

**Attachment E**  
**2001 Heritage Study of the South East Wing of Old Parliament House**

**OLD PARLIAMENT HOUSE**

**HERITAGE STUDY OF THE  
SOUTH EAST WING**

**SUPPLEMENTING THE OLD PARLIAMENT HOUSE  
CONSERVATION MANAGEMENT PLAN**

**Prepared by Michael Pearson (Heritage Management Consultants Pty Ltd),  
Duncan Marshall, and Brendan O'Keefe**

**For the Department of Communications, Information  
Technology and the Arts**

**August 2001**

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The South East Wing is a significant component of Old Parliament House which is, overall, a place of outstanding heritage values. The Wing makes a significant contribution to these heritage values in the following ways.

- The South East Wing is historically significant as a major surviving physical expression of the continuous expansion of Parliament over the 61 years of its occupation of the building. The increasing incorporation of executive functions in the building is highlighted in the Wing because of its ministerial accommodation function. The 1943 section has close associations with the expansion of ministers responsible for new departments required for war-time operations, seventeen new departments being added during WWII.
- The Wing has some significance as the earlier of the large extensions in the several campaigns which saw the construction of extensions to the four corners of Old Parliament House. The Wing, in retaining much of its internal layout and some fittings, is an evocative and valuable physical record of the working conditions of parliamentarians and staff over the period 1943-88.
- The 1948 extensions of the Wing also demonstrate the increase in the number of members by 60%, which took place in that year. The 1965 section of the Wing reflects the continued growth of ministerial support staff accommodated in OPH, and the desire to provide ordinary members with office accommodation. The physical demonstration of this history of expansion is better demonstrated in the South East Wing than in any other part of Old Parliament House. As the South East Wing provided ministerial and member accommodation, it was integral to the parliamentary operations of the House, rather than just being an overflow accommodation block for staff or other functions.
- The South East Wing provides extensive and relatively intact evidence of the built form of the accommodation provided for Members at various periods, and also extensive evidence of Ministerial accommodation. The latter reflects the increasing presence of Executive Government in the building, and the South East Wing only rivalled the northeast corner of the north wing in terms of the area of Ministerial accommodation provided.
- The South East Wing, as part of Old Parliament House, is strongly associated through personal memories of the occupation of the building with the staff, members and ministers who occupied it. These former occupants constitute a substantial group in the community, and their association with the building constitutes social significance. A number of prominent ministers and members associated with the Wing are figures significant in Australia's history, and their occupation of identified rooms and their work in the Wing has historical significance. These include Dame Enid Lyons, Arthur Calwell, Jack McEwen, W.M. Hughes, J.H. Scullin, Paul Hasluck, Don Chipp, Doug Anthony, and others.
- The Wing has strong associations for those who worked in the building, as well as sharing the overall significance of the Old Parliament House for the broader Australian community.
- The Wing has modest aesthetic qualities relating to its exterior and interiors. The exterior of the Wing expresses in a simplified way the Inter War Stripped Classical style of the original 1927 building, which helps retain the visual unity of the whole

building. The interiors continue this style but also reflect, in some parts, contemporary design ideas.

*The Old Parliament House Conservation Management Plan* (Pearson, Betteridge, O’Keefe, Marshall and Young 2000) establishes a planning framework in which detailed planning is to be carried out for major precincts within the House. This Heritage Study is one of those supplementary detailed planning studies.

The Old Parliament House Conservation Management Plan (CMP) establishes the overarching assessment of significance and development of conservation policy and implementation strategies for the place, and this study is an elaboration and expansion of significance, policy and strategy as it relates specifically to the South East Wing.

A history of the South East Wing provides the basis for an expansion of the statement of significance for that area. The history provides considerable detail of the sequential history of the Wing, in terms of changes fabric and occupants. A detailed physical description of the spaces within the South East Wing is provided. The elaboration of the CMP policies and strategies is provided as a *Commentary* on relevant policies and strategies from the CMP, followed by specific recommended *Actions* to be taken in relation to the South East Wing.

# CONTENTS

<b>Contents</b>	<b>Page Number</b>
<b>Executive Summary</b> .....	i
<b>1. Introduction</b> .....	1
1.1 Background and Planning Context	1
1.2 Authorship	1
1.3 Acknowledgments	2
<b>2. History of the South East Wing</b> .....	3
2.1 Introduction	3
2.2 The 1943 additions	4
2.3 The 1948 additions	10
2.4 The 1965 additions	20
2.5 Conclusion	32
<b>3. Physical Description</b> .....	35
3.1 Building and Wing Courtyard	35
3.2 Furniture and Objects	40
<b>4. Analysis</b> .....	41
4.1 Historical value	41
4.2 Aesthetic value including architecture	42
4.3 Scientific value	44
4.4 Social value	44
<b>5. Statement of Significance</b> .....	45
<b>6. Opportunities and Constraints</b> .....	47
6.1 Implications arising from Significance	47
6.2 OPH Conservation Management Plan Policies	48
6.3 Management’s Requirements and Aspirations	48
6.4 Condition and Integrity	53
<b>7. Implementation of OPH CMP Policies and Strategies</b> .....	56
7.1 Objective	56

7.2	General basis for planning and works	56
7.3	Definitions	57
7.4	Appropriate Uses of the South East Wing	58
7.5	Actions related to Fabric	60
<b>8.</b>	<b>Recommendations.....</b>	<b>64</b>
<b>9.</b>	<b>Bibliography.....</b>	<b>66</b>
<b>Appendix 1</b>	<b>Detailed condition and integrity issues</b>	<b>67</b>

# **1. INTRODUCTION**

## **1.1 BACKGROUND AND PLANNING CONTEXT**

The Old Parliament House Conservation Management Plan (Pearson, Betteridge, O’Keefe, Marshall and Young 2000) envisaged that a series of more detailed heritage studies would be undertaken to supplement detailed planning for the place. This approach was encapsulated as a policy;

**Policy 17** *Heritage Documentation and Planning for Rooms and Courtyards*  
Survey and documentation should be carried out as resources allow for each individual room, and for each group of interrelated rooms and spaces of Old Parliament House, including the courtyards. This documentation should identify specific historical and personal associations, physical characteristics and unusual or significant features, any changes made to the room or space, and should provide implementation strategies for the room or space compatible with conservation management plan policies. Detailed supplementary conservation works plans should be prepared for specific areas of the building prior to conservation or re-use. Such detailed plans should not be undertaken in isolation from an understanding of the building overall.

The Brief for the project establishes the Heritage Study as one of those supplementary detailed planning studies. The South East Wing is a major component of the heritage significance of Old Parliament House, with a distinct history and easily definable boundaries, which makes it a major ‘group of interrelated rooms and spaces’ referred to in Policy 17..

The Old Parliament House Conservation Management Plan (CMP) establishes the overarching assessment of significance and development of conservation policy and implementation strategies for the place, and this study is an elaboration and expansion of significance, policy and strategy as it relates specifically to the South East Wing.

The South East Wing Heritage Study has involved a review of the history of the Wing, a detailed analysis of the fabric, and consultation with a range of stakeholders to determine opportunities and constraints in the management of the Wing. A supplementary statement of significance and a set of implementation actions to give effect to Conservation Management Plan policies and strategies result from this process.

## **1.2 AUTHORSHIP**

The Heritage Study has been developed by the following team of consultants:

- Brendan O’Keefe — research and writing of the history (Chapter 2);

- Duncan Marshall, and Dr Michael Pearson of Heritage Management Consultants PL — oversight of the development of the heritage study and its writing, physical description, assessment of significance, management issues, and development of implementation strategies (Chapters 3, 4, 5, 6, 7,).

### **1.3 ACKNOWLEDGMENTS**

The kind assistance of the following people is gratefully acknowledged.

- Pam Saunders, formerly OPH General Manager
- Sarah Jane Brazil, OPH Heritage Officer, project manager
- Glenda Smith, OPH Manager Visitor Services and Education
- Kate Cowie, OPH Manager, Public Programs
- Steven Fox, Curatorial Manager, OPH
- Michael Richards, Historian, OPH
- Michael Perryman, OPH Manager, Property
- Virginia Anne Lyons, OPH Heritage Assistant / Librarian
- Andrew Sayers, Director, National Portrait Gallery.
- Simon Elliott, Assistant Director, National Portrait Gallery
- Nicolette Dillon, OPH Manager, Corporate Services
- Ian Cochran, OPH Volunteer Guide and former Serjeant-at-Arms and Assistant Clerk, House of Representatives

## **2. HISTORY OF THE SOUTH EAST WING**

### **2.1 Introduction**

As part of the terms on which the Australian colonies agreed to federate on 1 January 1901, the Australian Constitution specified that the seat of federal government was to be located in New South Wales, but not within a 100-mile radius of Sydney. At the time of federation, no site had as yet been fixed upon as the location for the seat of government and, pending a choice of site and its development, federal parliament convened in Melbourne. Towards the end of 1908, the Commonwealth government finally settled on Canberra as the site for the federal capital and in 1911 instituted a worldwide design competition for the layout of the future city. The design that was chosen a year later as the winner out of the 128 entries submitted was that of the Chicago architect, Walter Burley Griffin. Included as a central feature of Griffin's design was a Government Group of buildings with, foremost among it, the nation's legislature or parliament standing astride his Land Axis on the summit of Camp Hill; Kurrajong Hill behind it was reserved as the site for a so-called Capitol building, a ceremonial or cultural centre that Griffin envisaged as symbolising the new nation's spirit and achievements.

Some work on the development of the new city took place in the years before the outbreak of the world war in August 1914 but, as the war dragged on, progress on the work understandably lapsed. A little more than a year after the armistice, however, the Commonwealth government resumed consideration of the practicalities of transferring the seat of government from its temporary home in Melbourne to Canberra. As its centrepiece, the transfer required the erection of a building in which federal parliament could meet. In 1920, the government appointed a special committee, the Federal Capital Advisory Committee, to advise it on how the transfer could be achieved and on the parliament and other necessary buildings that would need to be constructed. Instructed by the government that the transfer was to be effected as quickly and economically as possible, the committee reported that it would take too long to build a permanent parliament house. Instead, if the transfer to Canberra was to be expedited, the committee recommended that a provisional building be erected to serve as the nation's parliament for fifty to one hundred years. Eventually, the government accepted the recommendation and determined that it would be built on the northern slopes of Camp Hill; later, the permanent building would be erected on the crown of the hill in the position Burley Griffin had intended for it, and the provisional building would be demolished. In 1922, the Chief Architect in the Department of Works and Railways, John Smith Murdoch drew up sketch plans for the provisional structure.<sup>1</sup>

Murdoch's sketch plans included on each of the southeastern and southwestern sides of the building a single-storey wing that was partly sunk into the ground. The wings almost completely enclosed narrow garden courtyards that flanked the central section

---

<sup>1</sup> Parliamentary Standing Committee on Public Works [PSCPW], 'Report ... relating to the proposed Erection of Provisional Parliament House, Canberra', Melbourne, Government Printer, 12 July 1923, pp. ix, 80; Federal Capital Advisory Committee, 'First Annual Report', July 1921, pp. 7, 11.

of the building, which comprised the Parliamentary Library and a set of offices on either side of it. This arrangement demonstrated that, contrary to later views, Murdoch's original intention was not to leave the outer side of each courtyard open or unenclosed. As well, the plans showed the proposed southeastern wing as consisting of two sets of offices laid out in a line along each side of a central corridor that ran the length of the wing. The inner (or westerly) set of offices housed the Serjeant-at-Arms' room, a records repository for the House of Representatives, clerical functions and various facilities. The outer (or easterly) set of offices, rather more grand, consisted from north to south of an office for the Clerk of the Papers, the Opposition Party Room, the Opposition Leader's office, the office of the Opposition Whip, the Country Party Room and, side-by-side at the southern end, smaller offices for the Leader of the Country Party and the party's Whip. The wing was provided with a side entrance and small loggia mid-way along its eastern elevation.<sup>2</sup>

Murdoch's plans were considered by the Parliamentary Standing Committee on Public Works in 1923 during its hearings and deliberations on the erection of a provisional parliament house. After briefly toying with the idea of adding upper storeys to each of Murdoch's southeastern and southwestern wings as a means of increasing accommodation in the proposed building, the Committee decided in the end not to proceed with the construction of the wings at all; the rooms that had been included in Murdoch's plans for the wings were re-assigned to other altered and expanded parts of the building. The main reason for the abandonment of the wings was that Members and Senators, after the stuffy and unhealthy conditions they had had to endure in the Parliament House in Melbourne, were anxious to have easy access from the legislative chambers to space and fresh air in the form of open garden courtyards; as noted above, the two wings as depicted by Murdoch almost entirely enclosed the garden courtyards, largely shutting them off from the outside and impeding the flow of air through them.<sup>3</sup> The effect of doing away with the two wings and, at the same time, the sets of offices that Murdoch had proposed on each side of the Library was to make each garden courtyard much larger and completely open on its outer side.

