, periods of peak loading, but these are more defined than elsewhere and are as follows :-

Morning peak.- 7 a.m. to 9.30 a.m.
 7 a.m. to 7.30 a.m. .. workmen.
 7.30 a.m. to 8.20 a.m. .. office staff.
 8.30 a.m. to 9.30 a.m. .. schools.

Midday peak.-
 12.35 p.m. to 1.25 p.m. .. office staff.

Afternoon peak.- Max. 4 p.m. (35 buses).
 3 p.m. .. kindergartens.
 3.30 p.m. .. schools.
 4.12 p.m. .. workmen.
 4.51 p.m. .. office staff.

Night peak.-
 7 p.m. to 7.45 p.m. .. Pictures, etc.
 11 p.m. (variable).

Picture shows are asked by the Transport Section as to closing time and bus movements are advanced or retarded accordingly.

As well as peak load variation there are daily variations in other off peak traffic due to Public Service pay days, wet weather, special functions and special visits such as Y.A.L. Boys.

There is a summer peak for special buses for sports, swimming, etc., approximating nine buses per week; special Dance buses average three per week.

Frequency. The frequency of service is difficult to define by reason of the complexity of the routing. For example on certain parts of the system traversed by as many as five routes, at times the frequency may be minutes or even three or four buses simultaneously. As these routes diverge, the frequency drops accordingly.

Both peak and off peak traffic have been very closely watched by the Transport staff and there have been minor changes from time to time, buses being added if required or deleted if not used.

The average passenger per bus carried from point to point varies greatly but the average maximum from hour to hour is not so variable and is as follows :-

6.30 a.m.	-	7.30 a.m.	..	30
7.30 a.m.	-	8.30 a.m.	..	37
8.30 a.m.	-	9.30 a.m.	..	61
9.30 a.m.	-	12.30 p.m.	..	30
12.30 p.m.	-	1.30 p.m.	..	35
1.30 p.m.	-	3.30 p.m.	..	33
3.30 p.m.	-	4.30 p.m.	..	57
4.30 p.m.	-	5.30 p.m.	..	41
5.30 p.m.	-	7.00 p.m.	..	31
7.00 p.m.	-	8.00 p.m.	..	30
8.00 p.m.	-	11.00 p.m.	..	21
11.00 p.m.	-	11.45 p.m.	..	30.

Thus the spacing is reasonable over the major part of the routes but some buses should be cut out on the outlying ends of the routes particularly on Routes 2 and 3 after 3 p.m.

Even these changes, however, promise a saving of from £200 to £300 per annum only but should be considered.

Mileage on regular and special traffic. The mileage is mainly on regular runs, the proportion being as follows :-

Regular services	..	<u>Bus miles.</u>
Special and educational services	..	736,211
		<u>136,000</u>
Total		<u>872,211</u>

The reimbursement for the latter is on a cost basis; thus the loss of £62,617 for 1951-52 represents about 20.4 pence per bus mile.

(b) Roads. The liaison between the Transport Section and the Department of Works has been effective in ensuring that the roads on bus routes are bitumen surfaced. Bus routes have not been extended until the sealing work is completed. The question of certain short cuts being possible was raised but all indirect routing has been for the purpose of picking up traffic rather than lack of roads.

Owing to the high standard of both main and subdivisional roads there is little evidence as yet as to extra cost of maintenance due to bus operation except failure of edges and guttering at bus stops. There has been extra expenditure in construction of certain turn-offs at main stopping places.

Some portion of the cost of road construction and maintenance from other Government funds is apportionable to the bus services but no such charge has been made to bus operation.

(c) Vehicles. Since 1942 the number of buses has increased but utilization, measured in terms of average miles run per bus per year, has fallen as shown in the following table :-

	<u>Total miles.</u>	<u>No. of buses.</u>	<u>Miles per bus.</u>
1942-43	657,412	25	26,296
1943-44	642,630	25	25,705
1944-45	694,513	29	23,949
1945-46	702,061	29	24,209
1946-47	723,500	35	20,671
1947-48	719,549	40	17,989
1948-49	760,256	54	14,079
1949-50	899,006	54	16,648
1950-51	948,500	66	14,371
1951-52	872,211	66	13,215

This reduction in utilization has not been noticeable in the operating costs because the undertaking is not charged with interest on funds employed and charges for depreciation are made on a mileage basis.

The reasons given for the increase in the number of buses were -

increase in ordinary and special traffic;
 expected increase in traffic during projected
 Royal Visit in 1951-52; and
 an endeavour to implement a policy of "one man
 one bus" to some extent.

By comparison, M. and M.T.B. buses in Melbourne average 23,000 miles per year and the past performances in Canberra indicate that the present utilization is not satisfactory. Density and distribution of population peculiar to Canberra may not permit metropolitan averages being reached, but a minimum of 17,000 to 20,000 miles per year should be aimed at, and this would be accomplished by reducing the number of buses in use. A satisfactory number would be 47, made up as follows :-

Maximum normal demand ..	35
Out of use during repair	6
Special running	<u>6</u>

47

Of the 18 surplus vehicles, 6 could be held to meet normal replacements within the next two years and 12 disposed of. The present book value of 12 surplus buses is \$19,533, and the disposal value in the region of \$24,000. Disposal of these units would release funds for other purposes, effect some saving in routine maintenance and relieve the present congestion in storage space.

The question of smaller buses should be examined in conjunction with one man operation, some of the larger buses being put on one man operation in the meantime. Consideration should be given also to conductors being provided for the heavily loaded part of the run, the conductor going to a certain point and then returning on another bus.

The use of smaller buses may not reduce further the number of larger buses which may be still required for peak loading.

It may seem to be a retrograde step to depart from standardization on a good type of bus and to discard provision for future increase of traffic. The 39-seater buses, however, are large for one man operation if running to capacity. There are possibilities in the smaller buses of at least maintaining, if not improving, the frequency at off peak hours at lower cost and without loss in running time.

Future developments giving initially a sparse traffic could be given a low cost service at an earlier stage if one man buses were employed.

The question of "feeder" services has been raised in two aspects - outlying services feeding the main services and North and South services feeding Civic Centre and Manuka with the elimination of some of the "through" buses. This should be considered in due course, although at the moment it cannot be seen whether any advantage would be gained. Outlying special buses entail "dead" running back to depot and the North and South traffic is reasonably heavy.

If 10 smaller buses could be applied to say 170,000 bus miles of the total 736,211 scheduled services, running say 17,000 miles a year per bus on intermittent week days and

full week end running, and with one man operation, the estimated saving is as under :-

	£
Saving in cost of running 170,000 miles at 1/-	.. 8,500
Saving with one man operation 170,000 miles at 1ld. 7,800
Total	<u>£15,300</u>

This would necessitate a capital expenditure of say £30,000 to save £8,500 per annum after allowing for the annual charges on the investment which are included in the above estimate.

In the meantime, as already stated, the saving of the £7,800 can be made by one man operation of the larger buses, even if small buses are not provided.

(d) Operation. Some special matters of operation have been covered in the sections above. In general, however, the operation is satisfactory as to control, rostering, manning, driving, and conductor's work.

There is a difficulty in providing for the effects of the award in abolishing broken shifts. This has been met in part. The total time occupied in bus running is 79%, and of the remainder, 8½% is occupied by cleaning.

The 12½% unoccupied time is not always at the depot but may be at outlying points. A further 2% is utilized for the car pool. The remainder of the cost of stand-by time is included in the bus operating costs. The utilization of a further proportion of this stand-by time is discussed under Section IV, Special duty vehicles.

(f) Capital and operating costs. In addition to the losses shown on city buses of £62,617 there were other Government costs as follows :-

Losses on operation	£
Capital charges -	62,617
Interest on written down value of :-	
(i) buses	6,699
(ii) buildings and equipment	1,548
Road costs, at least	<u>3,000</u>
Total	<u>£73,864</u>

(g) Fares. The magnitude and persistence of the losses on the bus services has necessitated some consideration of the level of fares, and the ability of the users of the services to contribute more revenue. Whilst there are opportunities for reduction in operating costs, particularly by the more effective utilization of vehicles and labour, the present gap between costs and revenues is so wide as to force a conclusion that a chronic state of unprofitability is certain. To a substantial extent the operating costs are effected by the deliberate dispersal of population in accordance with long range plans for the development of the city, and growth of population will not help unless the density is increased.

It is felt that some further "ability to pay" exists in the users of the bus services, and some adjustment of fares could be made as under :-

- (i) The minimum fare (sixpence) should remain as at present, but the differentials for additional sections should be twopence instead of one penny, as the longer journeys are those which are under-priced at present.

(ii) Overlapping sections should be abolished.

The gap between revenue and operating costs may be met by subsidy, but in our opinion the present method is not satisfactory. The morale of the management of an undertaking which is faced with large and recurring losses is always undermined, and the basis upon which any subsidy is granted should give the management a reasonable opportunity to "break even" by operating the services at a reasonable standard of efficiency. Several bases for the subsidy have been considered and are as under :-

- (i) A fixed percentage of the operating costs. (This has the disadvantage that it may subsidize inefficiency.)
- (ii) A fixed amount per bus mile. (This may appear to encourage extravagant running of vehicles but is less objectionable than (i).)
- (iii) A fixed percentage of the revenue. (This has the advantage of providing an incentive to increase the traffic.)
- (iv) A fixed amount per passenger. (If the basis of this subsidy were known to the public, the extent to which the Government is subsidizing the users of the services would be more readily understood by them.)

None of the foregoing methods is completely satisfactory, but our preference is either for (iii) or (iv).

(h) 1. Losses on week-end buses. The estimated loss on week-end buses in 1951-52 is as follows :-

<u>Saturdays, 1745 miles.</u>		£
Expenditure	..	19,285
Revenue	..	<u>9,048</u>
	<u>Loss</u>	<u>10,234</u>
 <u>Sundays, 1240 miles.</u>		
Expenditure	..	14,508
Revenue	..	<u>4,160</u>
	<u>Loss</u>	<u>10,348</u>

TOTAL LOSS £20,582.

2. Railway passengers' luggage. There are 4 to 5 trains per day to be met.

Trains were met by buses, and a departmental truck, the charge for the latter being 1/- per article.

This service was not used to any great extent and passengers still took their luggage on the bus.

The truck service was abolished owing to the excessive loss, but at the same time a size limit was paid on bus luggage, viz. 18" x 14" x 5".

It is now recommended that this restriction on size of luggage be waived for a trial period, but the luggage truck be not re-introduced.

It should be remembered that the only competitors to the bus service are private cars and taxis for which the only luggage restriction is capacity.

III. MINISTERIAL AND GENERAL PASSENGER CAR POOL.

The total number of cars is as follows :-

"Buick" and "Chevrolet" ..	38
"Holden" ..	<u>27</u>
Total	<u>65</u>

The average annual mileage per car is 12,500 which is low and compares with 40,000 miles for the average private hire car service in a metropolitan area.

The hour to hour demand fluctuates considerably and sample days are as under :-

<u>Time.</u>	<u>No. of cars in use.</u>	
	Heavy day - Parliament in session. Special function, 5 buses also used.	Normal day - Parliament not in session.
a.m.		
3-4	2	-
4-5	2	-
5-6	2	-
6-7	2	2
7-8	7	2
8-9	25	17
9-10	36	24
10-11	35	16
11-noon	33	16
p.m.		
Noon-1	32	20
1-2	18	20
2-3	19	22
3-4	23	16
4-5	28	23
5-6	33	18
6-7	18	13
7-8	17	19
8-9	7	18
9-10	18	25
10-11	21	20
11-midnight	31	19
12-1	10	4
1-2	8	-
2-3	3	-
Minimum	2	-
Average	28	11
Maximum	36	25

The wide fluctuation in demand involves low utilization of cars and one-third waiting time for stand-by drivers and is the largest single factor contributing to the high cost of the car pool service.

The use of pool cars preferably during slack periods has already been raised by Transport Section on 17/ 6/52 and all Departments were circulated on 3/ 9/52 (51/296) by Mr. H.R. Waterman, Assistant Secretary, A.C.T. Services, Department of the Interior.

This matter should be followed up also in connection with the use of pool cars during slack periods instead of special duty vehicles.

The number of cars in the past has been inadequate to meet demands which arise on special occasions, such as

State funerals, receptions, special conferences, etc., which average 10 to 20 per year. The Transport Section follows up these matters and is sometimes, as in the case of the Prime Minister's Department, called in to the planning discussions and this co-operation should be extended.

The peak demands have been met by relay working of cars and latterly by buses.

The only other expedients which would seem to be possible would be the calling up of special duty vehicles and the hire of private cars.

As soon as the effectiveness of these measures can be determined, consideration should be given to the reduction of the number of cars in the pool.

Another matter which should be considered is radio-telephone control.

At present the telephone service is used where available, but its use is limited to certain locations.

Police and Forestry vehicles are fitted with radio-telephone control, but Transport Section vehicles are not so fitted.

It is recommended that say 16 cars of the pool with regular drivers should be so fitted, with a control instrument in the car control office.

IV. SPECIAL DUTY VEHICLES.

There are 288 vehicles in this section, viz.-

Cars - under 10 h.p.	20	
11-20 h.p.	33	
over 20 h.p.	<u>43</u>	96
Motor cycles ..		6
Panel vans ..		16
Utilities - under 10 h.p.	78	
11-20 h.p.	<u>60</u>	138
Trucks - 1/3 ton ..	29	
4 ton ..	<u>3</u>	<u>32</u>
	Total	<u>288</u>

The special duty vehicles are allotted as follows :-

Department of Works ..	122
Department of Interior ..	121
Other Departments ..	34
Replacement vehicles ..	14
For disposal ..	<u>7</u>
	<u>288</u>

The average annual mileage is 7,500. 180 of these vehicles average less than 200 miles per week or say 10,000 miles per year.

It is clear that economy in running has been exercised but on the other hand there has been an increase in the number of vehicles. The capital invested on present book value is £115,636.

Representations have been made by the Transport Section from time to time as to the use of pool cars rather than exclusive cars but without much result. It is recommended that the Department be asked again to examine the question of the use of these vehicles having of course due regard to user efficiency.

Vehicles required for standby for immediate call up such as Electrical maintenance, Water supply and sewerage, Roads and bridges, Bush fire-fighting, need not be considered irrespective of mileage run.

For ordinary work 250-300 miles per week may be considered a fair usage, but where the mileage is less an examination should be made. Where there are a number of vehicles in the same Department a section or a small local pool may be possible. This is current practice to a small extent only. Alternatively, the use of pool cars should be considered: within the off peak periods with a driver, or at any time on the "hire-a-car and drive yourself" principle. The one-driver-one-car principle need not be considered as of paramount importance. Change of drivers has an advantage in that drivers can and will report defects on turning in the car.

Charges for special duty vehicles are made on the basis of estimated cost and the loss of £7,822 in 1951-52 represents merely the difference between estimated and actual costs. The "customers" have no optional source of service and it is important therefore that costs be kept at a minimum.

The Transport Section can do its part in keeping down the costs of maintenance and service of vehicles, but the greater responsibility lies on the Departments employing the vehicles because maximum utilization rests solely with them.

V. GOODS SERVICES.

There are 122 vehicles in the Goods Section as follows :-

<u>Type.</u>	<u>No. of vehicles.</u>	<u>Average annual mileage per vehicle.</u>
1/3 ton	8	8,800
4 ton	8	6,200
5 ton	57	10,300
7 c.yd.	14	9,100
Semi-trailers and Monarchs	14	8,700
Timber jinkers	3	11,900
Water carts	4	5,800
Pole raisers	3	6,300
Truck buses	2	6,500
5 c.yd. tippers	5	1,200
Breakdown vehicles	1	-
Pantehnicon	1	19,799
Miscellaneous	2	-
Total	122	9,700

On the whole utilization measured in this way is reasonable, the exception being the 5 c.yd. tippers.

In addition to the services rendered by its own vehicles, the Transport Section employs private contractors to meet all demands made upon it. In 1951-52 the outside contractors charges amounted to £51,387, whereas the cost of providing goods services with vehicles operated by the Section amounted to £32,395.

The Section makes charges on a basis intended to represent cost of operation and therefore profit or loss is not significant. The charges for outside hirings are recovered from the Departments concerned on the basis of the actual amount paid to the contractor, plus 7% to cover supervision and accounting by the Transport Section.

The following further comments are made :-

- (a) Rates charged by the Section are less than those charged by outside contractors but this should be so in view of the freedom from interest or profit charges, taxes and charges for use of roads.

- (b) As many charges are made on a time basis or time plus mileage basis the cost per unit of work performed may be over-looked. Such bases of charging have advantages for the Transport Section as simple and flexible methods of billing services but are not measures of efficiency as would be rates based on units of work performed such as tons or packages. The effective use of vehicles may be the responsibility of the Departments hiring the vehicles and there ought to be a constant assessment of the value of the work performed by the vehicles.
- (c) Interstate or long distance haulage is on a small scale but all the implications of the Commonwealth competing with the State owned railways ought to be carefully considered before undertaking any such work.

VI. COMMON SERVICES.

The matters referred to include the general supervision of the passenger and goods services, the management of workshops and stores and safety measures.

(d) Operation. Supervisory staff numbered 10 in 1942, rose to 14 in 1945 and is now only 10. Meanwhile the number of vehicles and the mileage run has more than doubled.

The staff should be increased by filling the vacancy on the establishment for a Mechanical Engineer and the establishment should be re-examined as to adequacy on the traffic side.

It is understood that the Traffic Inspector on the Bus Section will retire shortly and steps should be taken for training a successor preparatory to taking over.

Owing to the lay-out of the areas to be served, changes in traffic and the dependence of the users to a great extent on the bus operations, the constant attention of a Traffic Inspector is required. He needs initiative, experience in traffic generally and a knowledge of the local situation including time-tabling, routing sections and rosters.

It should be appreciated that the Transport Section is a large specialized undertaking for the supervision of which a staff of 10 is inadequate.

(e) Maintenance. The maintenance standard is generally good but the work and the workshop staff has more than doubled since the last workshops extension. The accommodation has not increased and good housekeeping has been rendered difficult.

No. 1 Extension to workshops as already planned (D. of I. file 50/606) should be proceeded with.

Consideration of No. 2 Extension of the workshop and the Service Station should also be given. These would be an important factor in increase of efficiency and reduction in repair and maintenance costs. The extensions will also improve the Stores accommodation which is limited particularly as to tyres which are an important item in cost and efficiency.

(f) Stores and supplies. Stores and supplies are adequate, and efficiently handled, and no recommendations are made except as already mentioned, to improve storage space.

(g) Safety measures. Safe working receives very close attention from the staff.

The Transport Manager, Mr. Roach, is a member of the A.C.T. Road Safety Council. Accident repair costs for the year 1951-52 were only £3,318 of a total operation cost of £456,718, less than 1%, i.e. 0.7%.

The accident rate per mile cannot be compared with elsewhere as the statistics include very minor accidents as well as minor and major accidents normally reported.

A comparison has been made, however, of the various sectional operations and is as follows :-

	<u>Mileage.</u>	<u>No. of accidents.</u>	<u>No. of accidents per 100,000 miles.</u>
Bus	985,188	16	1.6
Special duty	2,085,770	42	2.0
Goods	1,074,587	12	1.1
Passenger	798,345	12	1.5

A check should be made by Transport Section and user Departments into ways and means of reducing the accidents on special duty vehicles.

(h) Effect of recent awards on cost of operation and to users. The effect of recent awards on the omnibus operating costs are as follows :-

	<u>Increase 1951-52.</u>
	<u>£</u>
<u>Basic Wage increase.</u>	
£2. 1. 0 - increase between 7/ 5/51 and 5/ 5/52 ..	18,000
<u>Additional penalty rates.</u>	
September, 1951 ..	<u>4,000</u>
Total	22,000
Increased costs of fuel, tyres, and maintenance, spares, etc.	<u>5,000</u>
TOTAL	<u>£27,000</u>

VII. SPECIAL FUNCTIONS OF THE TRANSPORT SECTION.

Certain special functions are carried out by Mr. C.E.F. Roach, Transport Manager, and staff, viz.-

- (a) Preliminary designs and submissions as to buildings, bus terminals, workshop lay-out and their equipment, jigs and fixtures.
- (b) Specifications and preliminary design for bus bodies, etc. Design and construction of special vehicle bodies such as panel vans, buses, truck buses, cable jinkers, heavy duty vehicles and tipping trucks.
- (c) Investigation and instalment of equipment for servicing of fuel pumps and injection equipment.
- (d) Member of Purchasing Board (Vehicles), Department of Treasury.
- (e) Purchase of vehicles for other Departments.
- (f) Oil recovery installation.

Some of these matters are allied to normal managerial functions but should receive consideration in the determination of staff requirements.

VIII. RECOMMENDATIONS.OMNIBUS SERVICES.

Service and routes. Consideration should be given to re-routing some portion of buses on Routes 3, 4 and 5 to Route 8.

Timetables. No specific changes in bus timetables are recommended at present but consideration should be given to an early review.

Route map. As a minor matter, but helpful to new users, the route map should show route nos. and should be included in the timetable.

Roads. No further special action is recommended.

Vehicles (buses). It is recommended that 12 large buses be disposed of. Consideration should be given to smaller buses in considering the question of one-man operation.

One-man buses. The use of one-man buses on other than school services should be introduced over a developmental period for periods of light loading, and extended as far as practicable.

Capital and operating costs. Instead of showing large deficits, the question of subsidy should be properly disclosed and stated.

Fares. Fares should be based on depreciation and operation costs less a Government contribution as based either on a fixed percentage of the revenue or a fixed amount per passenger.

Fares should be based on longer sections in steps of say 2d. instead of 1d. Overlapping sections should be abolished.

Railway buses and luggage. Present luggage restrictions should be abolished, at least for a trial period.

Ministerial and general car pool and special duty vehicles. The use of cars to avoid peak hours, i.e. between 9.30 a.m. and noon, and 1.30 p.m. where this can be done without affecting user efficiency should be followed up with all Departments.

Special duty vehicles should be pooled where practicable and the "hire a car and drive yourself principle" developed.

Radio-telephone control is recommended for say 16 cars in the pool.

The trend should be watched with a view to an early reduction of total number of cars and special duty vehicles.

Replacement of vehicles. While for depreciation charges the present basis of mileage need not be changed, before disposal every vehicle should be considered on its merits owing to the high standard of maintenance and the increasing cost of replacement.

Admittedly both replacement and repair costs have risen and are still rising, but the increases may not be of the same order. Furthermore, especially with special duty vehicles the arduousness of the service may vary greatly.

Operation and maintenance. Supervisory staff should be increased by filling the vacancy on the establishment for a Mechanical Engineer and later by more assistance, particularly on the traffic side.

No. 1 Extension to Workshop, as already planned, should be proceeded with (D. of I. file 50/606).

Consideration of No. 2 Extension of the Workshop and the Service Station should also be given. These would be an important factor in increase in efficiency and reduction in repair and maintenance costs.

Safety. A check should be made by Transport Section and user Departments as to ways and means of reducing the accident incident on special duty vehicles.

IX. ACKNOWLEDGMENTS.

It is desired to record that every officer of the Department of the Interior associated with the A.C.T. Transport Section who were concerned in these investigations extended courteous and co-operative assistance and that all demands for information were promptly satisfied.

(SGD). W.D. CHAPMAN.

(SGD). L.A. SCHUMER.

Chapman and Schauer Report on the Management,
Administration and operation of the Transport Section of
the Interior, Canberra.

Statement indicating the action
taken on the recommendations
affecting the omnibus services

OMNIBUS SERVICES.

Services and routes. Consideration should be given to re-routing some portion on Routes 3, 4 and 5 to Route 8.

(Adopted. Some buses have been re-routed to Route 8 and others will be added to Route as required).

Timetables. No specific changes in bus timetables are recommended at present but consideration should be given to an early review.

(The review of timetables is a continuous process).

Route map. As a minor matter, but helpful to new users, the route map should show route nos. and should be included in the timetable.

(Not adopted as the estimated cost was 6d. per timetable and this was considered to be out of proportion to the value of the map to users generally and the sale price of the timetable).

Vehicles (buses). It is recommended that 12 large buses be disposed of. Consideration should be given to smaller buses in considering the question of one-man operation.

(This recommendation was not adopted because it was considered in the light of experience, that it would be inadvisable to reduce the number of vehicles, particularly in view of the then proposed Royal Visit and the contemplated increase in the local population. - Experience proved that the whole of the bus fleet was necessary during the Royal Visit for public transport - Special functions of National importance, such as the Immigration Convention, make a heavy demand on the bus, and other transport services.

The buses now used are A.B.C. 7.7 litre vehicles with 17.6 wheel base. This type has proved the most efficient and economical of the six types used in the Transport Section during a period of 20 years. The capacity of the A.B.C. 7.7 litre is to carry 39, seated.

(On the basis of safety, economy, utility and efficiency it was considered that there would be no advantage in replacing the A.B.C. vehicles with smaller vehicles).

One-man buses. The use of one-man buses on other than school services should be introduced over a development period for periods of light loading, and extended as far as practicable.

(After very careful consideration this recommendation was not adopted. The main argument in favour of one-man buses is the saving of the conductor's wage. The main arguments against are:

- (a) The drivers of one-man buses would not have sufficient time to clean the buses themselves, and this would probably result in the employment of cleaners;
- (b) Accident risk to passengers is increased;
- (c) One-man buses frequently cannot keep to their timetable;
- (d) One-man buses frequently become over-loaded;
- (e) Mothers with young children cannot receive assistance with strollers and parcels, and with the latest type.

of one-man bus, strollers cannot be carried unless they are collapsible and can fit under a seat.

- (f) There is a greater risk of accident to the children if one-man buses are used on all the school services.
- (g) If one-man buses are not used to transport the school children there is difficulty in their economic operation unless shifts are resorted to.

Capital and operating costs. Instead of showing large deficits, the question of subsidy should be properly disclosed and stated.

(Not adopted - On page 10 of their report Messrs. Chapman and Schumer said "The present gap between costs and revenues is so wide as to force a conclusion that a chronic state of unprofitability is certain." The Government provided the funds to bridge the gap and it is very doubtful whether providing the funds under the term "subsidy" as against "loss" would have any material advantage in a Government undertaking).

Fares. Fares should be based on depreciation and operation costs less a Government contribution as based either on a fixed percentage of the revenue or a fixed amount per passenger.

Fares should be based on longer sections in steps of say 2d. instead of 1d. Overlapping sections should be abolished.

(This recommendation was adopted in part. Overlapping sections were abolished and the length of sections equalised, but not necessarily extended. This resulted in increased fares in certain cases:

Fares were increased from 1st October, 1949, and again from 1st January, 1951, as follows:-

1st November, 1949.

From 3d. for the first two sections plus 1d. for each additional section, to 3d. for the first section plus 1d. for each additional section, with a maximum fare of 8d.

1st January, 1951.

To 4d. for the first section plus 1d. for each additional section, with a maximum of 9d.

The latter increase did not produce the amount of additional revenue expected, the number of passengers during 1951-52 being less than that for the previous year. As from the 15th September, 1952, fares were increased to 6d. for the first section plus 1d. for each additional section. - At that time in Melbourne and other places the first section was 4d.

The report of Messrs. Chapman and Schumer was received in January, 1953, and taking all the circumstances into consideration a further increase in fares by raising the step per section from 1d. to 2d. was thought to be inadvisable at that stage. In 1952-53 there was a further decrease in the number

of passengers.)

Baggage Issues and Luggage. Present luggage restrictions should be abolished, at least for a trial period.

(Adopted).

Operation and Maintenance. Supervisory staff should be increased by filling the vacancy on the establishment for a Mechanical Engineer and later by more assistance, particularly on the traffic side.

No. 1 Extension to Workshop, as already planned, should be proceeded with (D. of I. file 50/606).

Consideration of No. 2 Extension of the Workshop and the Service Station should be given. These would be an important factor in increase in efficiency and reduction in repair and maintenance costs.

(The position of Mechanical Engineer has been filled and the question of assistance on the traffic side is under consideration. Plans for the extension of the Workshop and a lubrication are being prepared and provision for the construction of the buildings has been included in the 1954-55 Works' programme.)

CANBERRA SENATE COMMITTEE.

WILLIAM HENRY KNIGHT, Mechanical Engineer, Assistant Transport Manager, Department of the Interior, sworn and examined.

THE CHAIRMAN.- You wish to table a paper?

MR. KNIGHT.- Yes. It is a schedule indicating the recommendations of the Schumer-Chapman enquiry, together with the action that has been taken on each item.

THE CHAIRMAN.- What type of buses do you use in Canberra?

MR. KNIGHT.- The buses used in the city ~~in the~~ bus fleet are A.E.C. single decker buses fitted with 7.7 litre compression ignition engines. They are English buses. We have 65 of them.

THE CHAIRMAN.- Do you think they are preferable to ^{double} ~~single~~ deck buses?

MR. KNIGHT.- I think they are definitely preferable for Canberra conditions.

THE CHAIRMAN.- Why?

MR. KNIGHT.- Double deck buses are more costly to maintain. There would be considerable difficulty in manoeuvring them in the curved avenues through which they would travel and continual lopping of trees would be necessary. In addition, I have noticed that it is more difficult to collect fares on double deck buses than on single deck buses.

THE CHAIRMAN.- It is a subject on which I feel very strongly, being a bus traveller. I find, in travelling from my homeⁿ to the city in Sydney that, even in peak hours I can get a seat on the top deck. If I sit in the bottom deck I either have to give up my seat to somebody who is standing or I have people falling over me all the time. Whilst I agree that there may be special conditions in Canberra which do not apply in Sydney I believe that some consideration should be given to what the customer wants. Can you tell us something about maintenance and replacement?

MR. KNIGHT.- The vehicles are checked every 500 miles. They are greased and inspected thoroughly underneath. Any mechanical repairs which are required are carried out at that time. At 1,000

CANBERRA SENATE COMMITTEE.

miles the oil is changed and oil filters thoroughly cleaned *at 2000 miles*. Maintenance is a constant process. The system is so arranged that each bus is checked carefully about once a week on the day off of the driver who normally uses that bus. To protect the public from accidents and things of that kind, the driver is required to log at the close of every shift any defect he has noticed in the bus and that bus is not allowed on the road again until that defect has been corrected and the log book initialled by the workshop foreman or mechanical engineer, indicating that the defect has been corrected. Further, each driver is instructed that regardless of anything else, he is not to take a defective bus on the road in any circumstances.

THE CHAIRMAN.- Do you ever have breakdowns?

MR. KNIGHT.- Yes, but not very often. It is very seldom that we have a breakdown with our diesel buses and then it is usually the copper fuel pipe.

THE CHAIRMAN.- Can you give us a brief picture of the administrative system?

MR. KNIGHT.- The Transport Section is a section of the A.C.T. Services Branch of the Department of the Interior. Its administrative staff comprises a Transport Manager, Assistant Transport Manager, a Mechanical Engineer who takes charge of the workshops, a Traffic Inspector, a Goods Supervisor, three clerks, two typists and one switchboard attendant. The workshop comprises one workshop foreman and 81 men, including leading hands. The passenger section which includes both the omnibus section and the car section comprises 162 men including leading hands, 14 car drivers and two bowser attendants. The goods section comprises 83 men and one leading hand. The fleet consists of approximately 574 vehicles made up of 65 city buses, 68 passenger cars, 123 goods vehicles and 308 what we call special duty vehicles. They are Holden cars, utilities and light vehicles used for inspection and maintenance work in the A.C.T. by other departments.

SENATE CANBERRA COMMITTEE.