Murdoch's plans for the two wings thus lapsed. But, while the wings did not then come to be erected as part of the original 1927 structure, they remained an option for the future if the need or desire arose to expand the building. Murdoch's scheme for wings on the southeastern and southwestern sides provided a ready-made formula for this expansion, even though the wings when they were eventually built did not precisely conform to his plan.

## 2.2 The 1943 Additions

Indeed, only eleven years after the opening of the building in 1927, Murdoch's plan for the wings was effectively revived. The revival followed trenchant criticism by Senators and Members of overcrowding in the building caused by the housing in it of

---

<sup>2</sup> PSCPW, 'Report ... relating to the proposed Erection of Provisional Parliament House, Canberra', Plan No. 1 (signed by Percy T. Owen, Director General of Works, 26 September 1922) and p. 100.

<sup>3</sup> J.S. Murdoch in evidence to PSCPW, 'Report ... relating to the proposed Erection of Provisional Parliament House, Canberra', pp. 25-7, 39, 100; Gavin Souter, *Acts of Parliament*, Carlton, Melbourne University Press, 1988, p. 55.

an ever increasing number of officers from the various government departments; such an eventuality had never been intended or foreseen for the building. While some Senators and Members favoured the complete expulsion of departmental officers, this was not a realistic option. It was far more convenient and efficient for ministers to discharge their parliamentary and executive functions in the one building, and for this they needed departmental officers close at hand. As it was, with insufficient office space available in Canberra to accommodate all departmental officers, the Provisional Parliament House had been pressed into service to house them. The resulting pressure on accommodation in the House prompted the government in 1937 to consider ways in which office space in the building could be expanded. This led in December of that year to a proposal from the Commonwealth's Chief Architect, Edwin Henderson from the Department of the Interior, for the erection of a two-storey wing on the outer side of the garden courtyard on the Representatives side. The scheme was in fact a part revival of Murdoch's 1922 sketch plan in which he had shown a wing in this position, with a corresponding one on the Senate side. Henderson actually produced working drawings for the proposed wing but, while the Joint House Committee quickly gave its in-principle approval for the provision of extra accommodation, Henderson's scheme subsequently became entangled in a protracted series of disputes, protests, proposals and counter-proposals. In the end, the Joint House Committee abandoned the scheme because of the projected cost and because the wing would have obstructed the view from 'certain existing windows'. Despite this, the scheme was to emerge again only a few years later as the proposed solution for a rapid deterioration in the accommodation situation in the building.<sup>4</sup>

The particular event that caused the deterioration and led to the re-emergence of the proposal was the Second World War. Following the outbreak of hostilities in September 1939, the volume of government business increased sharply and the number of government departments proliferated, a further seventeen departments eventually being created before the war's end.<sup>5</sup> The expansion of government business had the additional effect of dragging even more departmental officers into Parliament House, exacerbating the dire accommodation situation that already existed there. Facing what amounted to a crisis, the government had little alternative but to make substantial additions to the building. Initially, the government favoured the idea of placing another storey on the roof of the main building. In his response to this proposal, the Works Director of the Department of the Interior, A.S. Robertson, pointed out that the foundations and walls of the building were not strong enough to support another storey; they could only be strengthened 'at great expense and inconvenience'. From an architectural viewpoint, too, Robertson warned that the government's plan would 'seriously affect' the appearance of the building. He strongly urged that the government not proceed with the plan.<sup>6</sup>

---

<sup>4</sup> Note on file, 'Proposed Additions to Parliament House, Canberra', 17 December 1937; memorandum, R.A. Broinowski to Chief Architect, 22 December 1937; minute, D. McCalman to Works Director, ACT, 'Parliament House: Additional Accommodation', 17 October 1941; minute, A.S. Robertson, Works Director, to Secretary, Dept of the Interior, 'Parliament House, Canberra - Proposed Additional Accommodation', 12 February 1942, CRS A292/1, item C15168.

<sup>5</sup> Paul Hasluck, *The Government and the People 1939-1941*, Canberra, Australian War Memorial, pp. 435-6, 581.

<sup>6</sup> 'Extract from Minutes of the Thirty Second Meeting of the National Capital Planning and Development Committee', 5-6 November 1942, CRS A3032/1, item PC46/1; minute, Robertson to Secretary, Dept of the Interior, 'Parliament House, Canberra - Proposed Additional Accommodation',

As an alternative, Robertson and the Acting Senior Architect of the Department of the Interior, D. McCalman, proposed a revival of Henderson's 1937 scheme for two-storey wings on the outer side of each garden courtyard. Henderson, in the meantime, had died; apart from his contribution to the design for extensions to the Provisional Parliament House, he had designed the original National Library in Canberra (1934-35; demolished 1968), the original Canberra High School (now the Canberra School of Art, 1938-39), Ainslie Primary School (1938) and, in Sydney, extensions to the GPO.<sup>7</sup> Robertson now recommended Henderson's scheme on the basis that, while it conformed to ...

... the general architectural features of the existing building, the proposal provided for reducing cost by simplifying the treatment of the cornices, reducing the thickness of the walls and roofing the new structure with galvanised iron or fibrolite instead of adopting a flat roof as in the main building.

As for the scheme's effect on the existing design of the building, the construction of the wings would only involve the demolition of the two covered ways that ran from the front section of the building to the dining block at the rear, the elimination of circular driveways on each side and the enclosure of the two garden courtyards.<sup>8</sup>

The sense of Robertson's arguments prevailed and the government accepted his proposal, though it was inclined at first to erect only one of the wings, that on the Representatives side. However, the magnitude of the accommodation crisis in the building quickly induced the government to approve the construction of the corresponding wing on the Senate side as well. The contract to erect the wing on the Representatives side was let to the builder, C. Banks of Griffith in the ACT, on 14 January 1943. Banks was given twenty weeks to complete the work. Later in the year, a similar contract for the wing on the Senate side was let to the building firm, Messrs Simmie and Company, also of the ACT.<sup>9</sup>

On the Representatives side, while the plan for the wing as a whole remained the same, there was a fair degree of modification to the number, arrangement and projected purpose of the spaces within it right up to the time that construction commenced and even apparently while it was proceeding. According to the original proposal, the main floor was to contain four ministers' offices, four attached ministerial staff rooms, a committee room, a waiting room, another staff room and possibly a toilet; the lower floor was to contain eleven private Members' offices and a committee room. By mid-December 1942, these plans had been altered to allow for five offices for ministers, five for ministers' secretaries, a waiting room and a toilet on

---

12 February 1942, CRS A292/1, item C15168.

<sup>7</sup> *Sydney Morning Herald*, 13 June 1939, p. 11; *Canberra Times*, 13 June 1939, p. 4.

<sup>8</sup> 'Extract from Minutes of the Thirty Second Meeting of the National Capital Planning and Development Committee' 5-6 November 1942, CRS A3032/1, item PC46/1; minute, McCalman to Works Director, ACT, 'Parliament House: Additional Accommodation', 17 October 1941, CRS A292/1, item C15168.

<sup>9</sup> 'Extract from Minutes of Thirty-Third Meeting of the National Capital Planning and Development Committee', 4-5 June 1943; 'Extract from Minutes of Thirty-Fourth Meeting ...', 19-20 August 1943, CRS A3032/1, item PC46/1; contract documents on file CRS A295/1, items 927 and 934.

the main floor. On the lower floor, thirteen private Members' rooms were now provided with, at the northern end [next to L84], a small messenger's office and telephone cubicle. However, when the wing was eventually completed on schedule by Banks and occupied in the latter half of 1943, both the number of rooms and their allocation differed significantly from the December 1942 plans. The wing included a total of 23 rooms, plus a toilet on the main floor and an attendant's or messenger's room on the lower floor level. For the external timbers of the building, varnished Queensland maple was used for door frames, window frames and flyscreens in order to match the existing external woodwork of the main part of the structure.<sup>10</sup>

Accommodation lists dating from the second half of 1943 record the original occupants or uses of the rooms in the new wing. These are set out below, with both the original room numbers and the corresponding modern numbers.<sup>11</sup> (The room numbering system was changed in the second quarter of 1950.)

Main Floor level:

<u>Original Room No.</u>	<u>Modern Room No.</u>	<u>Original Occupant / Use</u>
157 Minister	M63	J.H. Scullin [ALP], former Prime
157/1	M64	Toilet
158	M65	Secretary to Minister for Information
159	M66	Arthur Calwell [ALP], Minister for Information
160	M67	Staff, Minister for Information
161	M68	Staff, Minister for Repatriation
162	M73	Secretary to Minister for Repatriation
163	M74	C.W. Frost [ALP], Minister for Repatriation
164	M75	W.J. Scully [ALP], Minister for Commerce and Agriculture

---

<sup>10</sup> 'Extract from Minutes of the Thirty Second Meeting of the National Capital Planning and Development Committee ...' 5-6 November 1942, CRS A3032/1, item PC46/1; plan 'Additional Accommodation for Ministers and Members Parliament House Canberra', 14 December 1942, CRS A295/1, item 927; file CRS A292/5, item C15168; W.I. Emerton, 'The Case for a Permanent Building. Joint Statement by the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives and Report by Secretary, Joint House Department', 7 September 1956, [printed 14 May 1957] p. 9; Robert P. Christie, Foreman Painter, 'Renovation and Maintenance of External Woodwork of Parliament House', 7 March 1949, CRS A6728/1, item 191/6.

<sup>11</sup> House of Representatives [HReps] file 468/4 part 1, OPH.

165	M76	Secretary to Minister for Commerce and Agriculture
166	M77	Staff, Minister for Commerce and Agriculture
167	M78	R.T. ('Reg') Pollard [ALP]
 <u>Lower Floor level:</u>		
212	-	Attendant's Box
214	L84	Staff, Minister for Information
215	L85	Social Security Committee (though the room was later occupied by H.C. Barnard, ALP). <sup>12</sup>
216	L86	W.M. ('Billy') Hughes [LIB], former Prime Minister
217	L87	Dame Enid Lyons [LIB], widow of Prime Minister Joseph Lyons and, in 1943, the first woman to be elected to the House of Representatives. [Note: Dorothy Tangney was elected to the Senate at the same election, the first woman to be elected to this body.]
218	L88 & L88A	House of Representatives Committee Room
219	L89	Allan D. Fraser [ALP], Member for Eden-Monaro
220	L95	A.M. ('Chil') Blain [IND], Member for the Northern Territory
221	L96	Staff, Minister for Commerce and Agriculture
222	L97	A.W. Coles [IND]
223	L98	Unoccupied
224	L99	Secretary to Billy Hughes

---

<sup>12</sup> Ms list on file, 'New Wing', c. late 1946, HReps 468/4 part 1.

There were several noteworthy aspects of the distribution of rooms in the new wing. One was the provision of separate rooms for each minister's secretary and for his other staff, a significant departure from earlier plans which envisaged the creation of ministerial suites consisting of three contiguous rooms. The establishment of such suites represented something of a precedent or principle for ministers' accommodation, though it would be several years before the principle was adhered to consistently; as it turned out, neither the allocation of three rooms to each ministerial suite in the wing nor their contiguity was to last long. An immediate effect of the creation of three-room ministerial suites, however, was that the number of ministers accommodated in the new wing had to be reduced from the four or even five as was earlier proposed. On its completion, the wing was only able to accommodate three ministers and their staffs.<sup>13</sup> The three ministerial suites, which took up almost all of the available accommodation space on the main floor level, comprised: Rooms M65, M66 and M67 [Information]; M68, M73 and M74 [Repatriation]; and Rooms M75, M76 and M77 [Commerce and Agriculture]. These portfolios were all of middle to low rank in the ministerial hierarchy.