In addition, we have eight school panel vans and two Bedford school buses.

THE CHAIRMAN. - You use ordinary buses for school transport?

MR. KNIGHT. - In the city area, yes. We have two school buses which go out long distances.

THE CHAIRMAN. - Do you have any serious troubles at any time, such as small strikes?

MR. KNIGHT. - No, In the twenty-three years that I have been in the Transport branch, there has never been a strike. Relations with our men are excellent.

THE CHAIRMAN. - You have a system of inspectors who can demand tickets?

MR. KNIGHT. - Yes, we have inspectors on day and night shift.

THE CHAIRMAN. - I take it that that system does not produce friction with the conductors?

MR. KNIGHT. - No, the conductors do not resent the inspectors. Occasionally there have been defaulters, who have been dealt with.

THE CHAIRMAN. - The Public Service car system is included in those figures you gave us?

MR. KNIGHT. - Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN. - Do you think it is efficient to have your buses, lorries and public Service car system all working together?

MR. KNIGHT. - Yes, I do.

THE CHAIRMAN. - Some of your drivers are interchangeable?

MR. KNIGHT. - They are all interchangeable. We would have to increase our staff considerably if they were not. There is a fairly heavy peak load in Canberra, particularly in the morning and afternoon with a considerable amount of idle time in between. If it were not for the interchangeability of staff, the whole of our idle time would be increasing the losses on the buses. Instead of that, the men are used as car drivers and also as bus cleaners.

THE CHAIRMAN. - Is your depot at Kingston adequate?

MR. KNIGHT. - It is not adequate at present, but it will be when the extensions which we have asked for are erected. It is

SENATE CANBERRA COMMITTEE.

adequate now as far as garage accommodation is concerned, but not for work ^{also} accommodation. We are involved now in a heavy annual bill for overtime in our workshops, a big proportion of which will be eliminated when our lubricatorium is erected adjacent to the depot. We lose a lot of time in our workshops owing to the fact that the shop at the Power House end has been awaiting additions for a long time. In bad weather the men cannot work out in the open. Garage accommodation is adequate for all the years that we can foresee. Even if our ^{trucks} routes were doubled, we would not want to increase the accommodation of the Kingston depot.

SENATOR HANNAFORD. - You do not put the buses under cover?

MR. KNIGHT. - They are all under cover at night. We are looking ahead and securing sites in the outer suburbs, such as Lyne ^{had} and the further reaches of Yarralumla, where we will have sub-depots which will consist of garage accommodation where the buses can be housed at night. We have a similar depot at Ainslie, and that has several advantages. For one thing, you do not have all your eggs in one basket in case of fire, and you save hundreds of pounds a year by not having empty buses ^{run to and from the main} at ~~your~~ depot when shifts commence. Under this system ^{they} start and finish at the depot ^{nearest}. The men are at liberty to change shift, with permission, and they usually sort themselves out so that they work at the depots nearest their homes.

THE CHAIRMAN. - You have plans for extension?

MR. KNIGHT. - Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN. - Do you consider Kingston the best place for a depot?

MR. KNIGHT. - Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN. - Is it not rather congested at the moment - the whole area?

MR. KNIGHT. - Possibly, but as far as transport is concerned. I would suggest that if anything is to be moved it should not be transported. Every mile that you move transport away from the centre of the city adds thousands of pounds to the cost of the service.

THE CHAIRMAN. - In addition to that depot, do you think it would be wise to have a number of smaller depots?

MR. KNIGHT. - Yes - not for repair work, but for housing,

in the outer suburbs, as I have indicated.

THE CHAIRMAN. - Have you enough storage space, apart from your cars?

MR. KNIGHT. - Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN. - What effect do you say that the plan has on costs, compared with costs in a closer settled city? Does it make it much more costly for the people to come to and from the suburbs?

MR. KNIGHT. - It does not make it more costly for ^{the} people, ^{it does} but for the department, because the fares are not commensurate with running costs. If it would interest the committee, I shall now table a schedule of fares showing a comparison between Canberra fares and those of other cities.

THE CHAIRMAN. - Apart from the distances to be travelled, does the circular nature of the routes add greatly to the cost?

MR. KNIGHT. - The thing which affects us most seriously is the fact that our routes, for approximately 20% of their distance, lie in non-residential areas. Whether they are curved or straight does not matter over much, our greatest problem being the fact that they have to travel considerable distances through unoccupied areas, due to the layout of the city.

THE CHAIRMAN. - Do you think that the service is as frequent as the needs of the people require?

MR. KNIGHT. - I appreciate the fact that many people consider that the service is not as frequent as they would like it to be, but it is governed entirely by economic conditions.

THE CHAIRMAN. - Do you travel only on sealed roads?

MR. KNIGHT. - In the city service, with one minor exception in Fishwyck, we travel on sealed roads. With school children's buses, we go quite a long way out. For instance, we go to Naas and Pierce's Creek.

THE CHAIRMAN. - Does your peak traffic meet with bottle-necks?

MR. KNIGHT. - No, not bottle-necks, but it definitely has problems. The main problem is to obtain sufficient labour to meet the peak demands, within economic bounds, of course.

SENATE CANBERRA COMMITTEE.

THE CHAIRMAN. - Do you ever have any traffic blocks, such as at the approach to the Commonwealth Avenue bridge?

MR. KNIGHT. - Occasionally, but it is not a serious problem.

THE CHAIRMAN. - Does the fact that you provide a service for school children cut down the ordinary passenger service at that time?

MR. KNIGHT. - Yes, it is reduced to a minimum at that time, because we transport approximately 2,500 children to and from school each day, and we have 43 or 45 buses employed on that each day at the peak period.

THE CHAIRMAN. - Do you have many accidents?

MR. KNIGHT. - Very few.

THE CHAIRMAN. - Do you think that the Canberra streets, because of their curving nature, are likely to cause accidents when traffic becomes greater than it is now?

MR. KNIGHT. - I think visibility is a greater problem than are the curves. We have made many suggestions about that, and usually they have been adopted. We have approached Parks and Gardens, for instance, about the removal of trees or portions of trees. That has been done on the telephone, between officers, without any trouble.

SENATOR HANNAFORD. - Has there been any difficulty about such requests being granted?

MR. KNIGHT. - No. It is just a matter of looking at the site together, and the difficulty is solved on the spot.

THE CHAIRMAN. - Do you think that, when some of the areas which are at present covered by trees have buildings on them, visibility will again become a problem?

MR. KNIGHT. - I do not know of any case where buildings are likely to trouble us.

THE CHAIRMAN. - Are you concerned with the Queanbeyan bus service?

MR. KNIGHT. - No, we have nothing to do with it. That is a private service which operates solely between Queanbeyan and Canberra and is not comparable with our service.

THE CHAIRMAN. - I take it that your system of administrative

has been built up gradually?

MR. KNIGHT. - Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN. - Did the officers come from city transport services originally?

MR. KNIGHT. - No. The present transport manager and I are, both mechanical engineers. I joined the service in May, 1918, with the Department of Works & Railways in Melbourne, as a mechanical engineer, and remained in that capacity until 1932 when, during the depression, the people who were running the transport were put off, and we replaced them. We built up the service from that time. It was a very small show before then.

THE CHAIRMAN. - Do you know much about the transport systems of Sydney and Melbourne?

MR. KNIGHT. - I have never had an opportunity to study them, except what I have seen when I have been there on holidays.

THE CHAIRMAN. - You do not think you need to do that? Do you consider that you have enough knowledge and information to carry on here?

MR. KNIGHT. - Yes. The system is quite different.

(Continued on page 684)

SENATE CANBERRA COMMITTEE.

THE CHAIRMAN . - I suppose there are some general principles of conducting that are applied in all parts of the world?

MR. KNIGHT . - Yes. We probably have the most up to date system of any. Our new ticket machines are being adopted throughout England, and by the Green Lines in London.

THE CHAIRMAN . - Has an officer of your department been away to study methods elsewhere?

MR. KNIGHT . - No.

THE CHAIRMAN . - Do you have many serious complaints?

MR. KNIGHT . - Naturally, we have had some, but they are not numerous considering the number of buses we have and the number of passengers. Any complaint is carefully investigated. We hear both sides before taking any action. When we have done that, any necessary action is taken, and the person who lodges a complaint is informed.

THE CHAIRMAN . - There is an expert's report. Would you like add anything to the tabled document?

MR. KNIGHT . - No, I do not think so except to add that the investigation was a very thorough one. I was closely associated with both gentlemen when they made the investigation. Dr. Chapman is a Doctor of Engineering and is associated with the Department of Supply in Melbourne. Mr. Schumer is General Manager of Yellow Express, a private concern.

THE CHAIRMAN . - To what extent have their suggestions been put into effect?

MR. KNIGHT . - I have a document here that contains the answer and I formally table it.

THE CHAIRMAN . - Have you anything to say about fares and whether you consider them reasonable?

MR. KNIGHT . - I have submitted a table of fares. I have no opinion to express as they are a matter of policy.

SENATOR HANNAFORD . - Has the recommendation for one man buses been implemented?

MR. KNIGHT . - No. We ran one man buses in Canberra in 1932

SENATE CANBERRA COMMITTEE.

^{rather}
~~because~~ they were considered essential because of economic conditions at the time. We found certain difficulties which are indicated in this report.

THE CHAIRMAN . - Have you any feeder services?

MR. KNIGHT . - No, there is nothing to justify feeder services. The situation might change as Canberra develops.

THE CHAIRMAN . - The buses are fairly well filled at present, are they not?

MR. KNIGHT . - No, they are lightly loaded in off peak periods, particularly on Sunday afternoons and in the evenings. The shopping load has dropped off lately. That is thought to be largely due to the opening of corner shops in the outer suburbs and the increase of motor cars. It is estimated that there are 3.79 people to each motor ^{vehicle} car in the Australian Capital Territory.

THE CHAIRMAN . - Do the people here use taxis or hire cars?

MR. KNIGHT . - I think they must do. I do not know the extent to which they are used. There are 27 hire cars which are taxis so far as Canberra is concerned. Statistics of motor vehicles in the Australian Capital Territory are : motor cars, 5,314; lorries, including utilities, panel vans and other commercial vehicles, 1,638; solo motor cycles, 472; cycle outfits, 13; hire cars 27. Cycle outfits are motor cycles with side cars and auto cycles.

SENATOR RYAN . - Has the number of hire cars increased over the past ~~eighteen~~ months?

MR. KNIGHT . - I could not answer that question.

SENATOR RYAN . - The majority of travellers are one and two section customers?

MR. KNIGHT . - Yes.

SENATOR BENN . - Do you think that the population of Canberra is reaching a point where it would be economical for your department to run electric trolley buses?

MR. KNIGHT . - I have no practical experience of the operation of trolley buses, but I believe that the initial expenditure would be very high. They require a number of sub-stations to feed the overhead

SENATE CANBERRA COMMITTEE.

system at various points along the route, and they are quite expensive. They require a double wire system. Poles would be required at something like sixty feet intervals along all the routes, and we are not like Sydney or Melbourne where the wires can be hung on a building. There are number of suspension wires to which people might object for aesthetic reasons, particularly on ^{curves} ~~roads~~ and along circular streets. It would be necessary to keep the trees very closely pruned back from the trolley poles. The speed of trolley buses is governed by the speed of the bus ahead. If one picks up a heavy load, the others cannot pass at peak periods. ~~They~~ are some ^{of our} thoughts on trolley buses. Our buses are very flexible. We can move them off the standard routes to pick up school children. That cannot be done with trolley buses. I do not know anything about the cost of erection of overhead gear, but I submit this extract from the periodical Modern Transport dated the 9th October, 1954 ~~at~~ ^{on} page 10.

At a meeting of the Brighton (England) Town Council at which the question of trolley buses was discussed, Alderman Nicholls said: "If they decide to expand one of the trolley bus routes three miles, it would cost £60,000 in overhead equipment before they even bought a bus."

That is an indication of the expense of trolley buses. We have 45 miles of roadway that we use for bus routes.

SENATOR BENN . - The initial cost of providing the bus services that you have now would be high?

MR. KNIGHT . - Yes, it would cost about £6,000 in round figures to replace one bus.

SENATOR BENN . - The question of running trolley buses in Canberra has not been investigated?

MR. KNIGHT . - No, not beyond what I have quoted.

SENATOR BENN . - You have a busmans' Siberia in Canberra between the north and south sides?

MR. KNIGHT . - Yes, there is a lot of open space.

SENATOR BENN . - You would not get many fares there?

MR. KNIGHT . - No, that is one of the reasons for our losses. Probably it is the main reason.

SENATE CANBERRA COMMITTEE.

SENATOR BENN . - There is a likelihood that later, when Canberra population has increased, feeder services will be run making Civic Centre one centre and Kingston the other?

MR. KNIGHT . - Yes, that is possible.

SENATOR BENN . - Then it would be economic to run trolley buses between the two centres?

MR. KNIGHT . - I could not say. I have not investigated the matter.

SENATOR BENN . - You have referred to the pruning of trees. There would not be much cutting back of trees if you ran between those two centres?

MR. KNIGHT . - I would not answer that question without a full investigation. Nearly all the streets are tree lined.

SENATOR RYAN . - Do you consider that an officer of your department should visit other transport centres to study problems associated with transport, either in Australia or abroad?

SENATE CANBERRA COMMITTEE.

MR. KNIGHT.- It might be better if the question were put to my senior officers. I appreciate, of course, that no one can have too much information.

THE CHAIRMAN.- That is true, but I take it that if you have no serious problems and the system is working smoothly there would not be much need for it.

SENATOR RYAN.- You have told us about the maintenance of omnibuses. What is the position relative to the maintenance of the other vehicles?

MR. KNIGHT .- They are all regularly maintained, just the same as the buses are. Do you mean maintenance only, or are you thinking of depreciation too?

SENATOR RYAN.- Depreciation and replacements also.

MR. KNIGHT.- Depreciation is based on the estimated life of the vehicle. For depreciation purposes we estimate the life of a car, utility, panel van or truck up to 30 cwt. at 80,000 miles. Trucks up to 5 tons we calculate on the basis of 100,000 miles; semi-trailers, timber jinkers and trucks up to 10 tons, 150,000 miles; and omnibuses on a basis of 200,000 miles or 10 years. That is purely a life estimated for the purposes of depreciation. If we have a vehicle and it has greatly exceeded that mileage and is still in good mechanical order, it is not scrapped. Some arbitrary figure must be fixed for the purposes of calculation so that we know how much it costs us a mile to run a vehicle.

SENATOR RYAN.- Is the overall standard maintenance satisfactory and efficient?

MR. KNIGHT.- I think it is. It could be done much more cheaply if we get these building extensions that we are asking for. That is the extension to our workshop and the erection of the new lubricatorium building.

SENATOR RYAN.- In your opinion that is vital and necessary?

MR. KNIGHT.✓ It definitely is.

SENATOR HANNAFORD.- In your statement you did not

SENATE CANBERRA COMMITTEE.

mention the actual losses that are incurred each year.

MR. KNIGHT.- No.

SENATOR HANNAFORD.- You do sustain a loss each year?

MR. KNIGHT.- Yes. It varies a little from year to year. ^{last} ~~This~~ year it ^{was} ~~is~~ higher than it has been normally, partly due to pressure of business during the Royal visit. I would estimate, leaving out any calculation for increased margins, which have just been granted - I do not know exactly what that would be yet - that our losses would be about £63,000 per annum.

SENATOR HANNAFORD.- Compared with the losses sustained in other Australian cities, is that greater or less?

MR. KNIGHT.- I cannot tell that, because I have not all the statistics for the number of vehicles that the other cities have. I have their losses, but I have not their number of vehicles.

SENATOR BENN.- Your loss is approximately £1,000 a year for each bus.

SENATOR HANNAFORD.- The fares are comparable with those of other cities.

MR. KNIGHT.- Yes.

SENATOR HANNAFORD.- I am a little uninformed on the requirements of the goods services. Do you conduct goods services in Canberra for the purpose of earning income? Why are those heavy lorries provided? What are their functions?

MR. KNIGHT.- For Commonwealth use only. They are engaged in city delivery; that is railways clearance to various departments for government purposes only - a fleet of tipping trucks, which is mainly engaged on road work and other construction work, and heavy vehicles which are used to bring interstate goods, principally from Sydney, for the Department of Works - goods that are urgently required and are essential for their programme.

SENATOR HANNAFORD.- Have you a proper system of cost accounting for those services?

MR. KNIGHT.- Yes, on a mileage basis.

SENATOR HANNAFORD.- On a ton-mileage basis?

MR. KNIGHT.- No - according to the wages of the driver and

running
the cost of the vehicle. A mileage rate plus a labour rate.

SENATOR HANNAFORD.- Do those services also incur losses?

MR. KNIGHT.- No. They do not incur a loss because it is passed on to the customer in each case. We would be working for the Commonwealth in that case.

SENATOR HANNAFORD.- You run a cost?

MR. KNIGHT.- Yes. We ~~actually~~ debit the other department with the actual cost of the job. We make neither a profit nor a loss.

SENATOR HANNAFORD.- You are completely separate from the Department of Supply, which runs the transport for the Commonwealth in the other cities?

MR. KNIGHT.- Quite separate.

SENATOR WOOD.- Are the buses cleaned by automatic cleaners?

MR. KNIGHT.- No. We have looked into that question. It is not very easy to find a completely suitable cleaning apparatus. We made inquiries from the Sydney authorities as regards cleaning. They have found the same difficulties. You have almost to develop a machine of your own to suit your own vehicles. If you are not careful, some machines will knock the indicators and things off the buses. We find ^{the present system} ~~it~~ quite workable. We put the buses on a wash. The crew do their own cleaning. That is how we take up some of the lost time in off-peak periods. They wash the buses and clean them inside and out. ^{The men} ~~They~~ are equipped with rubber boots, aprons, hoses and any tools they require.

SENATOR WOOD.- The circular communications system in Canberra makes it expensive to run the transport services generally?

MR. KNIGHT.- It is not so much the curves as the spread of the city.

SENATOR HANNAFORD.- The bends scrub the tyres.

MR. KNIGHT.- The sharp curve does that if you have to pull round sharp bends. That is why we have tried to straighten our routes.

SENATOR RYAN.- Do you approve the change being made in the road in front of Hotel Kurrajong?

SENATE CANBERRA COMMITTEE.

MR. KNIGHT .- Yes. That is for parking buses off the roadway so that they do not obstruct traffic.

(The witness withdrew.)

(At 12.40 p.m. the Committee adjourned.)

B. 5.

Minutes
of
Senate Select Committee on
the Development of Canberra

Pages 692-889.

<i>Page</i>	<i>Name</i>
692-716	Prof. D. Minster
717-740	" F.E. Saunders
741-750	R.S.K. Harris
781-818	Sir John Burtens
819-829	H. H. Smith
850-889	M.E. Horner C.J. Ferrington.

basic framework which consists of the Parliamentary Triangle between Commonwealth, Kings and Constitution Avenues - the Water Axis focussed on Black Mountain and including the three Central Basins - and the Land Axis from Red Hill to Mount Ainslie, with Parliament House and the Australian War Memorial at either end. An example of the tendency to forget the importance of this architectural framework is the failure to develop appropriately the area at the junction of Constitution and Kings Avenues, which is the important third point of the Parliamentary Triangle. The large scale developments centred around Kingston and Civic have obscured the importance of this third focal point in the plan, but the coming extensive developments in the neighbourhood of Duntroon will bring clearly to light the importance of this junction point in the ultimate development of the city.

(2) THE TENDENCY TO FORGET THAT CANBERRA IS A CAPITAL CITY AND NOT A GARDEN SUBURB.

The present almost universal low density type of development is extremely wasteful in the provision of roads and services and will become increasingly inconvenient as Canberra disperses itself over ever wider areas of countryside. In any important city there is always a significant proportion of the population for whom an apartment in a block of flats is more convenient than a self-contained house and garden. Every important city must develop one or more closely developed centres for shops and offices; this means that the present two-storey maximum, generally applied to buildings in Canberra, must sooner or later be reconsidered and higher density developments be deliberately planned for in appropriate areas. The depressing impression given by some of the more criticised new housing areas arises, not so much from any grave defect in the houses themselves, but because of the great difficulty in achieving interest or variety when every building is one storey high. For aesthetic reasons, as well as for more important economic and social reasons, an increase in building heights is urgently needed.

(3) THE TREND TO CONSIDER NEW BUILDINGS IN ISOLATION AND TO IGNORE THE OVER ALL CIVIC PICTURE.

There are a considerable number of buildings in Canberra of good quality and interest architecturally, but the fine urban scenes to be expected in a capital city are generally lacking because of the failure to consider the visual effect of buildings in groups.

"Planning" in Canberra has so far not given sufficient attention to design in the third dimension or to developing harmonious groups of buildings, centres or precincts in which the height, size, colour and materials of the buildings is given equal consideration to the lay-out of the roads and foot-paths. One of the many examples of this is the lost opportunity to create a worthy first impression along Northbourne Avenue, the main entrance to the city from the North; there is a lack of harmony here and also a lack of the scale appropriate to the centre of a capital city.

CANBERRA NEEDS AN UP TO DATE PLANNING SCHEME.

To sum up the kind of defects outlined above it may be said that, while Canberra has a "plan", it does not appear to have a "planning scheme" in the modern meaning of the words. A planning scheme today is more than a blue print of the road lay-out, it makes allowances for continued change and development and it deals clearly with such essential matters as main traffic routes (as distinct from ordinary roads), zoning and the location of the main industrial and commercial centres, and the provision of the various kinds of open spaces and recreation areas, logically disposed throughout the area. None of these problems appears yet to have been solved with sufficient clarity and decision; for example there appears to be a feeling of uncertainty as to where the main shopping centre of Canberra will ultimately develop and this doubt probably adds to the reluctance of large retailers from Sydney and Melbourne to develop stores in Canberra, where they are so badly needed. A proper planning scheme would of course take into consideration the problems of Canberra as a Regional Centre and would consider the general development of the A.C.T. in association with the capital city.

SENATE CANBERRA COMMITTEE.

THE ADMINISTRATIVE MACHINERY FOR PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT.

To handle such a large scale and complex job as the development and control of a rapidly growing city is an undertaking of the first magnitude and considerable difficulty. It is a job of the kind being undertaken by the State Electricity Commission of Victoria or the Snowy Mountains Hydro-Electric Authority in New South Wales, and it should be handled in a similar kind of way. The procedure adopted for the building of the English New Towns gives an indication of the problems involved and how they can be tackled, and I should like to draw attention to the valuable information contained in the Reports of the New Towns Committee, of which Lord Reith was Chairman (Cmds. 6759, 6794 and 6876; 1945-46). I am attaching to this submission some extracts from the Final Report of this Committee which I consider have particular application to the problems of Canberra.

PROPOSAL FOR A NATIONAL CAPITAL DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION.

My recommendation would be that a National Capital Development Corporation be set up under a Chairman and seven to nine members, a majority being nominated and the others being representative of appropriate interests. Such a body would have the advantage of easy conversion to full scale Local Authority status when this became desirable. For the Chairman, an outstanding man of proved worth and public spirit should be chosen, as was the case in England where Lord Beveridge, Lord Reith, Sir Ernest Gowers and men of similar stature were appointed. The Corporation would appoint a Director or Manager with appropriate administrative, legal, financial and technical staff. The technical staff should include a planning branch, an architects' branch and an engineers' branch under a chief planner, architect and engineer of ability and drive. The Director's job would be comparable in responsibility with that of the Commissioner of the S.M.H.E.A. and he should be of that calibre and status.

SENATE CANBERRA COMMITTEE.

A SINGLE DIRECTIVE ESSENTIAL FOR SUCCESS.

The most important point to be observed in the administrative arrangements for the work of planning, implementing and controlling the development of Canberra is that these different functions should, under no circumstances, be separated: planning activities, building activities and managing activities each react on the other and it always leads to mistakes and trouble if the responsibility for them is divided. Planners, architects and engineers have to learn to work together, sometimes they fail to agree; in this case the responsibility should lie clearly with the Director to come to a decision and give clear instructions: it is his duty, however, to listen and give careful consideration to the advice of his technical officers.

SENATE CALIBERRA COMMITTEE

I believe that the time has come to make the next step forward in changing Canberra from an administrative township to a city fit to take its place among other world capitals. There appears to have been too little appreciation of the advantages of Canberra as a cultural educational, scientific, health, holiday and tourist centre, as well as an administrative centre. Canberra is already an important military centre and a great air transport junction, handling an ever increasing volume of traffic. Sooner or later, important business firms, insurance companies and such will find Canberra a convenient location for their head offices, while the growing population will demand the establishment of an increasing number of service industries which are likely to be followed by all sorts of other industrial undertakings, anxious to take advantage of the availability of abundant electric power and the amenities and prestige of the capital city. Today, the finest and smartest retail shops are not confined to New York, Paris and London but are to be found in California, Florida or on the Riviera, in places like Miami or Nice which have made themselves into fashion centres as well as holiday places. The same thing could well happen in Canberra.

For the purpose of building up a more healthy balance in the social and economic life of Canberra and for the wider purpose of promoting decentralisation from Melbourne and Sydney, which everyone knows to be desirable, new industries and new businesses of all kinds should not only be permitted but should be encouraged to come to Canberra. This means a considerable change in outlook from the attitude of seeing that any new development does no great harm to an attitude of welcoming new development, making provision for it, and fitting it into an over-all planning scheme.

In thanking the Committee for giving me this opportunity of appearing before them I should like to emphasize that the importance of developing Canberra in the best and finest way possible transcends merely economic considerations. Rightly or wrongly, the world judges by appearances and demands visible symbols of greatness. As an inspiration to her own people and that she may win an honourable place among the nations, Australia's National Capital must be worthy of her.

Canberra is one of Australia's greatest development projects which should be handled with the care and competence its importance deserves.

THE CHAIRMAN: You are site consultant to the National University?

PROFESSOR WINSTON: Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: Would you favour allowing complete autonomy to the University to construct anything else or do you consider that the City authority should have some means of making sure that the University does not go astray in its planning?

PROFESSOR WINSTON: I think that the Australian Capital Territory Authority should have power to look into all developments in the area including the University.

THE CHAIRMAN: Do you consider that over all planning has been undertaken in connection with the University?

PROFESSOR WINSTON: If it has not, it is entirely my fault

THE CHAIRMAN: Was there an original plan, in the beginning?

PROFESSOR WINSTON: Yes. It has been continued with. There has been overall planning.

THE CHAIRMAN: Do you favour the retention of the original plan for a west lake or do you favour the ribbon of water that has been suggested?

PROFESSOR WINSTON: I think that that matter will be decided, in the long run, by engineering considerations which I am not very competent to talk about. Other things being equal, I rather favour the abandonment of the West Lake, subject to appropriate protection being granted the University with regard to the racecourse or any other inappropriate activity on that spot.

THE CHAIRMAN: Would you prefer the whole of that land to be used for public purposes?

PROFESSOR WINSTON: I would prefer it to be used for recreational and other useful purposes.

THE CHAIRMAN: With regard to traffic and road problems, would you favour any serious modification of the existing plans for roads?

SERVICES CANBERRA COMMITTEE

PROFESSOR WINSTON: I would consider it essential to bring out certain roads as vitally important, as opposed to residential roads. The trouble in Canberra is that all roads tend to look about the same in importance. I think that half a dozen major through roads are required which would take people from one part of the city to another. However, the general pattern need not be altered very much in order to accomplish this.

THE CHAIRMAN: Do you think that it would be advisable to modify the plans for the outlying suburbs?

PROFESSOR WINSTON: Yes. I feel that insufficient consideration has been given to the design of those suburbs as architectural units. I think that they should be broken down into groups or "precincts", as they are coming to be called. Each precinct would comprise a ~~very~~ small group of buildings or houses of a ^{harmonious design.} similar type.

THE CHAIRMAN: Would you favour increasing the density of population in the nearer suburbs?

PROFESSOR WINSTON: Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: Would you favour doing that by reducing the size of allotments or by increasing the height of the buildings?

PROFESSOR WINSTON: In the main, by building up in certain areas. About a quarter of the population do not need a whole house and garden and could be accommodated in multi-storey units.

THE CHAIRMAN: How high would you favour building flats?

PROFESSOR WINSTON: I would not stipulate a limit. It is an economic problem. You cannot make people walk up much more than three storeys these days. If you instal a lift in a building it must be of 7 or 8 storeys in order to pay for the lift.

THE CHAIRMAN: But tall buildings affect the appearance of a city?

PROFESSOR WINSTON: Within reason, the higher the buildings the better the appearance.

THE CHAIRMAN: But do you think that it is good to have one tall building among a number of low ones?

SENATOR CANBERRA COMMITTEE

PROFESSOR WINSTON: I think that it can be good.

THE CHAIRMAN: Do you think that it would be worth while our obtaining one good consultant in order to give the general plan of Canberra an overhaul; or could we keep the existing plan and appoint a progressive planning authority?

PROFESSOR WINSTON: I think that you could retain the existing plan. It is much more important to have a progressive planning authority than to have a new plan. This is a machinery problem, not a problem requiring new ideas.

THE CHAIRMAN: Do you think that an authority similar to the Snowy Mountain Authority would be appropriate for Canberra?

PROFESSOR WINSTON: Yes. However, I believe that there should be modifications in the form of the authority because this is a job which will continue for all time and I think it desirable to bear in mind that you are working towards the time when you will have a real local authority.

THE CHAIRMAN: Of course, Canberra will always be in a different position in relation to a local authority than an ordinary town.

PROFESSOR WINSTON: I appreciate that fact but I hope that, at some time, there will be reasonable representation. I think that a body such as the Snowy Mountain Authority has in mind terminating its work in time.

THE CHAIRMAN: Do you think that we should set up an authority the work of which would be terminated when all the headquarters of public offices were established in Canberra and then have Parliament set up a new system of control?

PROFESSOR WINSTON: That might be a good idea. It might provide the impetus to get the work done.

SENATOR VINCENT: Would you say that, in some cases, not only the spirit but the letter of the original plan for Canberra has been ignored?

PROFESSOR WINSTON: Yes. But in many of those cases one would want to ignore the letter of the plan. I do not favour

SENATE CANBERRA COMMITTEE

maintaining the plan for the sake of it, but I think that there is something significant in the central idea.

SENATOR VINCENT: If the central idea of the plan were ignored would you agree that the spirit and essence of the plan had been ignored?

PROFESSOR WINSTON: Yes. But, as yet, we cannot say that. It only seems to be the trend.

SENATOR VINCENT: Are you aware that the present Parliament House which is a temporary Parliament house was constructed on a site to which Burley Griffin objected?

PROFESSOR WINSTON: I did not know that.

SENATOR VINCENT: Are you aware that the site which Burley Griffin selected for the permanent Parliament House is some distance further up the hill?

PROFESSOR WINSTON: Yes.

SENATOR VINCENT: I suggest that Burley Griffin intended to have no obstruction between Parliament House and the vista towards Mount Ainslie?

PROFESSOR WINSTON: That is a key point in the plan.

SENATOR VINCENT: Now we have a temporary Parliament House right in the middle of that vista which follows a line from Mount Ainslie to the proposed site of the permanent Parliament House?

PROFESSOR WINSTON: That is so. But you can ^{hardly} call that a mistake.

SENATOR VINCENT: But you would agree that the temporary building is obstructing the vista that Griffin intended?

PROFESSOR WINSTON: That is true.

SENATOR VINCENT: Would you agree that if the permanent Parliament House is constructed on the site originally intended it will look down to the back door of the present building?

PROFESSOR WINSTON: Upon the construction of the new parliamentary building, the present building would have to be removed in order to observe the requirements of the plan.