Another significant feature of the wing was that, for the first time in the Provisional Parliament House, some individual private Members had their own private office accommodation. The lucky few were Members of unusual position or status. Foremost among these were the two former Prime Ministers still serving in federal Parliament, J.M Scullin and Billy Hughes. The allocation of private offices to them recognised the special status of former Prime Ministers and created a precedent for reserving individual offices for Members in this category. Another Member of unusual status who secured a private office was Dame Enid Lyons. Although she was the widow of Prime Minister Joseph Lyons, it was almost certainly her position as the only female Member from 1943 to 1946 that saw her occupy her own office; it would not have been proper for her to share a room with one or more male Members. Similar in a way was the position of the only two independent Members of the House of Representatives, A.M. Blain of the Northern Territory and A.W. Coles who also happened to be the joint founder and managing director of the major retail firm G.J. Coles. It would not have been appropriate or practical to assign these Members to one or other party room where Members with party affiliations conducted their business. Allan Fraser was probably unusual in that he required a private office so that he could also use as his electorate office.<sup>14</sup> It is not clear why Reg Pollard was allocated his own office on the main floor, but his proximity to the Minister for Commerce and Agriculture, a position to which he succeeded in late 1946, suggests that he may have been involved with the portfolio.

The character of the wing and allocation of rooms remained much the same after the federal election of September 1946 and through to the end of eighteenth parliament, though there were some significant differences. On the main floor, there were only four changes. Rooms M67 and M68, which had been occupied by staff of the Ministers for Information and Repatriation respectively, were re-assigned to the new

---

<sup>13</sup> 'New Wing to House of Representatives. Accommodation Available', 30 September 1943, HReps 468/4 part 1.

<sup>14</sup> Information from Ian Cochran.

Vice-President of the Executive Council, W.J. Scully, and his secretary. Pollard's room, M78, was allocated to staff of the Minister for Repatriation. Pollard himself succeeded Scully as Minister for Commerce and Agriculture, and occupied the latter's old room, M75. H.C. Barnard succeeded Frost as Minister for Repatriation in Room M74, while Arthur Calwell retained his portfolio and office at M66.

On the lower floor, there were also four changes. Barnard's office, L85, was given to Tom Sheehan, one of Jack Lang's erstwhile followers, while Lang himself succeeded to the room formerly occupied by A.W. Coles, L97. Next door to him in L98 was another Independent Labor Member, the newly-elected Doris Blackburn, who was now one of four women in federal parliament. At the end of the corridor, Room L100, the Social Security Committee Room was given over to staff of the Department of Immigration and Information. One intriguing new development in the wing was the concentration in it of several dissident Labor Members whose offices, intriguingly, were next to or across the narrow corridor from their (nominal) political foes, Billy Hughes and Dame Enid Lyons, both Liberals who had defected from Labor ranks. This must have made for interesting confrontations and conversation in the corridors between, say, Hughes and Jack Lang. Another notable consequence of the changes to the wing was that two of the three ministerial suites - those of the Minister for Repatriation and of the Minister for Immigration and Information, were broken up, their staff now occupying offices that were physically separated from the offices of the ministers and their secretaries; in the case of Immigration and Information, the office for staff was now located on the lower floor. These changes to the ministerial suites demonstrated that they were in no way regarded as permanent or sacrosanct; as with almost all of the other office spaces in the building, they could be modified and re-assigned for other uses to suit circumstances.<sup>15</sup>

### 2.3 The 1948 Additions

The accommodation problems in the provisional building were eased by the construction of the two new wings and by other modifications that were hurriedly made to the building during the war to accommodate additional ministries and ministerial and departmental staff. In the immediate post-war period, the number of ministries was reduced and with it the numbers of ministerial and departmental officers who had to be housed in the building. The departure of many of these officers released a substantial amount of office space that, with the exception of the two new wings, had been created by the makeshift alterations during the war. Much of this space was now allocated to private Members and Senators.<sup>16</sup> Although most of these parliamentarians were accommodated two, three or four to a room, the principle was now fully conceded that private Members and Senators should have their own offices. This extended the small concession or advance of 1943 by which a few parliamentarians of unusual status were accorded their own private rooms.

With the principle established that parliamentarians should have their own office

---

<sup>15</sup> 'Rooms under House of Representatives Control or on House of Representatives Side of Building', c. late 1946; 'Rooms under House of Representatives' Control, etc. at the End of the Eighteenth Parliament', late 1949, HReps 468/4 part 1.

<sup>16</sup> Minute, A.G. Turner, Serjeant-at-Arms to Clerk of the House of Representatives, 'Allocation of Rooms', 9 October 1946, HReps file 468/4 part 1.

space in Parliament House, an important new or rather long deferred consideration now loomed that threatened to exacerbate the accommodation situation in the building once again. According to terms laid down in the constitution, a fixed ratio had to be maintained between the nation's population and the number of Senators - and by extension the number of Members - representing the people in federal Parliament. Since Federation, the rate of population growth in Australia had been much faster than anticipated and, by the end of the war, a substantial increase in the number of parliamentarians was long overdue. In Parliament, the Chifley government was asked whether, in order to cope with any increase in the number of Members and Senators, it planned to proceed with the erection of the permanent parliament house. The government, however, was not at all willing to take action on this matter probably because of the financial pressures it had to contend with from the war and post-war reconstruction. On the other hand, the government decided that an increase in the number of Members and Senators could not be put off much longer. This was not just, or even mainly, a matter of principle as the government saw that the increase would be to its electoral advantage in the difficult election it would have to face before the end of 1949. The government therefore put forward a proposal in 1948 to raise the number of Members and Senators to 123 and 60 respectively at the next election (including a Member each for the Northern Territory and the ACT). Duly endorsed by Parliament, the increase from 111 to 183 parliamentarians amounted at one stroke to a sixty per cent expansion in their number. Such a substantial increase demanded that urgent arrangements be made for their accommodation in the Provisional Parliament House.<sup>17</sup>

To increase the office space in the building, three schemes were put forward, each of them involving the addition of a third storey to the 1943 wings on both the Representatives and Senate sides. In the end, the scheme fixed upon was the one that provided the most extra floorspace: 20,320 square feet, comprising 4,000 square feet on the lower floor, 5,820 on the main floor and 10,500 for the upper floor. Apart from the third storeys to be built on top of the 1943 wings, the additions included three-storey right-angle returns to connect the southern end of each wing with the dining block at the rear of the provisional building. Plans for the extensions were drawn up by D.G. Edward, an architect in the Department of Works. Initially, there was some concern that the addition of a third storey to each wing would have a detrimental effect on the architecture of the building. After examining Edward's plans, however, the National Capital Planning and Development Committee determined that the additions would have no adverse aesthetic impact and thus gave its approval to the scheme.<sup>18</sup>

One of the most important factors in planning for the construction of the third floor additions was the load-bearing capacity of the walls of the 1943 wings. As the wings had never been intended to support upper floors, the bearing capacity of their walls had to be assessed and, if necessary, some method devised to strengthen them to carry

---

<sup>17</sup> H.C. Barnard and J.B. Chifley, in *Commonwealth Parliamentary Debates* [HReps], 10 February 1943, CRS A461, item B4-1-10; Harold Holt and Chifley, in *Commonwealth Parliamentary Debates* [HReps], 5 April 1946, CRS A461/7, item A4/1/10; *Canberra Times*, 5 April 1946; Souter, *Acts of Parliament*, pp. 395-6.

<sup>18</sup> 'Extract from Minutes of the 68th Meeting [of the NCPDC]', 21-2 June 1948, CRS A3032/1, item PC46/1; documents relating to third storey in CRS A976/64, item 52/0239 part 1; Souter, *Acts of Parliament*, p. 397.

the additional load. The external walls, built as eleven-inch brick cavity walls, were found by the Principal Engineer and Principal Architect in the Department of Works and Housing to be capable of supporting an extra floor. The problem was with the internal corridor and cross-partition walls. On the Representatives side, the corridor walls were constructed of 4.5 inch brickwork to their full height, but the cross-partition walls had been built of 4.5 inch brickwork on the lower floor and part of the main floor only. The remainder of the cross-partition walls, it was discovered, consisted of material of 'no structural value'. Various alternatives were put forward to deal with the problem. Eventually, the method chosen to increase the load-bearing capacity of the existing two storeys was to double the thickness of the corridor walls to their full height and length in brick.<sup>19</sup>

The additions on the Representatives side of the building provided for an additional 23 offices, a male and a female toilet and an attendant's box on the upper floor. In addition, four new rooms were to be added to the southern end of the main floor and three to the same end of the lower floor. In the idiosyncratic numbering system that had grown like topsy with the many alterations to the building, these latter two sets of rooms came to be numbered from south to north: 162D, 162C, 162B and 162A on the main floor (now rooms M69 to M72 respectively); and 220C, 220B and 220A on the lower floor (now rooms L92, L93 and L94-L94A respectively). The contract for the erection of the additions was let on 14 July 1948 to the builders, John Grant and Sons of Martin Place, Sydney, the contract stipulating a finishing date of 31 March 1949. Later, a separate contract for the plasterwork in the additions was let to Hook Brothers of Harrington Street, Sydney<sup>20</sup>.

In conformity with the practice in the rest of the building, the contractors were required to use Australian timber, in this case Queensland maple, for all joinery and timber panelling. As it happened, a controversy arose at this time over the external timbers in the building as a whole. The timbers, which were used in external door and window frames and in flyscreens, were mostly of Queensland maple and had been stained and varnished periodically since the erection of the building to preserve their grain. By the late 1940s, the timbers were exhibiting serious weathering due to constant exposure to the elements, a deterioration that had been accelerated by the decision taken on austerity grounds to discontinue the varnishing during the war years. Acting on the advice of the building's Foreman Painter, the Minister for Works and Housing, Nelson Lemmon, determined in mid-1949 that the external timbers should henceforth be painted. To this, however, the Joint House Committee expressed vehement opposition, arguing that the use of varnish should continue in order to display the grain of the timbers. The matter was eventually referred to the Prime Minister, Ben Chifley, for resolution and it appears that he decided in favour of varnishing. Thus, the external timbers for the 1948 additions to the Representatives wing were, along with the rest of the wing, provided in varnished Queensland maple. It was not until 1960-61, after another decade of exposure had weathered and

---

<sup>19</sup> Minute no. C.24673, B.A.J. Litchfield, Acting Principal Architect, Dept of Works and Housing, to Director of Works, ACT, 'Additions to Parliament House', 12 August 1948, CRS A976/64, item 52/0239 part 1.

<sup>20</sup> Letter, W.E. Potts, Director of Works, ACT, to John Grant and Sons Pty Ltd, 14 July 1948; minute, D.G. Edward to Architect in Charge of the Drawing Office, 4 August 1948; letter, H.J. Grant, John Grant and Sons, to Director of Works, ACT, 15 February 1949; letter, Potts to John Grant and sons, 27 July 1949, CRS A976/64, item 52/0239 part 1.

bleached the timbers and opened up their grain, that the decision was made to paint all of the building's external timbers, using a colour that approximated the original stain and varnish.<sup>21</sup>

The exterior walls of the additions, along with the rest of the wing, consisted of rendered timber painted a brilliant white. Rather like the external timbers, problems with the render and its coating of paint arose with the building in general during the course of construction of the additions. Moisture seeping through the render and peeling paint necessitated frequent repainting of the external walls in the early 1950s. Eventually, this external repainting was incorporated into a five-year repainting cycle for the whole House, inside and out.<sup>22</sup>

A number of factors interfered with the progress of work on the additions to the House, leading to a protracted delay in its completion and an enormous overrun in the project budget. In fact, it was to be some years before all work was completed, with the cost of the project ballooning from the original estimate of £45,000 to over £140,000. Among the difficulties that led to the delay and cost overrun were insufficient detail being provided to the contractors at the start of the project as to what the ultimate requirements would be, the elaboration of details and then changes to them during the course of the work, the unfortunate necessity to demolish and rebuild certain parts of the extensions to meet new or changed requirements, the addition to the project of extra works that did not form part of the original proposal, and the obligation placed on the contractors to arrange their work so that it interfered as little as possible with the functioning of Parliament. Coupled with these factors was a general increase in the cost of materials and wages during the project. The wage bill was swollen further by dint of the fact that considerable overtime had to be worked - and paid for - to ensure that particular parts of the project were completed by a specific date.<sup>23</sup>

Nevertheless, despite the delays in completing all of the work, the new offices in the Representatives wing were ready for occupation in early 1950, following the change of government at the December 1949 elections. With this change and the addition of new offices, the allocation of rooms in the wing took on a rather different complexion. After some to-ing and fro-ing with rooms in the early months of the new government, the allocation of rooms comprised:<sup>24</sup>

---

<sup>21</sup> See correspondence re external timberwork 1949-1960 in CRS A6728/1, item 191/6.

<sup>22</sup> Minute, Robert P. Christie, Foreman Painter, to Secretary, Joint House Department, 20 August 1952, CRS A6782/1, item 191/6; Wallace Brown, 'Jubilee for a Temporary Parliament', *Courier-Mail*, 30 April 1977.

<sup>23</sup> Minute, R.M. Taylor, Director of Works ACT, to Secretary, Joint House Department, 4 July 1951, CRS A976/64, item 52/0239 part 3; memorandum, L.F. Loder, Director-General, Department of Works and Housing, to R.M. Taylor, Director of Works, Canberra, 'Extensions to Parliament House', 4 May 1951; Department of Works Completion Report: 'Alterations to Parliament House', CRS A976/64, item 52/0239 part 4; Emerton, 'The Case for a Permanent Building', p. 9.

<sup>24</sup> 'Rooms under House of Representatives' Control July, 1950i with ms changes, HReps 468/4 part 1.

Main Floor:

<u>Original Room No.</u>	<u>Modern Room No.</u>	<u>Original Occupant / Use</u>
157	M63	J.S. Rosevear [ALP], a former Lang supporter
157/1	M64	Men's Toilet
158	M65	Staff, Minister for Commerce and Agriculture
159	M66	Staff, Minister for Commerce and Agriculture
160	M67	Dame Enid Lyons [LIB], Vice-President of the Executive Council
161	M68	Secretary, Vice-President of the Executive Council
162	M73	Secretary, Postmaster-General
162A	M72	Staff, Postmaster-General
162B	M71	P.J. Clarey and W.P. O'Connor [ALP]
162C	M70	George Lawson [ALP]
162D	M69	Dan Mulcahy and Rowland ('Rowley') James [ALP], both former Lang supporters
163	M74	H.L. Anthony [CP], Postmaster-General
164	M75	John McEwen [CP], Minister for Commerce and Agriculture
165	M76	Secretary, Minister for Commerce and Agriculture
166	M77	Staff, Minister for Commerce and Agriculture
167	M78	Staff, Postmaster-General

Lower Floor:

214	L84	Staff, Minister for Labour and National Service and Immigration
215	L85	House of Representatives typist (departmental)
216	L86	W.M. Hughes [LIB]
217	L87	House of Representatives typist, opposition party
218	L88 & L88A	House of Representatives Committee Room, but used by A.D. Fraser [ALP], Member for Eden-Monaro
219	L89	Private Secretary, Minister for Defence
220	L95	House of Representatives typist, opposition party
220A	L94	Messrs A.M. McDonald and R.S. Ryan [LIB]
220B	L93	E.J. Holloway, Arthur Drakeford and Reg Pollard [ALP]
220C	L92	E.J. ('Eddie') Ward, a former Lang supporter, and W.G. Bryson [ALP]
221	L96	Allan D. Fraser [ALP], Member for Eden-Monaro
222	L97	Dr Lewis Nott [IND], the first member for the ACT
223	L98	House of Representatives typist, opposition party
224	L99	Secretary to W.M. Hughes
225	L100	Staff, Minister for Labour and National Service and Immigration
212	?	Attendant's Box

Upper Floor:

301	U51	G. Freeth, W.L. Grayden and Paul Hasluck [LIB]
302	U52	Women's toilet
303	U53	Arthur Calwell [ALP]
304	U54	C.W.J. Falkinder [LIB]
305	U55	B.H. Kekwick [LIB]
306	U56	J. McLeay and K.C. Wilson [LIB]
307	U57	Men's toilet
308	U58	Electrical and other equipment
309	U59	Attendant
310	U60	A.R. Downer [LIB]
311	U61	Staff, Minister for the Army and Navy
312	U62	Staff, Minister for the Army and Navy
313	U63	Staff, Minister for the Army and Navy
314	U64	A.S. Hulme, M.L. McColm and H.G. Pearce [LIB]
315	U65	R.W.C. Swartz and B.M. Wight [LIB]
316	U66	D.R. Berry, D.A. Cameron and E.N. Drury [LIB]
317	U67	D.O. Watkins and Tom Sheehan [ALP]
318	U68	W.F. Edmonds, L.C. Haylen and W.J.F. Riordan [ALP]
319	U69	J.N. Nelson and J.J. Clark [ALP]
320	U70	C. Chambers and G.W.A. Duthie [ALP]
321	U71	H.V. Johnson [ALP]
322	U72	C.R. Cameron and A.V. Thompson [ALP]

323	U73	E.H.D. Russell [ALP]
324	U74	Kim Beazley and T.P. Burke [ALP]
325	?	Attendant or Store

The status of the wing was enhanced somewhat by the presence in it of the offices of the Minister for Commerce and Agriculture and of the Vice-President of the Executive Council. Although the holders of these positions had been housed in the wing in the last few years of Labor's tenure of power, they assumed a greater importance under the new Liberal-Country Party government. Not surprisingly, the Commerce and Agriculture portfolio ranked quite significantly higher in this administration than it had under Labor, and indeed it was one of the highest-ranking ministries. Its importance was further reflected in the fact that it was held by the Deputy Leader of the Country Party, Jack McEwen. In similar manner, the position of Vice-President of the Executive Council was enhanced by the figure who now occupied that office, Dame Enid Lyons, the widow of Prime Minister Joseph Lyons and herself 'probably the best known and most widely respected woman in Australia.'<sup>25</sup>

Another noteworthy feature of room allocations in the wing was that Rooms M69 and M71 were specifically reserved for occupation by Members with physical disabilities, Messrs Mulcahy and James in the case of M69 and Clarey and O'Connor in the case of M71. These rooms were probably selected as offices for these Members because they were easily accessed from the rear of the building and because, located as they were on the main floor level, they allowed their occupants to move around the more important parts of the building without having to negotiate flights of stairs. One disadvantage with the rooms was that they were about as far from the House of Representatives chamber as it was possible to get on the main floor. On the other hand, they were of course close to the dining room.<sup>26</sup>

The Speaker in the new Parliament was Archie Cameron who retained the office until his death in August 1956. During his tenure, Cameron attempted to affirm the principle of minister's suites in the provisional building consisting of three rooms: one for the minister, one for his secretary and the third for his other staff. At the same time, however, Cameron refused to exercise the Speaker's traditional function of deciding which suites were to be allocated to which minister; this he left for the government to determine. The result, according to the Clerk of the House, was ...

... the inglorious scene of Ministers of the State in the order in which they hear of their inclusion [in the ministry], or in which they decide to take a chance on inclusion, rushing along corridors and sticking labels on doors.<sup>27</sup>

---

<sup>25</sup> Souter, *Acts of Parliament*, p. 359.

<sup>26</sup> 'Room Allocations requiring Finality: Notes for Speaker', February 1950, HReps 468/4 part 1.

<sup>27</sup> Memorandum, Clerk of the House to Speaker, 'Rooms for Ministers', 13 September 1956, HReps 468/4 part 2.

It was in an attempt to put a stop to this ‘unedifying spectacle’ that Cameron’s successor as Speaker in August 1956, John McLeay, revived the tradition of the Speaker controlling the distribution of rooms, though he did confer with the government on the allocations.<sup>28</sup>

In practice, the allocation of ministerial suites at least in the House of Representatives wing in the period 1950-56 was not nearly as haphazard as the criticism from the Clerk of the House implied; ministerial suites in the wing remained fairly stable throughout these years. Conversely, Cameron’s principle of allowing three rooms for each minister seems not to have been applied with any great rigour. ‘Black Jack’ McEwen, the Minister for Commerce and Agriculture, and his staff continuously occupied five rooms in the wing over the period [M75 for the Minister; M76 for his secretary, and M65, M66 and M77 for other ministerial staff].

Nevertheless, a number of changes did occur in the ministerial accommodation in the southeast wing in these years (1950-56). Dame Edith Lyons’s office as Vice-President of the Executive Council [M67] and that of her secretary [M68] became respectively the office of the Minister for Social Services, A.G. Townley, and his secretary in May 1951. Townley retained these rooms, together with M78, even after he became Minister for Air in July 1954, a portfolio he held until late October 1956. Wilfred Kent Hughes, who became Minister for the Interior in May 1951, took over at that time the suite that had formerly been occupied by Anthony as Postmaster-General [M72, M73 and M74]. On the upper floor, the three rooms that had served as staff rooms for the Minister for the Army and Navy, Josiah Francis, [U61, U62 and U63] passed to the new Minister for Territories, Paul Hasluck, in May 1951. Hasluck himself occupied U62 as his office, and he and his staff remained in occupation of these rooms for the best part of a decade. All in all, the changes in ministerial accommodation over the period were by no means marked, let alone erratic.<sup>29</sup>

One other change that took place in the period, though in regard to private Members’ accommodation, was the conversion of an entrance vestibule on the lower floor into a new room to house three private Members. The change was effected in August-September 1953 and the new room designated L94A. Three Liberal Members, Hubert Opperman, W.C. Haworth and T.F. Timson, were the first occupants of the room.<sup>30</sup>

Rather more changes to the ministerial accommodation in the wing took place in 1956 and later years in the decade. By early 1959, the following rooms were used by ministers or their staff, the actual office used by a minister not being clear in all cases:<sup>31</sup>

---

<sup>28</sup> Minute, Speaker to H.S. Robertson, Minister for Social Services, 13 September 1956, HReps 468/4 part 2.

<sup>29</sup> Minute, Eric J. Harrison to Speaker, 18 May 1951; and other documents, HReps 468/4 part 1.

<sup>30</sup> Memorandum, Serjeant-at-Arms to Speaker, ‘Private Room accommodation for Members’, 10 August 1953.; file note, ‘21st Parliament. Private Members Accommodated in Private Rooms’, January 1955, HReps 468/4 part 1.

<sup>31</sup> ‘23rd Parliament: Allocation of Rooms to Ministry’, 29 January 1959, HReps 468/4 part 2.

<u>Room No.</u>	<u>Occupant(s)</u>
<u>Main Floor level:</u>	
M65	Staff, Minister for Social Services
M66	Staff, Minister for Social Services [or the Minister himself]
M67	Staff, Minister for Primary Industry [or the Minister himself]
M68	Staff, Minister for Primary Industry
M69	Staff, Minister for the Army [or the Minister himself]
M70	Staff, Minister for the Army
M72	Staff, Minister for Supply
M73	Staff, Minister for Supply
M74	Staff, Minister for Supply [or the Minister himself]
M75	Staff, Minister for Interior and Works [or the Minister himself]
M76	Staff, Minister for Interior and Works
M77	Staff, Minister for Primary Industry
M78	Staff, Minister for Social Services
<u>Lower Floor level:</u>	
L100	Staff, Minister for the Army
<u>Upper Floor level:</u>	
U53	Staff, Minister for Immigration
U54	Minister for Immigration
U55	Staff, Minister for Immigration
U61	Staff, Attorney-General
U62	Attorney-General
U63	Staff, Attorney-General

U71	Staff, Minister for Air
U72	Minister for Air
U73	Staff, Minister for Air

The interesting aspect of this list was that the wing had become much more of a ministerial wing by the late 1950s. Virtually the whole of the main floor was given over to ministerial offices, as was much of the upper floor. Only the lower floor remained as substantially an area for private Members' offices. This character of the wing, which had developed over the decade, was to persist when extensions were made to it a few years later. The only difference was that the ministerial suites in the wing after the extensions had been built were concentrated on the main and lower floor levels.