SENATOR VINCENT: Do you think that the permanent Parliament House might be better sited in the locality now known as "Capital Centre" - on top of Capital Hill?

PROFESSOR WINSTON: At first glance, I would say no. I would think that it would be inconvenient.

SENATOR VINCENT: Is the suggestion worthy of consideration?

PROFESSOR WINSTON: Yes.

SENATOR VINCENT: At present no development is envisaged for the area shown on the plans as "Civic Place". Have you any ideas on that subject?

PROFESSOR WINSTON: I understood that Griffith had the idea of a sort of municipal centre. I think that he imagined that the ^{civic} authority would be located there.

SENATOR VINCENT: Have you any views as to how that centre should be treated?

PROFESSOR WINSTON: I can only say that it seems to me that the area of this circle is so great that you cannot hope to develop all around it as is presumed on this plan. I think it necessary to develop the business and shopping centre in proximity to the existing city on one side of the area as "Civic Place".

SENATOR VINCENT: Should the plan be modified?

PROFESSOR WINSTON: I think it must be.

SENATOR VINCENT: Have you any views as to how it can be modified?

PROFESSOR WINSTON: Not in detail. In general, I would develop the area near the area that has already been developed for business. I would not centre on the Hill but would develop around the ^{"Civic"} ~~city~~ and to the north.

SENATOR VINCENT: Would you suggest that as a desirable site for a City Hall?

PROFESSOR WINSTON: It might well be.

SENATOR VINCENT: What else could be sited there?

PROFESSOR WINSTON: Almost any important public building ;

SENATE CANBERRA COMMITTEE

SENATOR VINCENT: I think that we should be careful not to preserve the sites in perpetuity without using them and I should like to find out how the important focal points should be treated.

~~PROFESSOR WINSTON~~: Assuming that a local authority is established in Canberra, the area that I have mentioned would be a suitable site for its building?

PROFESSOR WINSTON: Yes.

SENATOR VINCENT: As an example of the tendency to forget the importance of the architectural problem you mentioned the failure to develop the junction of Constitution and Kings Avenues. How do you think that that focal point should be developed?

PROFESSOR WINSTON: I cannot describe that here. It requires working out.

(Continued on page 705)

PROFESSOR WINSTON: It looks as though there does not appear to be anything proposed for the area that would eventually make it important. I would have to spend about three days considering the matter in order to give an idea of what could be done about it.

SENATOR VINCENT: You consider that some thinking should be done about the matter?

PROFESSOR WINSTON: Yes, it is urgent. Above all, there should be no crossing other than the correct one on that Avenue.

SENATOR VINCENT: The Chairman asked you about building heights?

PROFESSOR WINSTON: Yes, I do not think that there should be a building limit.

SENATOR VINCENT: Would you suggest that a block of flats of say eight storeys, near Civic Centre, would not throw out of focus the important public buildings that exist in some other parts of Canberra?

PROFESSOR WINSTON: That depends entirely upon how such a high building is placed, and how it is designed. Very large and very high buildings may be found in large numbers in America, but in some places importance is given to low buildings nearby because the high buildings have been placed in the background. When high buildings are put up there must be good open spaces around them.

SENATOR VINCENT: Otherwise high buildings could throw out of harmony the general aspect of the City?

PROFESSOR WINSTON: Yes.

SENATOR VINCENT: Are you aware of the prescribed locality of the eight storey block of flats that is to be built near Civic?

PROFESSOR WINSTON: Yes, but I have not seen drawings or pictures of them.

SENATOR VINCENT: Do you say that such a block of flats would throw out of harmony the general aesthetic aspect of the important buildings in Canberra?

PROFESSOR WINSTON: I do not know enough about the matter to say one way or another, but I do say that you must be careful where you site high buildings.

SENATOR VINCENT: At present the great volume of the north-south traffic passes along Northbourne Avenue, over the bridge and into Commonwealth Avenue?

PROFESSOR WINSTON: Yes.

SENATOR VINCENT: Having regard to the estimated size of Canberra in 50 or 100 years' time, would you say that there is a grave danger of that bridge becoming a traffic bottleneck similar to the Princes Street Bridge in Melbourne?

PROFESSOR WINSTON: Yes, I think so.

SENATOR VINCENT: Can anything be done to prevent such a catastrophe?

PROFESSOR WINSTON: Yes, the first thing to do is to build a ~~wide~~ ^{sufficiently} wide bridge when the present bridge needs to be replaced. The second thing to do is to build a third centre and access to it along the line of Kings Avenue, so that the traffic can flow through Duntroon.

SENATOR VINCENT: It might be desirable to consider the development of Canberra east and west and south-west and south-east, as well as to the north?

PROFESSOR WINSTON: Exactly.

SENATOR VINCENT: You referred to the uncertainty as to where the main shopping centre of Canberra should be?

PROFESSOR WINSTON: Yes.

SENATOR VINCENT: Do you suggest that there should be a main shopping centre?

PROFESSOR WINSTON: Yes. I believe that ~~because~~ almost any organization, whether it be a city or anything else, needs a heart. A city needs ^{unity} ~~uniformity~~ and although there are many important sub-centres in Canberra it is impossible for me to conceive a city

without a main centre. A centre is needed for commercial interests, retail shopping and pleasure.

SENATOR VINCENT: Do you not think that it would be undesirable to have a central shopping area in a city that has a total ground area of more than most cities - in proportion to population?

PROFESSOR WINSTON: Yes, if it were the only centre. There must be sub-centres and other centres, but I consider that there should also be one ^{main} heart or "core".

SENATOR VINCENT: Is not that a traditional conception of a city, and as such it has no actual merit?

PROFESSOR WINSTON: I think it has the merit that a person knows where to go to find the main centre of business. It is inconvenient to go to three widely separated centres to conduct ^{different} ~~such~~ business activities.

SENATOR VINCENT: You referred to the organization of a planning authority. Do you suggest that such an authority should be placed under ministerial control, and if so, under what Minister?

PROFESSOR WINSTON: I do not know, although I had an idea it might be directly responsible to the Prime Minister.

SENATOR VINCENT: Do you consider that Canberra should be planned exclusively as a centre of government, or as a centre of government and a regional centre or as a centre of government, a regional centre and an industrial centre?

PROFESSOR WINSTON: It certainly ^{must} ~~should~~ be an administrative centre, and it also should be, very importantly, a regional centre. There should also be a certain amount of industry in Canberra. I believe that the industries should be light industries of ^{different} ~~all~~ kinds, everything to do with the building trade, electronics, anything that requires more skill than material, printing, watchmaking, ^{optical equipment} ~~everything~~ that is easily transported and that will serve the needs of a big city. I do not consider that those industries need be all luxury industries.

SENATOR VINCENT: Why do you exclude heavy industries?

PROFESSOR WINSTON: I cannot see any industrial advantages for heavy industries in Canberra.

SENATOR VINCENT: Assume that in the atomic era it is convenient to locate heavy industry away from Melbourne and Sydney. Would you advocate setting up heavy industry in Canberra?

PROFESSOR WINSTON: In general, no, because it would be inadvisable to locate vital heavy industries in the same place as vital government functions. I suggest that we need to wait for many more people, a bigger labour force and a bigger market in Canberra before heavy industries are established.

SENATOR VINCENT: Canberra will always be the seat of government and do you think it undesirable that it should compete with other cities in regard to industry?

PROFESSOR WINSTON: There may be some political objection but I would not think that it could be substantiated. I do not think that London, Paris and Rome are any the worse off for being administrative centres and industrial centres.

SENATOR VINCENT: You do not think that ⁱⁿ Canberra, as a Federal capital, ^{this} has significance?

PROFESSOR WINSTON: Yes, I think that it has ⁱⁿ significance but I am not sure that ~~it would be so~~ ^{this argument could be maintained.} if it were argued out.

SENATOR VINCENT: Do you consider that the domestic architecture in Canberra could be improved?

PROFESSOR WINSTON: I think so, in common with such architecture everywhere.

SENATOR VINCENT: How could we establish a type of domestic architecture in Canberra that could be regarded as ideally Australian?

PROFESSOR WINSTON: I do not think that you can establish a type of architecture. It must come in a natural way. You can discourage the worst and encourage the best, but you cannot establish a type.

SENATOR VINCENT: Could we encourage a typically Australian style of architecture in Canberra?

PROFESSOR WINSTON: I believe that a typical style is beginning to emerge, and it is getting encouragement ^{through} ~~in the~~ general public interest. It is not long ago since half a dozen new Canberra homes were thrown open to public inspection. I believe the inspections were tremendously popular, and I believe that that is the ^{sort of} ~~way~~ way in which we can arouse interest. We cannot direct that a certain architectural style shall be developed. We can only encourage a good style as we encourage good morals, good books and so on. We can talk about it, give exhibitions of good work and show the public what is good. We can also have a continuing steady pressure by authority to ^{suppress} ~~separate~~ the worst and encourage the best. I do not think that we can do very much ^{more}.

SENATOR VINCENT: As the Department of the Interior builds most of the houses in Canberra, could not that Department do something about better design?

PROFESSOR WINSTON: That is a matter of personal opinion. ~~I do not think that it is possible to do much except to encourage good books or good architecture.~~

SENATOR VINCENT: Do you agree that the architectural style of public buildings should never be experimental, but should be on an approved traditional standard?

PROFESSOR WINSTON: No, I think differently. I believe that it is traditional to be experimental. Buildings must change and I do not think we can do anything about it.

SENATOR VINCENT: There is a large administrative building in course of construction to the east of Parliament House. A complementary building will be erected later to the west of Parliament House. Should that building be in harmony with the general architectural pattern of the structures nearby, such as the Patents Office, the External Affairs building, and so on?

PROFESSOR WINSTON: The existing buildings have not achieved a high enough quality for the new buildings to conform to them. If they were of a very high quality I would say Yes.

SENATE CALLED. COMMITTEE

SENATOR VINCENT: Could not a new first-class building be erected and conform to the basic architectural patterns of those buildings?

PROFESSOR WINSTON: I doubt it.

SENATE CANBERRA COMMITTEE.

SENATOR VINCENT: You have referred to the abandonment of West Lake. Do you advocate a substitute water treatment in that area?

PROFESSOR WINSTON: Yes.

SENATOR VINCENT: You would prefer a ribbon of water?

PROFESSOR WINSTON: Yes.

SENATOR VINCENT: What would you do with the area now occupied by the racecourse?

PROFESSOR WINSTON: It could be part of a larger recreation area. The present racecourse area could be used for playing fields, perhaps in conjunction with the University and the new University College, and perhaps for general public use.

SENATOR VINCENT: Looking at Canberra, the main impression to my mind is that of a garden or pastoral atmosphere. Do you suggest that atmosphere should, at all costs, be maintained, as one of the key-notes of Canberra development?

PROFESSOR WINSTON: I would hope it could be retained through large areas of Canberra but, if it is to become a real city, it cannot be a pastoral city alone. It must be an urban city and in establishing ^{the} important centres, it is inevitable that you will lose something of that pastoral quality. I hope it will be kept in a substantial measure but that would be impossible in central areas.

SENATOR VINCENT: Why do you think that?

PROFESSOR WINSTON: Because it would lead to a dispersed pattern of building which would be most inconvenient to use. If you are to retain a sort of pastoral, rural, basis of development in a city of 250,000 people, which is quite a probable figure for Canberra, the city will stretch so far that it will be inconvenient to use and very expensive to maintain.

SENATOR VINCENT: Even with the construction of say, three storey flats?

PROFESSOR WINSTON: Then you begin to lose your pastoral effect.

SENATOR VINCENT: They could be so sited as to retain the pastoral effect.

PROFESSOR WINSTON: To a great measure, yes, but not altogether. In certain areas, as a contrast, it would be good to have an urban city instead of a pastoral city. You could have both. You could have the delightful trees of the residential areas, and widely spaced public buildings, but at some point you would want to ~~go into a city~~ *get the real go into a city feeling.*

SENATOR RYAN: The Griffin Plan provided for the establishment of a purely administrative centre. Would you say that form of development has been changed for economic reasons?

PROFESSOR WINSTON: I would say economic and social reasons - chiefly social. People are beginning to feel that there is something wrong in a city in which every man, woman and child is a government servant.

SENATOR RYAN: You consider for that reason that balanced planning is necessary for Canberra?

PROFESSOR WINSTON: Yes.

SENATOR RYAN: Do you consider that the development of Canberra's suburban areas is conforming to the Griffin Plan?

PROFESSOR WINSTON: I think it is conforming as well as possible to that plan but it cannot continue to conform completely because Griffin did not envisage the kind of development that is ~~happening~~ *necessary* today.

SENATOR RYAN: Do you consider that, at the present stage of Canberra's development, sufficient areas have been alienated for public reserves and parks?

PROFESSOR WINSTON: Not as yet. I think it is very important that there should be recreation areas, a botanical area, a zoological area etc. on a national scale.

SENATOR RYAN: You believe that as Canberra grows proper provision must be made for park lands, recreation areas and so on?

PROFESSOR WINSTON: Yes. It is important to preserve them now when it is easy to preserve them.

SENATOR RYAN: Do you consider that the circular road system should be continued?

SENATE CANBERRA COMMITTEE.

PROFESSOR WINSTON: Quite frankly I do not think it was a happy thought at all.

SENATOR RYAN: It is quite patent that, as population increases, circular road systems will become an increasing danger to transport?

PROFESSOR WINSTON: We could think of a better and more practical road pattern.

SENATOR RYAN: You think that type of road system is finished?

PROFESSOR WINSTON: Yes.

SENATOR HANNAFORD: You have mentioned the need for through roads. Can you give any idea of where they should be? Would it involve any substantial alteration of the plan and particularly of the circular layout of the city?

PROFESSOR WINSTON: I think a good deal could be achieved in areas not yet built up. I do not know exactly where the through roads should be, but it should be possible to get from point to point without going through the ^{main} centres of the city.

SENATOR HANNAFORD: That would mean by-passing shopping areas and so on. You think that is essential?

PROFESSOR WINSTON: Yes.

SENATOR HANNAFORD: Evidence has been given that the Royal Military College at Duntroon would be very much assisted in its function if it were to have certain areas adjacent to the American War Memorial and also on the slopes of Mount Ainslie in the vicinity of the rifle range. What is your opinion of the effect of such a move on the Canberra Plan?

PROFESSOR WINSTON: I am afraid that brings us back to one of the first points I made. That area is a very important part of the plan. It is most important for the fulfilment of the plan that that area should be developed as part of the Canberra urban area. I hope that Duntroon's requirements can be satisfied without encroaching too much on what should be ^{main} the centre of the city.

SENATE HANDBERRA COMMITTEE.

SENATOR HANNAFORD: Therefore you are opposed to any increase of the size of the present Duntroon allotment?

PROFESSOR WINSTON: In that direction, if it can be avoided, yes.

SENATOR HANNAFORD: What about the high sloping land on the eastern side of Mount Ainslie?

PROFESSOR WINSTON: That does not seem to me to be so serious. I do not think it would matter. Of course, I do not know what the Royal Military College proposes to do with it.

SENATOR HANNAFORD: Evidence has been tendered that the area sought by the College should be kept for city development. I understand that, even on the higher ground, there will be some building. For that reason, it is contended that the land should not be given over to Duntroon for a training area.

PROFESSOR WINSTON: It is obviously something that must be looked into very carefully in case we spoil the whole plan of that area.

SENATOR HANNAFORD: You believe that, to give the city proper balance, it is necessary to develop the area adjacent to the American War Memorial and surrounding Mount Pleasant?

PROFESSOR WINSTON: Yes.

SENATOR HANNAFORD: The land at present used by the racecourse is not within the University area?

PROFESSOR WINSTON: No. It is just out of that area.

SENATOR HANNAFORD: What is the University's particular objection to having a racecourse there?