#### **2.4. The 1965 Additions**

Despite continual internal modifications of the provisional Parliament House and the extensions to it in the 1940s, the pressure on accommodation in the building remained acute. The pressure arose from two principal sources. Maintaining the trend that had arisen in the building's first years, the encroachment of departmental staff into the building continued. Though the practice had dire implications for office space in the building, it was the only efficient and indeed feasible means by which ministers could discharge their parliamentary and departmental responsibilities; the alternative for ministers would have been a continual - and ultimately impractical - rushing back and forth between Parliament House and their respective departments. The second source of pressure on accommodation in the building derived from an understandable desire of all Members to have their own private offices. In 1956, the President of the Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the Secretary of the Joint House Department reported on the accommodation problems in the building in a case they put forward for the erection of a permanent parliament house. Nothing happened, however. Then, in early 1959, after many Members complained about the situation, a survey of accommodation in the building revealed that up to six Members were sharing a single office, that seven Members had no office at all and that another 32 Members occupied various rooms on the Senate side. In addition to these unsatisfactory arrangements, several ministers were unhappy about the pokiness of their existing office suites.<sup>32</sup>

Following the complaints and subsequent survey in 1959, the Department of Works put forward four alternative proposals for increasing the number of offices on the Representatives side of the building. The proposals were considered by the House of Representatives House Committee for the purpose of recommending one of them to the government. From the outset, the House Committee was not warmly disposed towards three of the proposals because to a greater or lesser extent they each involved coverage of the existing garden courtyard. As one of the three, moreover, only

---

<sup>32</sup> Minute to House Committee probably from Speaker, 'Proposal for Additional Accommodation for the House of Representatives', 3 May 1960, HReps 1/105 part 1; Emerton, 'The Case for a Permanent Building', 7 September 1956 [printed 14 May 1957].

provided for an extra 22 rooms, the Committee quickly rejected it as inadequate. Of the two remaining courtyard proposals, the Committee could not endorse the one that afforded the most new rooms, 27 in number, as it was prohibitively expensive for the amount of office space gained. By contrast with this, the last of the four proposals provided 47 additional rooms for a cost that was not much greater, and it did not trespass on the garden courtyard. This proposal entailed the construction of a block east of the existing southeast wing and joined to it, enclosing a smaller garden courtyard or light well. The House Committee fixed on this proposal as its much preferred option and asked the Department of Works to prepare plans for the extension, with certain additions. When drawn up, the plans provided for an additional minister's suite, 53 private Members' rooms and a conference room, the whole adding 16,859 square feet of floor space to the building. The total cost, with full airconditioning, was estimated at L166,500. The particular advantages of the scheme, as the House Committee saw it, was that it would almost double the office accommodation available to private Members and, in the case of ministers ...

Suites of three rooms ... could be allotted to each portfolio and in the event of changes in the Ministry a new Minister could immediately move into the new suite allotted to that particular portfolio. This would almost completely obviate the present confusion resulting from changes in the Ministry, involving large changes in rooms, telephones, furniture, etc. and a great deal of dissatisfaction as far as Ministers are concerned.<sup>33</sup>

In the end, however, the government of the day would not agree to such extravagant expenditure on enlarging on what was after all a provisional building, especially as a permanent parliament house would have to be erected in the not-too-distant future. In April 1960, the government rejected the whole scheme.<sup>34</sup>

Never really off the agenda, the accommodation issue re-surfaced in a major fashion in the latter part of 1963. On the motion of a government Member, W.C. Wentworth, a Select Committee on House of Representatives Accommodation was appointed ...

... to consider the adequacy or inadequacy of the accommodation available for Members and Ministers and their staffs on the House of Representatives side of the present Parliament House and to make recommendations in relation thereto.<sup>35</sup>

Chaired by Leslie Bury, the Committee assembled a detailed picture of the accommodation deficiencies on the Representatives side, while its recommendations for what was desired in regard to office accommodation constituted a set of principles that would form the basis for additions to the building. The Committee reported that

---

<sup>33</sup> 'Accommodation Requirements for the House of Representatives Ministers and Staffs, and Private Members', House of Representatives House Committee meeting 17 March 1959; J. McLeay, 'Proposals for Additional Accommodation for the House of Representatives', 25 August 1959, HReps 1/105 part 1.

<sup>34</sup> Minute to House Committee probably from Speaker, 'Proposal for Additional Accommodation for the House of Representatives', 3 May 1960, HReps 1/105 part 1.

<sup>35</sup> Extract from Votes and Proceedings of the House of Representatives, 26 September 1963, in 'Report from the Select Committee on House of Representatives Accommodation', 1963, p. 3, HReps 1/105 part 1.

single rooms were occupied by the leader and deputy leader of the opposition, three party whips, a party secretary and two private Members who had no electorate office of their own; another private Member used a party room as his office. Twelve offices were occupied by two Members each, fourteen offices by three Members each and eight offices by no less than four Members. The Committee noted the difficulties that Members experienced in trying to interview constituents or anyone else in their rooms, conduct telephone conversations or carry out the considerable volume of office work associated with their membership of committees or of one or other government body. Those Members who were housed on the Senate side of the building experienced special problems of their own. Twenty-six Members were accommodated in nine rooms on the Senate side, with eight of these rooms located on the top floor of the building in the far southwest corner. Members occupying these rooms had trouble reaching the House of Representatives chamber before the Division or Quorum bells stopped ringing.<sup>36</sup>

Ministers and their staff also suffered from a range of accommodation problems. One minister from the House of Representatives, together with his staff, was compelled to occupy offices on the Senate side. On the Representatives side, fifteen ministers and their staff occupied 44 offices, an average of just less than three rooms per minister. The Report observed that ...

... Some of the Ministers' rooms are small and badly situated. In certain cases their Private Secretaries and staffs, including those of the Prime Minister, work under very serious disabilities in overcrowded offices. The incorporation of verandahs to obtain more space, has, in many instances, left rooms badly ventilated and without natural light. Some staff are widely separated from their Minister, which militates against working efficiency.

Because of the critical shortage of space, ministers had insufficient room to properly receive official visitors and deputations, much to the ministers' embarrassment. Indeed, the absence of waiting rooms often meant that visitors and deputations had to wait in corridors outside ministers' offices. The space problems on the Representatives side extended to the committee rooms as well. There were only two such rooms on this side of the building and these had to serve as the meeting venues for about 35 private Members committees, and five Standing and two Select Committees. On many occasions, committees were simply unable to secure a suitable room to hold a meeting.

Since the Accommodation Committee considered that it would be at least ten to twelve years before a permanent parliament house would be ready for occupation, it recommended as the only feasible solution to the current accommodation problems that an extension should be made on the southeastern side of the existing building. This would of course make the building an asymmetrical structure, but the Committee did not think that this would affect the main view of the building from the front. The extension, the Committee believed, could be completed ready for use in eighteen months and, accordingly, it recommended that the National Capital Development Commission prepare plans for the extension as a matter of urgency. To be taken into

---

<sup>36</sup> 'Report from the Select Committee on House of Representatives Accommodation', 1963, p. 6, HReps 1/105 part 1.

account in the plans were certain paramount requirements that the Committee spelled out virtually as principles for the new wing. These included the provision of a sufficient number of rooms such that no more than two private Members had to share a single office. The offices, moreover, were to be situated as close as practicable to the House of Representatives chamber, a stipulation that was designed to put an end to the housing of Members on the Senate side of the building. The Committee thought it ‘highly desirable’, too, that special facilities should be provided for physically handicapped Members and that they should be accommodated in offices close to the chamber.

The Committee also called for the provision of more committee rooms in the extension and the establishment of suites consisting of three adjacent rooms for each minister. As with the principle of no more than two Members to an office, this latter requirement aimed at reaffirming and extending the existing standard for ministers’ suites and placing it on a much more solid footing - in contrast to the situation that had prevailed hitherto in which so-called suites were divided and re-allocated willy-nilly to suit changing circumstances. The Committee recommended that the new suites should, at the very least in the case of senior ministers, be located close to one another. There was one further desideratum for the proposed extension that was not specifically enunciated among the Committee’s recommendations, but was implicit in its criticisms of the accommodation situation in the building. This was the need to provide proper ventilation and natural lighting for rooms in the extension.<sup>37</sup>

Preliminary design considerations for the extensions were elaborated in the early part of 1964 and these envisaged the accommodation of Hansard staff on the lower floor, ministers on the main floor and private Members on the upper floor. However, when Cabinet approved the construction of the extensions in April 1964, it removed Hansard in favour of additional ministers’ suites on the lower floor, as well as two committee rooms; Cabinet was thus responsible for giving the extensions much more of a ministerial character. The design for the extensions was undertaken by the Department of Works on behalf of the National Capital Development Commission, and the contract for carrying out the building work was let to D.A. Constructions Pty Ltd of London Circuit, Canberra, in September 1964. James Maccormick and George Dunlop of the Department of Works were the supervising architects for the project.<sup>38</sup>

On completion of the work of construction and fitting out the extensions, they were officially handed over to the Speaker, Sir John McLeay, on 16 August 1965. Immediately, however, a problem arose which required additional work. On each of the three floors, the fire doors connecting the new extensions with the rest of the building had been made only two feet six inches wide. The Minister for the Interior voiced his dissatisfaction with the width of the doors and, as a result, work was swiftly put in hand to widen the doors to four feet three inches each. Workmen using pneumatic drills carried out the widening during a parliamentary recess in September 1965, and the work was completed later in the same month. This additional task

---

<sup>37</sup> ‘Report from the Select Committee on House of Representatives Accommodation’, 1963, pp. 6, 7, 9, 10, 11, 12, HReps 1/105 part 1.

<sup>38</sup> Minute, A. Ferrari, Director of Works, to Assistant Director (Design), 23 March 1964; minute, L.W. Engledow, Acting Secretary Manager, NCDC, to Director of Works, 27 April 1964; file note, ‘Parliament House Extensions, Proposed Timetable’, [May] 1964, CRS A1653/1, item 64/4795 part 1; ‘Parliament House Extensions’, *Architecture in Australia*, September 1966, p. 100.

brought the final cost for the project to just over \$480,000. At this point, another problem came to light when one of the ministers complained that his suite was too hot. On investigation, it was discovered that the windows of all of the rooms had been fastened on the inside with a woodscrew only and that the enterprising occupants of the extension had been unscrewing them in order to open the windows and let in some fresh air. The upshot was that the temperature control mechanism in the extension was sent haywire. To solve the problem and put the extension's unruly occupants in their place, the windows were fastened with key-operated screws, with the key safely retained in the Joint House Department.<sup>39</sup>

Consisting of three storeys with a basement plant room, the completed extension was an L-shaped structure which stood to the east of, and was joined to, the 1943-48 wing. Between it and the older wing, it enclosed a small garden courtyard which had been provided as a lightwell delivering natural light to the rooms surrounding the courtyard. The extension was constructed of steel beams encased in concrete, concrete slab floors and cavity brick walls which were rendered and painted to match the colour, wall texture, window details and cornice moulds of the existing building. Both the parapet levels and the floor levels also matched those of the existing structure, and the roof comprised steel roof decking supported on timber beams. Inside, the rendered walls were painted off-white, with one wall in each minister's office and the committee rooms panelled as decorative feature with polished mountain ash boards. Ceilings were fitted with white acoustic plaster tiles and the floors were carpeted, except for the entrance lobby for the lower floor which was supplied with jarrah parquet flooring; the carpet was a charcoal-coloured Australian-made Axminster in a grade above A1. Photographs of the interior of the extension at the time of its completion show a modern, well-appointed office block, with clean lines and a minimum of adornment or ostentation. From its fittings and furnishings, the interior could by no means be described as plush. It had much more of a functional look about it, with the timber panelling of some of the walls the only concession to embellishment, and a fairly mild one at that.<sup>40</sup>

The extension provided an additional 25,000 square feet of floor space and added another seventy rooms to the building, bringing the total of rooms up to 520. The new rooms included ten minister's suites on the lower and main floor, 29 private Members' rooms on the upper floor [U99-U109; U111-U113; U115-U129] and two committee rooms on the lower floor [L153 and L156]. As the Accommodation Committee had recommended in its 1963 report, each minister's suite consisted of three rooms - an office for the minister, one for his private secretary and another for three ministerial staff members. In addition, each suite was provided with a small

---

<sup>39</sup> £300,000 Wing for MPs. 3 weeks old - faulty, *Melbourne Herald*, 4 September 1965; minute, Ferrari to Secretary and Manager, NCDC, 'Parliament House Extensions - Additional Minor Work', 7 September 1965; minute, Ferrari to Director General of Works, Melbourne, 'Parliament House Extensions; Your 60/762 of 8th September, 1965', 23 September 1965; minute, Engledow to Director of Works, 'Parliament House Extensions', 6 October 1965, NCDC, 'Elemental Cost Analysis', November 1966, CRS A1653/1, item 64/4795 part 2.