PROFESSOR WINSTON: So far as I understand it, there is little objection to having ^{harness} ~~pony~~ races of the kind that have been held there up to now. What they fear is the development of a full-scale commercial race course with possibly night trotting and dog racing ^{and dirt-track} ~~as~~ ^{well.} They fear the worst and they naturally consider that it would be an inappropriate development to have a typical commercial race course, operating night and day adjacent to the University.

THE CHAIRMAN: Apart from that, it is the wrong place so far as the city is concerned?

PROFESSOR WINSTON: Yes. Consider, for instance, the traffic and parking problems. A proper race course site was set aside a long time ago.

SENATOR HANNAFORD: The plan provides for the erection of a bridge which would serve traffic in that particular area.

PROFESSOR WINSTON: I know the one you mean but there would still be great traffic difficulties. Traffic from the north would be encouraged to go through the University area. It would be a grave injury to the University if something of that kind happened there - any ^{other} commercial use attracting large crowds of people.

SENATOR HANNAFORD: I am interested in your remarks about the advantages of high buildings in appropriate centres. You will agree, of course, that the centre of Canberra - that is the central triangle - could be used with advantage for the erection of buildings higher than those at present established there?

PROFESSOR WINSTON: I think such buildings are necessary if the city is to be given dignity.

SENATOR HANNAFORD: You believe in a good skyline?

PROFESSOR WINSTON: I do - an interest ⁱⁿ ~~in~~ the skyline. It is an impossible task to give real interest with one storey buildings throughout the whole area.

SENATOR HANNAFORD: No witness has ever been able to explain to us why the large open area west of the Hotel Kurrajong has never been developed. Do you think that area could be developed from a civic point of view or would you favour its use as a residential area?

PROFESSOR WINSTON: You would have to work out what you considered to be reasonable government requirements for the next 25 or 50 years. My first thought is that the area should be reserved for further governmental building perhaps not yet envisaged. Consider how Washington has grown beyond all early expectations. Because of the relationship of this area to existing governmental buildings I

believe that it should be reserved for further development of that kind. I should also be unwilling to do anything in a commercial or business way that might interfere with the development of Civic Centre. Therefore I think the only alternative would be to build homes if you could be reasonably sure that the land would not be required for administrative buildings in the future.

SENATOR VINCENT: Are you conversant with the Griffin Plan for the treatment of Capital Hill?

PROFESSOR WINSTON: I have a fair idea. The Parliament House is to be on the lower slopes and for the top Griffin envisaged a purely ornamental building such as ~~the~~ ^{a classical} Pantheon perhaps.

SENATOR VINCENT: That would not be in accordance with Australian tradition although it might be in accordance with American sentiment or Roman sentiment. Do you agree with Griffin's Plan for the treatment of that Hill?

PROFESSOR WINSTON: I cannot imagine you would have ~~an~~ ^{an} ~~appropriate~~ ^{exactly} building of ~~that~~ kind.

THE CHAIRMAN: With regard to architecture, do you think that the fashionable big glass box type of architecture is suitable for civic buildings in Canberra?

PROFESSOR WINSTON: Generally speaking no. Because of ~~the~~ ^{the} ~~Canberra's~~ extremes of climate, I think architects should be wary about the amount of glass they use in their buildings ^{for Canberra}

(The witness withdrew)

SENATE SELECT COMMITTEE ON THE DEVELOPMENT OF CANBERRA

SUBMISSION BY DENIS WINSTON, M.T.P.I., F.R.I.B.A., F.I.L.A.,
PROFESSOR OF TOWN AND COUNTRY PLANNING, UNIVERSITY OF SYDNEY.

ADDENDUM: EXTRACTS FROM THE FINAL REPORT OF THE NEW TOWNS COMMITTEE, 1946.
LORD REITH - CHAIRMAN.

SOCIAL STRUCTURE

Paragraph 22.

The terms of reference stipulate that the new communities shall be self-contained and balanced, and we have frequently used these expressions in our reports. There is no doubt about the meaning of "self-contained" and we have indicated how this can be brought about. There may, however, be some doubt as to the full significance of a "balanced" community, and still more as to how that is to be achieved. So far as the issue is an economic one, balance can be attained by giving opportunity for many sorts of employment which will attract men and women up to a high income level. Beyond that point the problem is not economic at all nor even a vaguely social one; it is, to be frank, one of class distinction. So far as these distinctions are based on income, taxation and high costs of living are reducing them. We realise also that there are some who would have us ignore their existence. But the problem remains and must be faced; if the community is to be truly balanced, so long as social classes exist, all must be represented in it. A contribution is needed from every type and class of person; the community will be the poorer if all are not there, able and willing to make it.

Paragraph 23.

Where possible, therefore, businesses and industries established should include not only factories, shops, and the businesses and services meeting local needs, but head-offices and administrative and research establishments including sections of government departments and other public offices. It is most desirable that proprietors, directors, executives and other leading workers in the local industries and businesses should live in the town and take part in its life. Many professional men and women, writers, artists, and other specialists not tied to a particular location should find a new town a good place in which to live and work. So also should retired people from home and overseas, from every kind of occupation, as well as people of independent means. All these should find interest and scope in playing their part in the development of the social, political, artistic, and recreational activities of the town.

MAIN CENTRE

Paragraph 36.

Besides the principal shops, many of the public and administrative buildings of the town will naturally be in the centre, though not necessarily in a single group. Those that are visited frequently by the general public, for example the head post office, should be in the shopping part of the centre, though,

- 4 -

as we say in discussing shops, they should, like banks, be placed so as not to break the continuity of shop frontages. The national and local government offices, fire station, police station and magistrates' court, one or more churches, concert hall, theatre, library, art gallery, and some central educational and recreational buildings, would form a separate group or groups conveniently accessible from the main shopping thoroughfare. There may also be central gardens with restaurants; and if the intention is to have a very spacious treatment of such features it may increase the area needed for the centre as a whole. Unless, however, there is a strong topographical reason, a park should not be in the centre. There will also be refreshment houses, hotels, cinemas, public halls of various kinds, club-rooms, and office premises in the centre, some of which may be grouped with the shops and some with the civic buildings, but which should be close to both. The more accessible the public buildings are the more they will be used.

LAYOUT AND GROUPING

Paragraph 41.

Lessees and tenants have always pressed for individuality in their business premises and dwellings even if in principle they agree there must be some harmony. This pressure cannot be disregarded. Each piece of development requires careful thought in order to use the opportunities which site and arrangement can give to achieve distinctiveness and variety within a harmonious whole. Standardisation of units may be inevitable, particularly in housing schemes; but the desire for some degree of individuality can often be met by ingenuity in layout and in details of design and planting. Too much variety may give a sense of restlessness. Where, on the other hand, uniformity of design is unacceptable, harmony can be obtained by consistency of style and materials and by carefully considered building lines and roof silhouettes. The right balance between unity and variety will demand the exercise of an individual and sympathetic judgment, based both on aesthetic and practical considerations.

Paragraph 42.

While the preferences of purchasers and tenants must govern the accommodation provided, the diversity of demand will ordinarily suffice to give designers ample scope. Architectural interest in a residential layout can be obtained by the use in agreeable conjunction of differing types of dwellings - detached houses, terraces, three-storey flats, and here and there higher buildings.

CONTROL OF DESIGN

Paragraph 45.

Leases should contain covenants that the placing, design, elevation and external materials of buildings should be approved by the agency. This should apply to extensions as well as new buildings and to outbuildings and fencing. Where there is an open layout of forecourts the covenants must provide for its preservation. The leases should also require observance of the agency's building regulations.

Paragraph 46.

The administration of this control must not be oppressive; it requires a judicious blend of firmness and flexibility. Designs which are vulgar or which clash with others will obviously be rejected, and so far lessees and builders will in principle support the control. But opinions differ as to what is good and appropriate, and there will be pressure for degrees of individuality overstepping the limits set by the aims of unity or harmony. In its decisions the agency must be finally advised by one person; matters of taste cannot be determined by a team. Advice on approvals should be a function of the agency's chief architect since the buildings have to take their place in a general conception, the aesthetic aspect of which is his responsibility. An alternative sometimes advocated is to refer designs to an independent consulting architect or panel of architects; but as they would not be continuously engaged in the team-work of development their approach would necessarily be negative. They could eliminate the very bad; but they could not help much in securing expression of a positive architectural conception of the town or neighbourhood. The chief architect may himself wish to have, on occasion, the advice of a consultant or a panel, or for important buildings that of the Royal Fine Art Commission. But any appeal from the responsible architect to an outside body or individual would make it difficult to apply a creative conception of the town as a whole. The architect's opinion may of course be overridden or modified by the agency itself for business or other reasons.

Paragraph 47.

It should be the policy of the agency so far as possible to secure the employment of qualified architects by bodies or persons building in the town.

Paragraph 48.

In the town centre or particular parts of the town, it may be desired to have a specially high degree of architectural unity. This is best secured by entrusting the actual designing of a street or building scheme to one architect; and several architects might be thus employed, the designs being subject to the chief architect's approval. An alternative method, applicable specially to the centre, is that the general exterior treatment of a district or group of buildings shall be laid down by the chief architect, or another appointed for the task, while individual buildings are designed by other architects with some latitude for individual expression within the ensemble.

Paragraph 49.

There are differing schools of thought on architectural principles and the agency will have to remember this in the choice of its chief architect. Not every architect is prepared to admit merits in a school of thought differing from his own; there will be corresponding divisions in public preference. It may not therefore be practicable to insist on one general architectural character throughout the whole town, desirable as that might be. But it is obvious that two conflicting styles, even if both have merits, could not be placed happily together in the same street or group. The capacity and ability of the chief architect will greatly influence the final effect obtained.

USE OF SURROUNDING LAND

Paragraph 66.

The creation of a new town will inevitably result in some change in the form of agricultural production in the district, and the agency should establish machinery whereby farmers are kept informed of coming developments so that they may adjust their programmes thereto. The object would be, on the one hand, to relate the expanding needs of the town to production policy in the green belt; and on the other, to obviate any excessive development of one type of production which might occur through the creation of a new market. The agency might also promote certain central services on behalf of producers - such as those developed on the estates of the Land Settlement Association - whereby producers could obtain the advantages of, for example, central dairying, organised buying and selling, co-operative use of agricultural machinery, and possibly the processing of vegetables and fruit.

ROADS

Paragraph 102.

The radial roads should not, as in so many existing towns, converge at a single central point, but should connect with an inner ring road, not necessarily symmetrical, around the main shopping and civic centre by means of which traffic may pass from one radial to another. This would keep the centre free of through or cross traffic. A further ring road, or series of connecting roads, should be provided between the inner ring and the green belt to enable traffic having its origin or destination within the town to find its way to or from the surrounding main roads without passing through the centre or residential neighbourhoods.

Paragraph 103.

The main radial roads and the outer and inner rings should be designed as free-flow traffic channels, buildings on their frontages not having individual access to them. The areas bounded by the radial and ring roads should be so laid out as not, by providing shorter routes, to attract any through traffic, and the roads within these precincts should connect with the main roads only at a limited number of points. Subject to this necessary discouragement of the movement of through traffic across the precincts, the internal layout should be such as to provide for easy vehicular access between all parts of the town. It is not good planning to force needless detours on motorists and pedestrians, or to introduce twists and turns that make it difficult to find the way about.

INDUSTRY, TRADING ESTATE FACILITIES AND COMMERCE

Paragraph 120.

We have already emphasised that not only factory industries, but businesses mainly employing clerical staffs, and governmental and other administrative offices, should be encouraged to come. Many such businesses could conveniently and economically be carried on in a new town, even if they have to be linked with a large centre and maintain part of their establishments there. Manufacturers who have sales and export departments may well find a new town a suitable place for these

as well as for production. The attraction to the town of businesses with office staffs will be influenced by the policy, to which we have referred, of providing amenities satisfying to people of all incomes and interests.

Paragraph 121.

The agency should provide or arrange for the provision of suitable office buildings on rental. Most of these should be in the main business centre, but some firms may prefer the industrial zones. Some offices, as we suggest later, could be in the upper storeys over shops and other commercial buildings. They should have good natural lighting, central heating, lifts, and all the other conveniences of first-class office buildings in cities.

Paragraph 122.

There will in any case be many commercial and professional businesses serving the local community. Among these may be mentioned banks, insurance agencies, building societies, estate agencies, typing and secretarial bureaux, photographers, advertising agencies, solicitors, accountants, architects, and other professional firms. For some professions and for local commercial businesses, office space will be required; in a few cases they will need ground floor premises in shopping streets. Certain professions such as those of doctors and dentists may without detriment to residential amenities be carried on in private houses; but even for these some central premises would be needed. The agency should adjust its building programme to this demand.

PLACES OF REFRESHMENT AND HOTELS

Paragraph 201.

The reputation of a town is materially affected by the service which its restaurants and hotels offer to visitors. The new towns will, from their nature, have few if any historical associations to attract the curious; but the great social adventure which they will embody, the fulfilment of their architectural possibilities, and the development of their industries should arouse a world-wide interest. It is therefore important for our national reputation and for the citizens themselves, that these towns should seek to revive all that is best in our traditional hospitality, and should, at the same time, enrich that tradition with much that other countries have to teach about the art of good living. Visitors to the new towns should at once be aware of courteous and efficient service in attractive surroundings, and of good food skilfully prepared. As soon as the development of a town permits there should be plentiful accommodation at various levels of expense with a proper range of menu and amenity.

Paragraph 203.

A variety of restaurants to suit differing tastes and purses will be essential. The tendency and exigency of the time continually increase the habit of eating out. Hired domestic labour is unlikely ever to become as plentiful as it once was, and women naturally want to take what respite they can afford from work in the home. War-time experiences have strengthened the impulse to escape from the necessity of preparing and clearing up every meal in the week. Some of the restaurants should be open in the evenings and on Sundays.

* * *

Paragraph 207.

The provision of food and drink should be regarded as one of the minor arts of social life. Places of refreshment (restaurants, inns, etc.) will vary in character, in size and in the type of refreshment served, but all should provide both food and drink. Some, and particularly those in the centre of the town, should have terraces where customers can watch the activities of the streets. Some should have gardens, either ornamental or equipped with bowling greens, skittle alleys or other forms of recreation. Some should provide music, a dance floor, or facilities for indoor games. Refreshment houses of this kind will do much to break down the barrier of shyness that newcomers to a town are apt to feel, and to provide a background against which the more highly organised forms of social activity can develop. There may, of course, be proprietors of cafes and restaurants who do not wish to serve alcoholic drinks, and there should naturally be no obligation on them to do so. But any restaurant serving substantial meals should be able to obtain a licence without difficulty; and, conversely, no lease should be granted to a house which does not provide food in some form.

The Corporation must annually submit to Parliament its accounts and a Report of its activities.

D.W.

4th March, 1955.

SENATE CANBERRA COMMITTEE

FREDERICK EDWARD TOWNDROW, Dean of the Faculty of
Architecture and Building, New South Wales University of Technology,
Sworn and Examined:

PROFESSOR TOWNDROW: Mr. Chairman and Members of the Senate Select Committee, it was suggested that I should speak on the new towns of England. I have not had time to prepare a comprehensive statement or to study other aspects of your very important inquiry. I am primarily an architect with an interest in town planning, particularly the development of garden cities, as they used to be called. Recently I visited one or two of the new towns of England and I was very much impressed by the progress they had made over the last five years. I cannot deal with them fully but I shall mention one or two matters of general interest and one or two which may have some relevance to your consideration of future policy for the development of Canberra.

I commend to the attention of the Committee the reports of the New Towns Committee ~~of~~ which Professor Winston ^{has referred to} ~~provided~~ ~~precis~~. As you know, there are fourteen new towns now being built in Great Britain, twelve of them in England and Wales, and two in Scotland: eight of them are within a radius of twenty to thirty miles from the centre of London; one, Cwmbran, is in Wales; one, Corby in the eastern Midlands; and two are in the north of England. The optimum planned population of these ~~towns~~ vary from 50,000 to 80,000 people.