<sup>40</sup> Minute, Engledow, Acting Secretary and Manager, NCDC, to A.G. Turner, Clerk of the House of Representatives, 17 February 1965, HReps 1/105 part 2; Department of Works, 'Parliament House Extensions: Preliminary Report on Proposed Building Enclosure and Allied Services and Suggested Floor Space Allocations', April 1964; minute, Turner to Director of Works, 'Extensions to Parliament House', 13 May 1964, CRS A1653/1, item 64/4795 part 1; 'Parliament House Extensions', *Architecture in Australia*, September 1966, pp. 100-3.

waiting room or alcove next to the secretary's office. A notable feature of the internal arrangements was that, at Cabinet's behest - and undoubtedly as a consequence of the frequent changes that had been made to the building over the years - the partitions between rooms were designed with maximum flexibility in mind to allow 'practical and economic rearrangements at any time.' For this reason, none of the partition walls were load-bearing. At Cabinet's insistence, also, much care was taken to soundproof the rooms effectively.<sup>41</sup>

In line with the recommendation of the Accommodation Committee, the extension allowed all private Members, to the number of 97, to be housed in offices on the Representatives side of the building and for no more than two Members to share the one room. Thirty-six Members were now accommodated on the upper floor of the new wing, 25 of them in single rooms and ten in double rooms. The double rooms were all located at the southern end of the extension and were distributed equally among the political parties: two for the Liberal party, two for the Labor Party and one for the Country Party. The original occupants of the private Members' rooms in the extension were as follows:<sup>42</sup>

<u>Room No.</u>	<u>Occupant(s)</u>
U99	A.W. James [ALP]
U100	J.J. Clark [ALP]
U101	W.J.F. Riordan [ALP]
U102	Reg Pollard [ALP]
U103	Kim Beazley, senior [ALP]
U104	Clyde Cameron [ALP]
U105	J.A. England [CP]
U106	C.W.J. Falkinder [LIB]
U107	H.J. ('Jeff') Bate [LIB]
U108	Sir John Cramer [LIB]

---

<sup>41</sup> 'Parliament House Extensions', *Architecture in Australia*, September 1966, pp. 100-3; *The Parliament of the Commonwealth of Australia*, Canberra, Government Printer, 1968, under heading 'Parliament House'; letter, A.G. Turner to G.W.A. Duthie, 29 April 1965, HReps 1/105 part 2; minute, J.M. Overall to Ferrari, 'Parliament House Extensions', 23 March 1964; Department of Works, 'Parliament House Extensions: Preliminary Report on Proposed Building Enclosure and Allied Services and Suggested Floor Space Allocations', April 1964; minute, Ferrari to Executive Architect, Bank and Special Projects Section, Department of Works, Sydney, 'Parliament House - Canberra: Proposed Extensions to House of Representatives', 9 April 1964, CRS A 1653/1, item 64/4795 part 1.

<sup>42</sup> A.R. Browning, Serjeant-at-Arms, 'Allocation of Private Members' Rooms - August, 1965', 3 June 1965, copy with manuscript alterations, in HReps 468/4 part 3.

U109	E.N. Drury [LIB]
U111	J.M. Hallett and D.W. Maisey [CP]
U112	G.D. Erwin and Jim Killen [LIB]
U113	Don Chipp [LIB]
U115	B.P. Hansen and E.W. Harding [ALP]
U116	N.L. Beaton and S.J. Benson [ALP]
U117	L.J. Reynolds [ALP]
U118	Pat Galvin [ALP]
U119	A.S. Luchetti [ALP]
U120	Jim Cairns [ALP]
U121	C.H. Webb [ALP]
U122	Frank Crean [ALP]
U123	Fred Daly [ALP]
U124	R.McN. Holten [CP]
U125	L.J. Failes [CP]
U126	W.C. Haworth [LIB]
U127	Sir Wilfrid Kent Hughes [LIB]
U128	W.C. Wentworth [LIB]
U129	K.C. Wilson [LIB]

An interesting feature of this allocation of offices was that, although they were allotted in rows to political parties, Members from opposing parties occupied offices across the corridor from one another. Such intimate working conditions must have made it difficult for Members from one party to conceal from their political foes that something was afoot at any time. It may be noted, too, that the original distribution of private Members' rooms provided for 28 such offices, though 29 were actually allotted on completion of the extension. The extra office may have been the very small room, U129, which may not have originally been intended for use as a Member's office at all.<sup>43</sup>

---

<sup>43</sup> 'Parliament House Extensions', *Architecture in Australia*, September 1966, p. 102 [re 28 Private

The ministers' suites in the new wing were numbered from 1 to 10, with numbers 11 to 13 being given to the existing 'suites' in the 1943 wing. The suites in the extension, with their corresponding room numbers and original occupants, were:<sup>44</sup>

Lower Floor:

<u>Suite No.</u>	<u>Room Nos.</u>	<u>Occupant(s)</u>
1	L141	Doug Anthony, Minister for the Interior
	L142	Minister's Private Secretary and waiting room
	L143	Staff of the Minister for the Interior (3)
2	L144	Staff of the Minister for Immigration (3)
	L145	Private Secretary to the Minister for Immigration and waiting room
	L146	Hubert Opperman, Minister for Immigration
3	L147	Dr Jim Forbes, Minister for the Army
	L148	Minister's Private Secretary and waiting room
	L149	Staff of the Minister for the Army (3)
4	L150	Staff of the Minister for the Navy (3)
	L151	Private Secretary to the Minister for the Navy and waiting room
	L152	Fred Chaney, Minister for the Navy

Main Floor:

<u>Suite No.</u>	<u>Room Nos.</u>	<u>Occupant(s)</u>
5	M112	Alan Hulme, Postmaster General
	M113	Private Secretary to the Postmaster-

---

Members' rooms].

<sup>44</sup> Letter, Harold Holt to Sir John McLeay, Speaker of the House of Representatives, 7 June 1965; minute, [?] to the Secretary / Manager, NCDC, 'Parliament House extensions - Door Lettering', 11 June 1965, HReps 1/105 part 2; 'Parliament House Extensions', *Architecture in Australia*, September 1966, p. 101.

		General and waiting room
	M114	Postmaster-General's staff (3)
6	M115	Staff of the Minister for National Development (3)
	M116	Private Secretary to the Minister for National Development and waiting room
	M117	David Fairbairn, Minister for National Development
7	M118	Reg Swartz, Minister for Health
	M119	Minister's Private Secretary and waiting room
	M120	Staff of the Minister for Health (3)
8	M121	Staff of the Minister for Housing (3)
	M122	Private Secretary to the Minister for Housing and waiting room
	M123	Leslie Bury, Minister for Housing
9	M124	C.E. Barnes, Minister for Territories
	M125	Minister's Private Secretary and waiting room
	M126	Staff of the Minister for Territories (3)
10	M128	Staff of the Attorney-General (3)
	M129	Private Secretary to the Attorney-General and waiting room
	M130	Billy Snedden, Attorney-General

In the older 1943 part of the wing, Suite no. 11, comprising rooms M66, M67 and M68, was allocated to Ian Sinclair, the Minister for Social Security, and his staff. The Minister for Air, Peter Howson, occupied Suite no. 13 [rooms M74-M76] as his ministerial suite. But, the other so-called suite in this area, Suite no. 12 [rooms M71-M73], was not in the end occupied by a minister and his staff; instead, the three rooms making up the suite were given over to private Members' accommodation. Meanwhile, in the older part of the wing, a separate set of contiguous offices, rooms U61, U62 and U63, constituted another unnumbered ministerial suite on the upper

floor. These three rooms, now occupied by Allen Fairhall, the Minister for Supply, and his staff, had existed continuously as a ministerial suite from the time they were first built and occupied in early 1950. However, two other sets of offices that had served as ministerial suites since 1950 - U53-U55 and U71-73 - were abandoned as suites at this time by the Minister for Air and the Minister for Health respectively in favour of Suites 13 and 7. The vacated offices were re-allocated as private Members' rooms.<sup>45</sup>

With the establishment of the ministerial suites, particularly in the new extensions, the suites remained relatively stable as ministerial accommodation for the rest of the provisional building's life as the nation's Parliament. Although changes did occur, the stability was reflected in the fact that ministers tended to hang on to their suites even when they changed portfolio. One consequence of this was that the suites in the wing served from time to time as the offices of ministers with fairly weighty portfolios, such as Foreign Affairs, Attorney-General, Defence and even, in one period, Treasury. Even in those cases where ministers did shift from one suite to another on changing portfolio, a fair degree of stability could be retained because a suite vacated by a minister was not uncommonly re-occupied as the 'home' of that portfolio by the incoming minister. The first sign of the new stability occurred when Harold Holt succeeded Sir Robert Menzies as Prime Minister in January 1966. Only three ministers changed rooms on the formation of the new ministry, and only one of these changes affected the new wing. Howson, the Minister for Air, now also became Minister assisting the Treasurer and moved into rooms adjacent to the latter's suite in the main part of the building. His former offices, M74-M76, were occupied by Malcolm Fraser in his first ministerial appointment as Minister for the Army. The outgoing Minister for the Army, Jim Forbes, took over the Health portfolio, but stayed put in Suite no. 3 [L147-L149]. Another two ministers to remain in their suites were the new Minister for Defence, Fairhall, in rooms U61-U63, and the new Minister for Labour and National Service, Leslie Bury, in rooms M121-M123 [Suite no. 8]. The responsibilities of both of these ministries had grown in importance with the introduction of conscription in late 1964 and the commitment of a battalion group to Vietnam in May 1965.<sup>46</sup>

In the latter half of the 1960s and early 1970s, a number of changes occurred in the ministerial occupancy of the Representatives wing as the Holt, McEwen, Gorton and McMahon governments came and went fairly quickly. Suite no. 10 was abandoned as the Attorney-General's suite before the end of the decade and by late 1970 the Attorney-General, Tom Hughes QC, and his staff were ensconced in three of the original 1943 offices, M66, M67 and M68, which had been re-titled Suite no. 11 in 1965. These rooms were refurbished for the Minister in late 1970, with new carpets, curtains and furniture being provided.<sup>47</sup> Less than six months later, following the accession of the McMahon administration, these rooms were re-assigned to the Minister for the Army, Andrew Peacock. In an unusual move, the new minister called in a team from the Army's Organisation and Methods section to examine the layout of

---

<sup>45</sup> Minute, A.G. Turner, Clerk of the House, to F.W. Kinch, 'Parliament House extensions - Installation of P.M.G. Equipment in Ministers' Desks', 1 March 1965; letter, Harold Holt to Sir John McLeay, 7 June 1965, HReps 1/105 part 1.

<sup>46</sup> Turner, Clerk of the House, 'Ministerial Accommodation Changes - First Holt Ministry, January, 1966', HReps 468/4 part 3; HReps 61/25 part IX.

<sup>47</sup> HReps 71/232.

his suite, report on its suitability and, if necessary, recommend changes. Much to the chagrin of the Serjeant-at-Arms, Ian Cochran, the Army team put forward a number of proposals for alterations. In discussion with the team, however, Cochran was able to water down the changes and, in the end, they only involved the removal of some recently-constructed shelving and built-in furniture, the replacement of some other furniture and some other minor work.<sup>48</sup>

Meanwhile, in March 1971, Phillip Lynch had taken over the Labour and National Service portfolio and occupied Suite no. 10, with M130 as his office. Two months later, the McMahon government took a significant new initiative when it created a ministry devoted to Environment, Aborigines and the Arts. Although a Minister under the Prime Minister had looked after Aboriginal affairs for some little while previously, neither this important area nor the environment and the arts had ever before been represented by their own government department. The first minister was Peter Howson who occupied the remaining ministerial suite on the upper floor, rooms U61-U63. Other important occupants of the wing from August 1971 were the Minister for Foreign Affairs, Nigel Bowen, in Suite 6 [M115-M117] and the Minister for Defence, David Fairbairn, in Suite 8 [M121-M123]. Yet another was the former Prime Minister, John Gorton. Owing to the long reign of Prime Minister Menzies and the early deaths of former Prime Ministers Curtin, Chifley and Holt, there had been no occasion to follow the old practice of allocating a special office for former Prime Ministers. But with Gorton's replacement as Prime Minister by William McMahon in March 1971, the practice was revived. Gorton was allocated room U113 at the far end of the upper floor as his office and remained there until at least the latter part of 1974. (A near neighbour for him after the Whitlam government was elected in December 1972 was Paul Keating in U110, having formerly occupied L96.) In short order, McMahon himself joined Gorton as a former Prime Minister and was given the larger room M71 as his office. This office was part of the small complex that had been designated ministerial Suite no. 12 in mid-1965 and was, for the first six months that McMahon occupied it, almost next door to the suites of two Whitlam government ministers, Rex Connor and Doug Everingham. McMahon retained M71 for approximately three years until he moved to another room in a different part of the building.<sup>49</sup>

Most of the ministerial suites in the southeast wing continued to be used as such during the years of the Whitlam government. Twelve of the thirteen numbered suites in the wing remained as ministerial suites for the first six months or so; the odd one out, Suite no. 12, had never in any case served as minister's suite. The old suite of offices on the upper floor, U61-63, also continued to be occupied as a ministerial suite, in this case by Kep Enderby QC, the Minister for both the Northern Territory and the Capital Territory. In addition, a former set of offices that had not been used as a minister's suite since the erection of the 1965 extension - U71 and U72 - was pressed into service for Bill Morrison, who held the Science and External Territories portfolios. Rex Connor, the Minister for Minerals and Energy who would soon become embroiled in the politically fatal Khemlani loans affair, occupied Suite no. 11 [M66-M68], while Suite no. 3 [L147-L149] became the offices of the colourful

---

<sup>48</sup> HReps 71/236.

<sup>49</sup> 'Parliamentary Handbook of the Commonwealth of Australia', Canberra, AGPS, 26th edition, 1993, pp. 427-30; Parliament House, Canberra, Telephone Directories, August 1972 and February 1973.

Minister for Immigration, Al Grassby. Soon after occupying the suite, the minister arranged for the staff room, L149, to be partitioned so that a separate room for his press secretary was created adjacent to the corridor. A similar partition was evidently provided in room M115, the staff room of Suite no. 6 which was now in the hands of the Minister for Environment and Conservation, Dr Moss Cass. At the same time, continuing pressure on office accommodation in Parliament House in general led to two further alterations to the southeast wing in early 1973. Both the women's toilet at U52 and the men's at M64 were converted into offices.<sup>50</sup>

The accommodation pressure in the House was ameliorated during 1973 by the completion of the new wing on the Senate side of the building and then by the construction of the northeastern and northwestern extensions. While these additions primarily benefited the Senate, they contributed to a general increase in office space in the building, not least by creating three suites for ministers from the Senate in the new southwest wing. Probably as a result of the general increase in office space, only the ten ministerial suites that had been established on the main and lower floors of the 1965 additions on the Representatives side [Suites nos. 1-10] were still functioning as ministerial suites by the latter half of 1973. The use as ministerial suites of the two older suites on the main floor [Suites nos. 11 and 13] and the two older suites on the upper floor [rooms U61-63 and U71-U72] was discontinued. In the suite vacated by Rex Connor on the main floor [Suite no. 11], the minister's office [M68] was taken over as a private Member's room by Paul Keating, who now became a near neighbour of former Prime Minister McMahon in M71.<sup>51</sup>

The ten ministerial suites in the wing remained as such for the rest of the Whitlam government's term of office. Moreover, occupancy of the suites was remarkably stable, with the same ministers tending to retain their suites even after they shifted from one portfolio to another. In this way, the wing came to house in early 1975 two ministers who had gained senior portfolios: Bill Morrison, the Minister for Defence, in M124 [Suite no. 9] and Kep Enderby as Attorney-General in M130 [Suite no. 10]. Later, as the turnover of ministers in the Whitlam government escalated, the ministerial suites in the wing often retained the same ministerial function despite changes of minister. The most extreme example of this, perhaps, was Suite no. 4 [L150-L152]. Through no less than four changes of minister in the two-month period June-July 1975, the suite remained as the offices of the Minister for Environment and Conservation.<sup>52</sup>

There were also some physical changes to various rooms during 1975. Early in the year, rooms L142 and L143, part of Suite no. 1 occupied by the Minister for the Capital Territory, Gordon Bryant, had both been partitioned to provide more private working spaces for secretaries and other staff. Minor alterations of a similar kind were made later in the year, shortly before the demise of the Whitlam government, to Suite no. 7 [M118-M120], which the Minister for Health, Doug Everingham, had occupied for more than two years. In the same year, 1975, some minor modifications

---

<sup>50</sup> Parliament House, Canberra, Telephone Directories, February and September 1973; HReps 73/199; minute, N.J. Parkes, Clerk of the House, to Secretary, Joint House Dept, 'Rooms M64 & U52', 12 January 1973, HReps 73/22.

<sup>51</sup> 'Parliament House, Canberra Telephone Directory September 1973'.

<sup>52</sup> 'Parliamentary Handbook of the Commonwealth of Australia', 26th edition, 1993, p. 433; Parliament House, Canberra, Telephone Directories, September 1973, August 1974, September 1975.

were made to the staff room, L150, of Suite no. 4, the suite occupied by the Special Minister of State, Doug McClelland.<sup>53</sup>

The ministerial suites in the wing also exhibited a large measure of continuity or stability during the years that the Fraser government was in power. From late 1975 until early 1983 when the Hawke administration took office, nine of the ten suites in the 1965 wing were used continuously as ministerial suites. The suite that was not used for the whole of the coalition's term of office was Suite no. 4 [L150-L152]; from the time of the Fraser government's accession until the end of the 1970s, these rooms were allocated as general office space. During these same years, some notable residents occupied offices in the wing. Up until the latter part of 1977, the Attorney-General, R.J. Ellicott QC, had his offices in Suite no. 5 [M112-M114], while Suite no. 6 [M115-M117] was occupied during 1975-76 by the Minister for Business and Consumer Affairs, the first ministerial appointment for a youthful John Howard. Howard returned to Suite no. 6 for a year or so from late 1977 when he succeeded to the prestigious Treasury portfolio, and at the same time Ellicott moved into the now-revived Suite no. 11 [M66-M68] as Minister for Home Affairs. Meanwhile, towards the end of 1976, the old ministerial suite on the top floor of the wing [U61-U63] was re-established and used as the offices of the Minister for Productivity, Ian MacPhee. The rooms were taken over as his offices by the Minister for Special Trade Representations, R.V. Garland, in December 1977, but their use as a ministerial suite ceased all together two years later. Similarly, Suite no. 11, where Ellicott was succeeded by the Minister for Science and the Environment, D.S. Thomson, at the end of 1979, was abandoned as a ministerial suite a year later. Another notable occupant of the wing for a time during the latter part of the 1970s was the former Prime Minister Gough Whitlam. After he resigned his leadership of the Labor Party following the December 1977 election, he retired to the backbench and was allocated his own office at M74.<sup>54</sup>

In the 1980s, the ten suites in the 1965 additions to the southeast wing were consistently used as ministerial suites. In contrast to the decades of the 1960s and 1970s, however, the suites were reserved for middle to low-ranking ministries, and no major portfolios were housed anywhere in the wing at all. Perhaps the most interesting new occupant of the wing in these years was Labor's new Member for Wills in October 1980, Bob Hawke. Shortly after his election to Parliament, Hawke was allocated room U116 in the farthest corner of the upper floor of the wing. It was from here that he first unsuccessfully contested leadership of the party in July 1982 and then gained the leadership when Bill Hayden resigned in February 1983, only a month before the federal election called by Prime Minister Fraser.<sup>55</sup>

---

<sup>53</sup> HReps 74/251; HReps 75/143; HReps 75/45.

<sup>54</sup> 'Parliamentary Handbook of the Commonwealth of Australia', 26th edition, 1993, pp. 434-8; Parliament House, Canberra, Telephone Directories, April 1976, August 1977, March 1978, March 1980, March and May 1981, September 1982; Souter, *Acts of Parliament*, pp. 564-5.

<sup>55</sup> Parliament House, Canberra, Telephone Directories, March and May 1981, September 1982; Souter, *Acts of Parliament*, pp. 589-90.

## 2.5 Conclusion

The southeast wing of Old Parliament House exists as a direct result of the accommodation pressures that arose almost from the time that the building was first erected and continued until it was replaced as the nation's legislature in 1988. The steady long-term encroachment of the executive into the building, the desire of private Members to have their own offices and the expansion of ministries in the early part of World War II combined to place intolerable pressure on space in the building by the middle war years. In response, the original two-storey section of the wing was built in 1943 to provide additional office space for ministers and for some private Members of special status, former Prime Ministers, independent Members and the first woman elected to the House of Representatives. A long overdue increase in the number of Members in the late 1940s, coupled with the continuing desire of Members for private office accommodation, led in 1948 to the addition of a third storey to the 1943 structure. With the completion of the additions, the wing was occupied by a few ministers and their staffs and by a significant number of private Members in single, double or triple rooms. During the 1950s, the character of the wing underwent a slow change as it became more of a ministerial wing, a character it was to retain until the end.

Increases in the number of ministers, their staff and their workload during the 1950s and early 1960s created the need for additional ministerial accommodation. To this was added the continuing agitation from private Members for their own private offices. The pressure from these sources led to construction in 1965 of a further three-storey addition in which a final - and this time largely successful - attempt was made to establish proper three-room suites for ministers. The additions also went some distance toward satisfying the demands of private Members in that they provided a substantial number of offices for them, especially on the top floor.

Throughout its existence, the wing also served as the 'home' of numerous important parliamentary figures. These figures included private Members of unusual status, varying from former Prime Ministers to radical, rebellious and rumbunctious characters like Jack Lang and Eddie Ward; sometimes, it may be argued, they could be one and the same, as in the persons of ex-Prime Ministers Billy Hughes and, to a lesser extent, the unorthodox John Gorton. Apart from private Members, the wing at various times housed the office suites of quite high-ranking ministers and ministries, notably Treasury, Commerce and Agriculture, Attorney-General, Defence and Foreign Affairs; and the wing also accommodated the office suite of the first Minister for Environment, Aborigines and the Arts in the early 1970s. Not unexpectedly, the individuals who occupied ministerial offices in the wing were often figures of significance in the political life of the nation. These included among many others Jack McEwen, Malcolm Fraser, John Howard, Paul Hasluck and Al Grassby.

### **Accommodation moves by members**

Members of parliament, especially those with a long parliamentary career, usually changed offices a number of times. The picture outlined above outlines the occupation of rooms in the Wing as identified in the documents studied. The history of changes of offices by individual members will developed further as ongoing research abstracts this information from the documentary history. It is not, in most

cases, possible as yet to say what proportion of a particular parliamentary career was spent in the Wing. This picture needs to be built up as the information comes to hand, as a valuable source of information for heritage assessment and interpretation.

### **Other Changes made to the Wing**

In addition to the physical changes made to the Wing which are noted above, it is apparent from an inspection of the Wing that a number of other changes have been made. However, documentary evidence of such changes has, so far, not been found. These changes include the following.

- The introduction of airconditioning into the Wing, and associated changes such as the installation of suspended ceilings.
- The installation of the fan coil units on the cornice of the Wing. It is suspected these were installed at the time of or after the asbestos encapsulation in 1984.
- The acoustic treatment of doors in the 1940s parts.
- The removal of flyscreens from the 1940s parts, except for those known to have been removed in 2000.
- Upgrading of interior finishes, such as those in Room M74, and the replacement of carpets to the lower and main floors (believed to be after 1988).

Additional questions have been raised during the study about a number of other matters but again, documentary evidence has not been found. These questions relate to:

- the exterior paint colour of the rendered walls of the Wing and whether it was always white or an off-white; and
- similarly, whether the timber windows were always white painted externally. Were the windows of the 1943/48 parts of the Wing originally clear/stain finished, and when were some of them painted?

These matters should be the subject of specific or opportunistic research as circumstances allow.

### **3. PHYSICAL DESCRIPTION**

This description is based on a physical survey of the Wing. In some cases the furniture or other items located in a room made a full inspection of the room impossible.

[XXX Note: the upper floor of the wing is yet to be fully surveyed, and the results incorporated.]