Their world importance as a social and architectural development can hardly be over-estimated. In the long history of mankind and throughout the world the building of towns should have been a planned or at least a carefully thought out process. The town is an essential and important part of life, yet, with one or two exceptions, thousands and thousands of towns have been built in a haphazard way, and left to grow or decay without any real appreciation of their needs. It might seem as if it is only recently that

mankind has acquired the knowledge and technique for consciously planning and constructing the organic environment known as a town.

Thus, interested people such as politicians, townplanners, architects, engineers and administrators are coming from all over the world, even from the U.S.A., to see the new towns of England and note the way that they are developing. Most of them were started from four to six years ago. Already some of them are nearly half built.

The new towns vary considerably in their original circumstances. Some like Corby are expansions of former schemes for a new town and are related to large industrial developments, which were already in being. For instance, at Hatfield there is a growing concentration of the aircraft industry. New Hemel Hempstead is a triumph of tactful organisation which will incorporate and surround an old town which had already a proud history and an important range of industry employing 7,000 people. Stevenage has the nucleus of an older town, while Crawley has two small nuclei, namely old Crawley and Three Bridges. Harlow was open country except for two or three hamlets. Welwyn Garden City perhaps offers a parallel with the present needs of Canberra for here, before the war, was the important new satellite city already well planned and more than half built. All the main planning had been firmly established; an urban district Council had been installed. It was then a question of "filling in" and more rapid expansion. In order to accelerate and simplify the process, a Development Corporation was formed. This corporation also deals with the development of near-by Hatfield.

The eight new towns around London are part of the plan for moving people and factories from the overcrowded areas of the metropolis. Sir Patrick Abercrombe in the Greater London plan proposed that one and a quarter million people should move out of London. Of these, 800,000 were to move to existing and smaller towns in the country, which would be accomplished by the controlled location of industry; and 350,000 people were to be accommodated in the new towns which were specially to be built. A total of 100,000 people

was generally regarded as the limit for any new town, and when the pre-planned limits had been reached further towns were to be planned and developed. It is ~~not~~ possible that Britain will plan and build further new towns.

Each town is to be self-sufficient for modern living. It will contain places for work, for living, for education and all that goes to make a full life, with shops, parks, public houses and places of amusement and recreation as well as wide range of industrial and commercial activity for different sorts of people of different ages and capacities.

Generally, the new towns are "polynuclear". That is, they consist of a combination of five or more carefully planned townships. Each township or "neighbourhood" is like a little town in itself of about 10,000 people. Each one has its own schools, shops, churches, meeting hall, hotels, and service industry up to a certain level of service. The heavier industry will be grouped in certain locations as related to the town as a whole. In some plans, each small township is surrounded by a narrow ribbon or belt of parkland and ~~at~~ the centre of the whole scheme is the headquarters township, or town centre, which will contain the main administrative buildings such as the big stores, the main hotels, the town hall, a museum, the theatre and possibly a technical college and a college of university rank as well as blocks of flats and the special shops such as Art and Music shops which can only exist upon a large population.

The legal, financial and administrative machinery for these new towns was established by the New Towns Act of 1946. Each town is under the direction of a separate New Town Development Corporation. Each is an independent body answerable to Parliament through the Minister of Housing and Local Government. ^{the} Development Corporation has to satisfy the Minister that it is doing a good and economical job, and it presents to him annually a detailed report under a number of specified headings such as progress, planning and design, civil engineering, building and construction, land acquisition and disposals, administration, population, recreation, finance and accounts with

detailed balance sheets.

A New Town Development Corporation is specially called into being to do what its name implies: to build a new town. That, in itself, is a very big job, and it concentrates on that job. It may be likened to a new kind of contracting organisation, under Government auspices, which has a definite job to do within a certain time in planning, design, construction, housing and the creation of civic and architectural amenities so that people can work and live in a healthy, and happy environment.

It has not necessarily the functions of a local authority. During the initial stages of development it may have to assume certain of those functions or collaborate with an existing local authority, but the intention is that it shall hand over completed sections to an elected local authority as soon as possible. When the town is finished the Corporation will be dissolved and the elected local authority will carry on.

Apart from executive staff, each corporation consists of a Chairman who is often someone distinguished in the fields of architecture, building or civil engineering, and five or six Board Members. One of these might be an expert on estate development, one ~~is~~ a prominent accountant, and one the Chairman of the County or local authority.

The chief executive officers generally consist of general manager, consulting architect and town planner, chief executive architect, chief engineer, estate officer and/or solicitor, chief finance officer, housing manager and public relations officer.

The corporation operates like a private company, it must be self-supporting and must not eventually show a loss. It has to borrow all its money from the Treasury at the prevailing rate of interest (4%) as laid down for public loans. The loans are amortised over a period of 60 years and interest and part repayments of principal are paid annually just as they would be to a bank. The corporation receives no government subsidies except the housing subsidy of £35 per house per annum which is payable to all local authorities

undertaking housing work of this kind. For industrial and commercial land and buildings sold outright as freehold, or leasehold, or let to tenants, the corporation may work on a safe margin of profit. It may also sell land to individuals or build houses for varying income groups or sell land to speculative builders whose designs must be approved. It may sell land to the local authority for the building of subsidised houses or local offices, or sell land to all appropriate county and national authorities for them to build schools, clinics, post offices and libraries.

Thus, though the corporation will design and let the great majority of contracts for building, there is a great deal of flexibility in the methods of disposal of land and the actual construction of the buildings. For instance, the industrialist may buy the land and build his own factory to approved designs by his architects, or he may finance the building which will be designed and built specially for him by the Corporation; or he may buy or rent part or whole of a standard type of factory building which the corporation itself builds "on spec".

Moreover the Corporation will encourage house purchase by offering generous mortgage facilities, such as 10% deposit, with repayment over 25 years with interest at $4\frac{1}{2}$ % per annum.

In regard to subsidised housing, the following statement by Crawley Development Corporation may be of interest. There is skilful architectural control throughout the whole town. I do not remember seeing any unsightly buildings:

Under the New Towns Act of 1946, the Corporation is given a number of instructions which are imposed upon it by the Act of Parliament. These are as follows:-

1. It has to borrow from the Treasury all the money required for the building of Crawley, including the building of houses, and for this money it pays the rate of interest laid down by the Government for public loans. The same rate of interest has to be paid by all local

authorities in the country for the money which they borrow to build local authority houses.

2. Each separate development, whether it is factories or houses, must be self-supporting. As far as the houses are concerned, the Corporation must build them so that they show no profit and no loss, and under these conditions they are eligible to receive housing subsidies at the national level. At present, each house receives a subsidy of £35:12:0 per annum.

3. The Corporation is allowed to average the rents for its houses, and those which have greater advantages or amenities, such as corner houses, have a slightly higher rent; those with not quite such a good view or position a lower rent.

While the Corporation has no power to vary the rate of interest on the money it borrows, or to build houses which show a financial loss, there are many things which it can do which affect the ultimate rent of the houses it builds. The headings of matters which affect cost are as follows:-

- A. The layout of the town as a whole.
- B. The layout of each neighborhood.
- C. The construction, width, paving and amenities of roads and verges.
- D. The density of houses: that is, the size of the plot of land on which they are built.
- E. The design of the houses.
- F. The specification; that is, the type of materials used for floors, roofs, doors and other parts of the building.
- G. Alternative methods of construction.
- H. The size and type of contract let to builders.

The first factor in producing an economic town in which to live is to ensure that the factories

SENATE CANBERRA COMMITTEE

shops, amusements, railway and bus stations are within easy reach of the houses, and that they are so placed that they do not unnecessarily spread out the total area of the town with an unnecessary length of roads and approaches. From the moment when the first master plan of Crawley was laid out, the effect of this group planning upon the ultimate rent of houses was realised, and the town pattern of Crawley, closely examined, has proved to be extremely economic in the placing of all the principal groups of buildings in the town.

The layout of each neighborhood has been so arranged that wherever possible the schools and large open spaces are on the borders of the housing development, and not such as to cause an expansion of the area as a whole. The houses are planned as compactly as possible, with short distances to travel to the shops

(Continued on page 725)

and the town centre."

"The width, construction and layout of the roads has been studied in great detail with the county councils, and each road has been adjusted in width and strength to suit the traffic it carries. Certain houses have been approached by footpaths and are built around small cul-de-sacs or squares, to secure the greatest possible economy of roads. Early roads had open verges which look attractive but are costly to keep up and deprive many tenants of the front gardens they would like, so that later roads have a small proportion of open verges and a large proportion of front gardens.

The number of houses placed on an acre of land affects the rent, and it is necessary to make a decision which keeps a just balance between the size of garden which the tenant would like and the rent he can afford to pay. The subsidies of houses in Crawley vary between 10 and 15 to the acre.

Good house planning provides for a wide choice of houses. Sizes have been varied substantially so that a tenant can choose a house to suit the rent he can afford to pay. The living space is in one large room in some houses, and in two rooms in others, with very considerable variations in the way in which it can be approached and used. The elevations of the houses have been carefully designed to provide wide variety of appearance and attractiveness. Some have bay windows and other features which give variety to Crawley as a whole.

Over 6,000 tenants and their relations have been questioned to ascertain the type of house in which they would like to live and the details of construction which appeal to the greatest number. These opinions have been carefully recorded, and are used as the basis of the design of houses at all times. The Corporation believes that there are no possible headings in planning, design, specification or detail which they have not traversed with the very greatest care in providing good houses at low rents."

SENATE CANBERRA COMMITTEE

"With the experience of the houses already constructed in front of them, and the expressed requirements of the tenants, the architects and engineers have continually reviewed their designs to get closer and closer to the houses and rents which people want.

In letting contracts the corporation has taken tenders for different sized groups of houses, ranging from under 30 to over 1,000. There has been opportunity, therefore, for the Corporation to compare the prices tendered by both small and large builders and to examine the economics of running contracts of different sizes. Contracts have been let by competitive tender and by negotiated tender, and every avenue has been searched to find the cheapest method of building."

Here follows a schedule of comparable weekly rents: rents for a typical three-bedroomed house range from 24/- to 32/- p.w. inclusive of rates and water.

As an example of the working of a new town we could examine the 7th Annual Report of the Crawley Development Corporation, for the year 1st April, 1953, to 31st March, 1954, as submitted to the Minister of Housing and Local Government and, with the similar reports from the other eleven towns, ordered to be printed by the House of Commons 26th July, 1954. I may say that the Crawley Report is a very fine piece of drafting and gives a very good idea of the developments that have taken place in that area.

Crawley has a special interest for me because I lived and worked near there at one time before the new town was thought of, and the Chairman of the Corporation, Sir Thomas Bennett, is an architect and was a war-time colleague of mine at the Ministry of Works, London. He visited Australia two years ago. There is another reason for my interest and it is this: that in its location it is rather like Canberra: it was a virgin site, and there seemed to be no particular reason why it should be there rather than anywhere else. It is not even on a main railway line, and as inducement of industry is considered to be the mainspring of new town development, its

location, south of London, half way between London, and Brighton, a seaside resort, seemed most inauspicious. New industry near London, with its necessary transport movements, has looked to London as a market and as a port, but at the same time many industries must link with Birmingham and the industrial Midlands and North for the supply of components and materials. Thus hitherto nearly all the new factories have been north or northwest of London. Yet Crawley was sited south, in the heart of beautiful country and with no industrial link or port or market in that part of England, except London.

I was agreeably surprised when I visited Crawley last Autumn to find that a fine new city was being conjured up out of the blue: that in spite of all foreboding many large and handsome factories had been built and were in full production and that the demand for factories and factory space was growing as fast as the capacity to provide them. One must obtain a very different idea of industrial development these days. In the old days we associated grime, dirt and noise with industrial areas. Some of the new areas have been splendidly planned and are a great asset to the districts in which they are situated. Moreover, many of the workers are now better educated, and the managers and directors have modern ideas about factories. There are now a total of 33 factories building or nearly completed providing a total of 1,200,000 sq. ft. and employing over 5,000 people. And this with about 4,000 houses, and many shops, schools and community buildings completed as well as 25 miles of roads and sewers and services, and with a population that is now 20,000, is I submit very remarkable progress for a place which only a few years ago was green fields and a small railway station on a branch line. The population of Canberra, a capital city, has only reached 28,000 odd.

The Crawley report has the following sections: 1. Summary of progress. 2. Statistical comparison. 3. Planning and Design. 4. Civil Engineering. 5. Building. 6. Land Acquisition and Disposals. 7. Administration. 8. Recreation. 9. Staff organization. 10. Finance and Accounts, this latter is the largest section and contains

SENATE CANBERRA COMMITTEE

many detailed schedules and itemised accounts as well as balance sheet and general revenue account. This accounting gives some idea of the thoroughness with which the project is pursued. It is run like an efficient and successful business, [Not a small part of the success is due to active and skilful public relations. In persuading industry to enter the town the procedure is not only to ask the directors of the firm to look around first but also their wives, then the management and their wives, and in due course the families of the work people come in for the day and are shown the sort of houses, the shops and other facilities they will have. When the factory is ready and the move takes place of the work people, in batches, everything is made ready for them. A proportion of houses is built for the children of work people.

There are already over 200 social clubs and organizations in Crawley to cater for the many social interests which people have. In the location of industry it seems that the social amenities and the wives of the directors and workmen have more to do with it than stark economics. ^{It is said that} ~~the fact of~~ ^{location} ~~hourne~~, when considering the development of a certain industry ^{deductors} ~~is~~, asked first of all for the location of the nearest golf course.

In regard to Canberra, what are the chief lessons we may learn from these developments in England? There are many matters of detailed organization and procedure which will repay further examination. But may I make one or two bald suggestions? For the development of such a big undertaking as Canberra it needs a body that will concentrate the whole time on the job. It should be self-supporting, financially independent, and with full powers to do the job on hand. It should report to Parliament through one Minister. It could be similar in powers and functions to a British new town development corporation. Its job and its mission in life should be positive, not just to be there whenever it is wanted. It should build up Canberra, in every sense, as rapidly as possible.

It must have its own competent full-time staff such as general manager, architects, engineers, surveyors, estate management, and public relations officers. Though it would have the final decision

SENATE CANBERRA COMMITTEE

on all matters of planning and architectural control it would allow the greatest possible freedom to outside architects and planners. Its chief executive architect should not attempt to design all the buildings himself, but rather he should set down certain guiding principles of design for the different areas, such as height, scale, style, materials and landscaping. He should strive for variety within an overall harmony. Thus one district could have a prevailing architectural character and another district a somewhat different character. There is too much sameness in the road plan of Canberra. It was originally drawn with an architect's compass, and it now requires a mariners compass to find your way around it.

Perhaps it might be a good idea to have a controlling or consulting architect for each district to advise on the details of street planning and architectural design. This is what they did after the first world war in Amsterdam. Perhaps they already do that in Canberra.

Every effort should be made to make Canberra into an organic living city and not just an abiding place for politicians, ambassadors, public servants and records. Even public servants have children, and there should be a life for them in the future at Canberra. For them there should be a greater variety of employment and a greater variety of social life and contacts. Only a few of them will want to be public servants or to marry public servants. Inbreeding is not good for a young country.

A city is not something that consists of roads, and a pattern on paper that would look good from an aeroplane. The most fascinating city in the world, Venice, has no roads at all, though it has a few waterways. Roads are a means for getting from one place to another in the quickest possible time and I do not know whether Canberra is good in that respect. It is buildings plus roads that make a noble organic city, not miles ^{and miles} of roads plus some isolated buildings.

People live on the ground, and in cities the visual environment consists of buildings and trees and shrubs. It is the arrangement

SENATE CANBERRA COMMITTEE

and harmony between these buildings that matters, especially the lower parts of the buildings - because most people hardly ever look up. Our buildings should give them something interesting to look at. According to the latest census returns the population of Australia has increased by one and a half millions over the last seven years, and is increasing at the rate of over 200,000 per year. What have we done in the last seven years to house these 1½ million people? Britain with a population that is almost static is building fourteen new towns. *[Slightly related to your enquiry there is another matter.]* The pro-rata increase of population in Australia is probably the highest in the world. For sheer need Australia is the place where they should be building new towns, rather than England. Canberra should be the great opportunity to show to all Australians how it can be done. How are we going to house the two million that will arrive during the next ten years? They can't all add themselves to the swollen streets of Sydney and Melbourne. We want a hundred new towns or planned expansions of older towns. The new city of Canberra can set the ball rolling.

In regard to matters of more detail for those who are interested, I have ^{the} statements of accounts and costs ^{of the towns.} All the towns that I have mentioned are well run, and produce a feeling of well-being in those who enter them. I show the Committee a plan of Crawley which indicates clearly the form of the town. I also refer the Committee to ^{Harold Hampstead} another town which had a considerable history ^{before} the ~~Development~~ ^{Development} Corporation was formed. There was great difficulty in modernising that town, but the ~~local~~ corporation obtained the necessary power to acquire the older property. The acquisition of that property and the building of new buildings needed very ^{tactful} ~~practical~~ handling. Moreover, a local authority had to be absorbed by the new authority and parts of the old town remodelled.

SENATE CANBERRA COMMITTEE.

THE CHAIRMAN: With regard to the corporations, I understand Lord Reith's committee which investigated the matter in 1946 considered seven or eight types of alternative organisations before deciding on this one?

PROFESSOR TOWNDRROW: Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: When that was put in the 1946 Act, was it considered fairly satisfactory or have there been amendments?

PROFESSOR TOWNDRROW: I have heard no criticism of the method although there may have been detail criticisms of which I have not heard.

THE CHAIRMAN: Can you tell us roughly the number of members of each corporation?

PROFESSOR TOWNDRROW: There is a chairman and five or six members, although in one case there are four members. In many instances, the chairman himself is a technical man.

THE CHAIRMAN: Can the chairman over-ride the committee in cases of differences of opinion or does he have to abide by a majority vote?

PROFESSOR TOWNDRROW: I do not know that.

THE CHAIRMAN: Do you know the method by which responsibility is enforced? Is a corporation directly under the Minister or does it have statutory powers unalterable by the Minister?

PROFESSOR TOWNDRROW: The form of the corporation is laid down in the Act of 1946. The corporation is answerable to the Minister and the Minister has power to make variations, generally speaking, on matters of policy. In regard to what is known as a designated area, the acquisition of land, a proposal has to go to the Minister for his approval. There would be first of all a designated area, which is ~~practically the whole town~~ ^{necessary for the future}, but variations of the extent of that area go to the Minister for his approval. Also, in regard to the basic master plan, that would be approved by the Minister. There is also a certain amount of detailed matter that is approved by the Minister and his officials but the broad intention is that there should be as little interference as possible.

With Committee

The following extracts from one of the reports may give some information on that point.

" We regard it as essential that the agency chosen should have no other responsibility.

" In our opinion a government sponsored public corporation financed by the Exchequer is, in general, the most suitable agency.

" We assume that such a corporation will be invested with sufficient powers to enable it to carry out its task free from the administrative control and consequent interference which are necessarily associated with full and direct government responsibility.

" The appropriate Minister (. . .) should have power to give such directions as he may from time to time consider necessary in the public interest in any matter of major policy.

" Subject to that, the corporation must have freedom of action comparable with that of a commercial undertaking."

THE CHAIRMAN: Do you think that we should not aim at too big a city for our National Capital, say 100,000?

PROFESSOR TOWNDROW: I could not be precise about that but I should think rather more than 100,000 would be a reasonable figure for a federal capital. In fact I should think that 200,000 would not be unreasonable but beyond that a city begins to lose a tremendous amount *as an easy place to live in.*

THE CHAIRMAN: I had the impression that we did not need to worry about the size and that once the population had reached a certain figure by the transfer of public servants, the city would continue to attract population of its own accord?

PROFESSOR TOWNDROW: That is what I was trying to say in regard to Crawley. Once the pump is primed it seems to go on pumping by itself.

SENATE CANBERRA COMMITTEE.

THE CHAIRMAN: Would you agree that the major trouble in Australia today is not urban growth, because there must be urban growth, but the growth in every State of one large city at the expense of the others?

PROFESSOR TOWNDROW: Yes, that is a matter that concerns us all and particularly Governments. Although ~~it~~ ^{Canberra} is not a typical example of new town development, the kind of psychological stimulus it would give would probably work for other new towns.

THE CHAIRMAN: If Canberra were to be controlled by a corporation would you suggest, in addition to the corporation, a kind of fine arts committee to deal with such matters as good architecture, public parks, and artistic features of the city, or would you leave that to the corporation?

PROFESSOR TOWNDROW: Broadly, I would favour such an advisory body. If it could be advisory to the corporation rather than directly advisory to say the government, it would be a more tactful way of doing it. Otherwise a lot of unnecessary friction might be set up.

THE CHAIRMAN: One of the main complaints about Canberra is that, except for the main shopping centres, one cannot buy anything anywhere. Do you favour the provision of little corner shops to supply everyday necessities that are frequently forgotten when shopping and perhaps such things as sweets for children?

PROFESSOR TOWNDROW: Yes. I think that is an ~~almost~~ essential part of planning.

THE CHAIRMAN: One of the joys of life of the small child is spending his pocket money at the corner shop. That appears to be one of the humanizing influences Canberra lacks.

SENATOR HANNAFORD: You consider that, in the development of Canberra, better results could be achieved by a corporation on the English lines than have been achieved under the present system of administration by virtually two Government Departments?

PROFESSOR TOWNDROW: I do, most definitely, provided of course that the corporation is vested with the necessary powers and

responsibility to do its job.

SENATOR HANNAFORD: In England, there is separate corporation for each town?

PROFESSOR TOWNDRON: Yes.

SENATOR HANNAFORD: Those corporations are achieving results in England that are being denied to Australia's National Capital?

PROFESSOR TOWNDRON: Exactly. Although some of those schemes have been in existence for only four or six years, some towns are already more than half built. In that short time they have reached population figures greater than that of Canberra.

SENATOR HANNAFORD: Is there any criticism of those towns from the general public in England?

PROFESSOR TOWNDRON: I have heard no major criticisms at all. I understand that some friction has arisen in certain instances, very often with existing local authorities established in a town such as Hemel Hempstead. However, when I visited there, I inquired about that matter and I was informed that the authorities were working together very well.

SENATOR HANNAFORD: Do you know anything of the satellite town that is being built about 20 miles from Adelaide between Adelaide and Gawler, by the South Australian Housing Trust?

PROFESSOR TOWNDRON: I have heard of it and I would certainly like to find out more about it.

SENATOR HANNAFORD: Would the English towns that you have mentioned be in the category of satellite towns or are they largely dependent on their own resources for their existence?

PROFESSOR TOWNDRON: They are dependent on their own resources for their own existence financially and in other respects. They are self-supporting and they try to attract industries. However, six of them are satellite towns in relation to London and that was their original purpose but they seem to be developing a separate existence. In some respects, the original intention that they should relieve some of the pressure on London is only partly being achieved.

SENATE CANBERRA COMMITTEE.

In many instances they are becoming places for new industries and new developments.

SENATOR RYAN: The population density in Canberra is very low compared with that of other Australian cities. What are the reasons for that?

PROFESSOR TOWNDROW: It is rather difficult to answer that. Generally speaking, population densities are somewhat lower in Australia than they are in similar developments elsewhere in the world. The Australian apparently likes a somewhat larger area of land than the average British man ~~likes~~. But in regard to Canberra, I think the ^{original} concept was that it should be expansive. I say "expansive" and I might also add "expensive". Whether such a spread can ever be justified economically I very much doubt. I also doubt whether it is necessary. Not every man wants a large piece of land to look after.

SENATOR RYAN: Do you think that the style of home building in Canberra contributes to the low population density?

PROFESSOR TOWNDROW: As I have said, in Canberra there is a conception that is both expansive and expensive. Apparently the habits of living of the Australian are such that, generally speaking, he wants a one-storey individual house standing on its own piece of ground. Just how deep that desire goes I do not know. It is often argued that it is very fundamental to the Australian because, in many other countries, people do build more compactly. In England, for instance, quite good classes of people would live in terrace houses. Even well educated workers are quite happy in four or six unit buildings, perhaps in a ^{quadrangular close} ~~cul-de-sac~~ which of course occupies very much less space than individual buildings. They prefer it that way. Whether we could get Australians to come round to a more compact form of living I do not know but it is worth trying.

SENATOR RYAN: You would advocate the erection of such buildings?

^{Yes - but}
PROFESSOR TOWNDROW: I would only do so cautiously.

SENATE CANBERRA COMMITTEE

SENATOR RYAN: To improve the population density in Canberra it would be necessary to restrict house allotments?

PROFESSOR TOWNDRON: I do not know what the density is but I should not think it would be much more than six to the acre.

SENATOR HANNAFORD: I think it is eight and is expected to rise to 25.

PROFESSOR TOWNDRON: In the new towns of England and in many other developments, there is more variety. There may be a cul de sac of houses which faces on a small green. There are perhaps 20 or 30 houses comprising a little square. They may be in blocks of from 2 to 6 and the people like it that way. It is very pleasant, architecturally. Nearby, there may be houses more spread out, occupied by higher income group people. Then you may get as at Harlow, one very tall block of flats standing out like a pinnacle, and occupied by young married people without children and perhaps elderly people who do not want the burden of a garden.

(Continued on page 737)

SENATOR VINCENT: You recommended an endeavour to construct Canberra as an "organic living city". How could we achieve that?

PROFESSOR TOWNDRROW: I think that it must be allowed to grow with a certain amount of encouragement. The encouragement of certain industry in Canberra would result, not only in the production of a greater variety of goods in Canberra, but in the attraction of a greater variety of individuals to the city.

SENATOR VINCENT: Is that what you meant when you said that we should endeavour to develop Canberra as an "organic living city"?

PROFESSOR TOWNDRROW: That would be the mainspring of the scheme. There would be other phases of it. For instance, the establishment of ^{an} an electronics industry would necessitate the development of the technical school in order to provide appropriate instruction for those who would work in the industry, *and soon new and interesting individuals would come into the community.*

SENATOR VINCENT: Do you not think that there would be an outcry from the other manufacturers of Australia if the Federal Government were to encourage secondary industry in Canberra?

PROFESSOR TOWNDRROW: I am not qualified to judge that matter. But industry is expanding at such a rate in Australia that there should be very little jealousy.

SENATOR VINCENT: Do you not consider that industrialists who had been encouraged to establish secondary industry in Canberra which was not directly related to the development of that city would be placed in a much more favourable position vis a vis his colleagues in other cities?

PROFESSOR TOWNDRROW: Do you mean in a political sense?

SENATOR VINCENT: I do not think that politics can be dissociated from economics.

PROFESSOR TOWNDRROW: It seems to me that that question could only be answered by experience.

SENATOR VINCENT: Have the new towns of England all been planned with a definite objective?

SENATE CANBERRA COMMITTEE

PROFESSOR TOWNDRROW: Their main purpose is to provide happy and healthy employment for human beings.

SENATOR VINCENT: But would you not also say that the aim is to establish industries?

PROFESSOR TOWNDRROW: Only insofar as industry is an essential aspect of human endeavour.

SENATOR VINCENT: But their problem is a little different from that of establishing a Federal capital?

PROFESSOR TOWNDRROW: I admit that. It seems to me that we have to ask in what way we can get the best Federal capital *the best for everybody*.

SENATOR VINCENT: Would you say that we lack an aim in relation to the establishment of the City of Canberra?

PROFESSOR TOWNDRROW: We do lack an aim because we have not a clear picture of what a fine, living city should be like. *And our former Canberra must be the administrative headquarters for the whole of Australia. That is its main job but more variety may help it in that job.*

SENATOR VINCENT: And a cultural centre.

PROFESSOR TOWNDRROW: Yes. The main purpose of Canberra is to be the city of the Federal Government. In order that it shall be a living city a number of other features must come into the picture. *But* the purpose of being the headquarters of Government *too much* obtrudes itself as the dominant factor.

SENATOR VINCENT: What would be wrong with encouraging the growth of industry, which, in many respects is desirable, at Queanbeyan?

PROFESSOR TOWNDRROW: There is a lot to be said for that idea. Certain ancilliary industries could be located at such places as Queanbeyan and Yass. They could feed the *smallest* most important industries in Canberra.

SENATOR VINCENT: What type of industry should we encourage and what type should we exclude?

PROFESSOR TOWNDRROW: It seems to me that the law of supply and demand would largely indicate the industries that should come to Canberra.

SENATE CANBERRA COMMITTEE

SENATOR VINCENT: But even if the growth is not planned -

it must be planned.
PROFESSOR TOWNDRON: A certain number of service industries would be required in the first place. Then ^{the} processing of foods would be needed for the Canberra market. When those industries had been established consideration could be given to the kind of industry that would be related to them and which would be to the advantage of Canberra. At that stage the authorities would have had enough experience in the selection of industries to command the situation. *They may then have to call a halt.*

SENATOR VINCENT: Would you say that it would be preferable to encourage the establishment of a boot factory at Canberra or Queanbeyan?

PROFESSOR TOWNDRON: I should not like to answer that question. In the first instance, it might not be considered necessary to the development of Canberra but, later on, it might be a good industry to have.

SENATOR VINCENT: You have referred to the desirability of constructing more compact dwellings. Do you maintain that we should foster the development of compact dwelling areas?

PROFESSOR TOWNDRON: Not as a whole. For the sake of variety of interest there should be different types of dwelling.

SENATOR VINCENT: Do you suggest that we should endeavour to change the Australian attitude which favours large blocks of land surrounding dwellings?

PROFESSOR TOWNDRON: I suggest that the experiment is worth trying.

SENATOR VINCENT: You think that it more desirable to use less land?

PROFESSOR TOWNDRON: Not as a whole. It takes all sorts to make a world and it will take all sorts to make Canberra. We need more variety. It might be possible for Canberra to have a number of separate districts or neighborhood units. In their centre, these neighborhood units would have their own subsidiary shops, a meeting

SENATE CANBERRA COMMITTEE

hall, a branch library and other facilities for the average housewife to obtain the things that she wants quickly. Some of the planning might be more compact in the centre of the neighborhood unit. There could be compact plans for the shops. Closes might be built, especially for people without children so as to provide a certain amount of interest. As in other towns, it will be necessary to find out what the people want but the administration must also try to educate them.

SENATOR VINCENT: Would you say that we could improve our general standard of domestic architecture in Canberra?

PROFESSOR TOWNDRON: It is quite good; but certain parts of the city could be better.

SENATOR VINCENT: Is there any way of arriving at a typical Australian House?

PROFESSOR TOWNDRON: It is doubtful whether we can develop architecture that is typically Australian although some of the more intelligent designers have attempted to build houses which are suited to Australian conditions.

SENATOR VINCENT: Could we evolve a typical Australian single storey house for Canberra?

PROFESSOR TOWNDRON: Some houses that I have seen in Canberra are on a high level, judged on world standards.

SENATOR VINCENT: Are they suited to Canberra?

PROFESSOR TOWNDRON: I think so. But there are tendencies to copy overseas fashion such as the use of large areas of glass which are not suitable for this climate.

SENATOR VINCENT: Do you consider that Canberra should have a main shopping centre; or should we attempt to disperse shopping centres so that there will be no one main shopping centre?

PROFESSOR TOWNDRON: I think that both are needed. A city, like many other forms of organisation, is a hierarchy. From the practical and psychological point of view it is desirable to have a place where women can get that special sort of thing.

SENATOR VINCENT: You do not think that the main shopping centre is merely the result of a main street complex?

PROFESSOR TOWNDRON: I don't think so. People like to be able to go to a big ^{and occasional} place and compare one thing with another.