#### **3.1 BUILDING AND WING COURTYARD**

##### **Context of the Wing in relation to the rest of the Building**

The South East Wing is located at the South Eastern corner of Old Parliament House. It joins the North Wing at its northern end and the South Wing at its southwestern corner. The Wing forms one side of the House of Representatives courtyard.

##### **General form and structure of the South East Wing**

The wing is a four storey structure, three levels above ground, and basement plant rooms under two parts of the wing. It encircles a courtyard.

The overall external form of the wing is a white painted, three storey, rendered masonry structure with a prominent cornice above the second storey. It has a parapet concealing the low pitched metal deck roof. Windows are generally painted or stained double hung timber.

The structure of the wing is best understood in two parts: the 1943/1948 part of the wing and the 1965 part. The 1943/1948 part is loadbearing brick construction, with some timber framed plaster walls, and with timber floors. The 1965 part has a steel frame partly encased in concrete, concrete floors and brick walls.

##### **Exterior of Wing**

###### ***General***

The external walls of the Wing are rendered brickwork. A general problem with the external rendered walls of Old Parliament House is a loss of adhesion between layers of render resulting in the render falling off. It is understood this problem may also affect the Wing, in particular the 1943/1948 part. The presence and extent of this problem needs to be investigated.

### ***North Wall***

This elevation, built in 1965, is three storeys tall with a red painted brick plinth and white painted, rendered brickwork above. There is a wide and prominent cornice between the second and third storeys. There are several painted timber windows on this elevation. The windows to the lower and main floors have a protruding architrave, except for one of these windows which just has a projecting sill. The shorter windows on the upper floor have just projecting sills. The wall has a narrow projecting painted capping on the parapet.

There is a set of concrete steps and ramp, with red face brick flanking walls, leading to the entry doors for the Wing. These are stained timber doors, side and high lights. The doors are sheltered by a flat projecting metal roof supported on painted steel columns.

There are two lights, one with a surface mounted conduit, a security panel, and a fire sprinkler plaque all mounted on the wall.

### ***East Wall***

This elevation, also part of the 1965 section of the wing, has a painted brick plinth with white painted rendered brickwork above. The wall is three storeys high, and there is a small step forward at each end. There is a prominent wide cornice between the second and third storeys. The elevation has a large number of painted timber windows, those on the third storey being shorter than for the other storeys. The lower and main floor windows in the pronounced end sections have simple architraves, except for the middle windows. These, and all other windows have just a projecting sill. There are open header joints above each window for ventilation and drainage. The wall has a narrow painted parapet capping.

There are numerous fan coil units mounted on the cornice, with various surface mounted conduits running across the wall. There are also three lights, with surface mounted conduits, and a security camera mounted on the wall.

### ***South Wall***

This wall is generally similar to the other exterior walls of the Wing. However, in this case, there are architraves around the lower and main floor windows only in the case of the end windows on the elevation. All other windows just have sills.

There are several fan coil units located on the cornice with associated surface mounted conduits. There are two lights, associated conduits, another cable and a security camera mounted on the wall.

### ***West Wall/House of Representatives Courtyard Wall***

This elevation, dating from 1943-48, has a red face brick plinth with white painted rendered brickwork above. There is a narrow cornice between the second and third storeys, and a narrow parapet capping. The wall features stained timber windows, all with projecting rendered sills. The upper level windows being shorter. Two windows have been modified, one with a metal grille, the other with the insertion of a fixed glass panel. There are also two stained timber doors with glass panels. There are masonry wall vents. There are several original rain heads and downpipes.

There are prominent original wall bracketed lights above each door.

The wall has a number of surface mounted plumbing pipes; several metal vents; a speaker; fire sprinklers; window awnings; and various electrical fittings. The windows on this elevation had flyscreens until 2000, when they were removed. They are now in storage.

### ***Wing Courtyard Walls***

The walls facing the courtyard display stylistic differences between the 1943-48 part and the 1965 part of the Wing. Both parts are three storeyed, rendered brickwork. The 1943-48 part, the western elevation, has a painted brick plinth with a smooth rendered surface above. The painted timber windows have a projecting sill, and there is a simple and narrow cornice between the second and third floors, and a narrow projecting parapet capping. The third floor windows are shorter than of the other two storeys below. Some of the windows have flyscreens. The wall has masonry vents.

A large original wall bracketed light is mounted on the wall.

There are a number of surface mounted plumbing pipes on the wall of this part of the wing.

The 1965 elevations, the north, east and south elevations, are finished in a slightly more textured painted render. They have a different character, with full height pilasters in between each pair of painted timber windows for the three floors. All of the windows are of the same proportion, they have a projecting sill, and there are open header joints above and below the windows for ventilation and drainage. The walls have a narrow painted parapet capping.

### ***Roof***

The roof of the Wing is composed of a series of low pitched metal deck roofs concealed behind parapets. The roofs are all single pitched. On top of the roof are a number of mechanical plant items.

## Interiors of Wing

Detailed survey data for each room is contained in Volume 2.

The interior finishes of the wing vary between the two parts of the wing, and also according to the status of the pre 1988 occupants. In general, the 1943/1948 interiors are painted, rendered brickwork walls, carpeted floors and painted fibrous plaster ceilings. The 1948 upper floor constructed over the 1943 part features timber framed plaster walls, both as internal walls and brick veneer external walls. Corridor ceilings are suspended acoustic plaster tiles, these being a later change. Joinery is either stained or painted timber. There are two sets of timber stairs in the 1943/1948 part.

The construction of the 1943 and 1948 parts of the Wing are superficially similar but vary slightly in some finishes detailing. These differences include:

- the wall render detailing. In the 1943 part the wall render is moulded to create a skirting, picture rail, and architraves around doors and windows. While the 1948 part also employs such mouldings, the architraves are thinner and the mouldings protrude somewhat from the face of the wall; and
- original cornices in the 1943 part are smaller in profile than those in the 1948 part.

The 1965 interiors are similar although ceilings are generally suspended, painted acoustic tiles. However, this part of the wing contains ministerial offices where there is extensive use of stained timber wall panelling. The 1965 part also contains on each floor an attendants room, toilets which feature wall and floor tiles, a kitchen and cleaners room. There are also committee rooms on the lower floor, and a lift and one set of stairs.

Asbestos has been used to protect elements of the structure of the 1965 part from fire. As a result of this, the ceiling space of the 1965 part was sealed in 1984, including installing a new ceiling underneath the original, and the original airconditioning plant was turned off and not used. When this study was initiated, it was assumed by OPH management that the internal walls and ceiling of the Wing would have to be removed as part of asbestos remediation. However, further investigation has shown that the internal walls of the Wing will probably not need to be demolished, although the ceiling will be.

The layout of the wing differs between the two parts. Each floor of the 1943/1948 part has a central corridor with rooms either side. The lower and main floors of the 1965 part has a corridor to one side facing the internal courtyard, and rooms along the other (eastern) side. The upper floor of the 1965 wing has a central corridor with rooms either side.

Acoustic privacy measures included acoustically sealed doors in key locations of both parts of the Wing, as well as special acoustic door vents in the 1943/48 part.

## Services

The Wing has a range of current and former services, as summarised below.

Electrical	GPOs are provided throughout the Wing. The wiring in the 1943/1948 part is thought to be deteriorated.
Lighting	Lighting is provided in all rooms, mostly fluorescent lights. Minimal emergency lighting is also installed in the Wing, mostly in corridors, and this dates from 1999.
Data	Data outlets are provided in most rooms, some of these date from after 1988. Nearly all rooms also have division lights and a clock. There are speakers mounted in the corridors.
Fire/Emergency	Sprinklers are provided in most rooms, and fire detectors, installed in 1999, are mounted in a number of other spaces, notably the corridors. Several EWIS handsets and fire break glass units are mounted in the Wing. Illuminated exit signs are located in corridors. The latter features date from 1999.
Lift	There is a single lift located in the northern part of the 1965 section of the Wing.
Airconditioning	<p>Some hot water radiators survive in the 1943/1948 part, and these are in working order. This part also has some airconditioning equipment mounted on the roof and within the ceiling spaces. This airconditioning plant services this part of the Wing.</p> <p>The airconditioning for the 1965 part survives but is not used and sealed off because of asbestos problems. This includes the basement plant room. Room airconditioners are installed in many rooms in the 1965 part, with fan coil units mounted on the exterior cornice of the Wing, apparently installed in 1984 when the central system was sealed because of asbestos concerns. Many of these rooms also have a small window mounted exhaust fan.</p> <p>The airconditioning for the Wing, including the ventilation of the toilets and kitchens, is generally substandard.</p>
Hot Water	There is a small separate plant room for hot water services located in the basement of the 1965 part. This only supplies toilets and kitchens, not the hot water radiators.

Many of the electrical, lighting and data services are supplied by surface mounted conduits, and this is often because of the ceiling spaces being sealed because of the presence of asbestos.

Some of the pipe and boiler lagging in the basement plant room and under the 1943/1948 part of the Wing contains asbestos.

### **Courtyard enclosed by the Wing**

The courtyard is encircled by the two parts of the Wing. The courtyard is at the level of the lower floor, and is accessed by two doors from this level. The courtyard is partly paved in concrete pavers. There is a paved path from the access door leading to an L shaped paved area. Two fixed timber bench seats are located in this paved area. The courtyard has a series of garden beds, some at a raised level behind low concrete brick walls, but the majority of the gardens are at the general level of the courtyard. The remnants of a gravel path are evident in the northern part of the courtyard.

The courtyard is planted with exotic tree and shrub species, including some large silver birches.

There is a set of steps at the northern end of the courtyard leading to the basement. These are fenced with chainlink. There is also a fan coil unit located at this end. At the southern end is a low wall surrounding a shaft which leads to the basement.

### **3.2 FURNITURE AND OBJECTS**

The wing contains few loose furniture items or objects relevant to pre 1988 use of the wing. Such items include the:

- safe in Room M130; and
- conference table in Room L153.

There are many pieces of fixed furniture and these are considered as part of the building fabric. The Wing is, however, used to store a lot of furniture and objects related generally to the use of Old Parliament House prior to 1988. Furniture and objects related to the Wing are stored elsewhere, either in the building or off-site.

An attempt should be made to identify furniture and objects held by DOCITA which specifically relate to the Wing.

## **4. ANALYSIS**

### **4.1 HISTORICAL VALUE**

The Register of the National Estate criterion for the historic value of a place is:

Its importance in the course, or pattern, of Australia's ... cultural history.

The Old Parliament House Conservation Management Plan (Pearson et al 2000) (CMP) identifies the heritage values of Old Parliament House as applying to the whole of the history of the occupation of the building by Parliament from 1927 to 1988. It also identifies the importance of the building in demonstrating the continuous growth of Parliament, and the expansion of parliamentary support staff which accompanied the encroachment of the executive arm of government into the Parliament building.

The South East Wing is a direct result of that expansion of Parliament (and especially the expansion of the number of parliamentarians in 1948) and the executive arm of government (with increased accommodation for Ministerial support staff), as well as reflecting the changing expectations of ordinary members for adequate office accommodation.

The South East wing provides extensive and relatively intact evidence of the accommodation provided for Members at various periods, and also extensive evidence of Ministerial accommodation. The latter reflects the substantial presence of Executive Government in the building, and the South East wing is only rivalled the northeast corner of the north wing in terms of the area of Ministerial accommodation provided.

The wing, in retaining much of its internal layout and some fittings, is a substantial physical record of the evolving working conditions of parliamentarians and staff over the period 1943-88. The pattern of accommodation is demonstrated in the physical building evidence in a way that is far more understandable and immediate than it is in the written and plan documentation.

Some of the historical significance of the South East Wing in demonstrating the expansion of Parliament was shared by the South West Wing, though that wing was less related to ministerial operations. However, the recent substantial adaptation of the South West Wing has significantly reduced its potential to demonstrate this aspect of history. This increases the significance of the South East Wing as the clearest expression of the expansion of parliamentary accommodation surviving in Old Parliament House.

The South East Wing is, to a lesser extent, significant as an example of the work of the Chief Architect of the Department of the Interior, Edwin Henderson, who devised the scheme for adding the South East and South West Wings in their original two-storey form.

One question to arise in considering the historical significance of the overall Wing, is whether the 1940s parts are more significant than the 1965 part, given factors such as the earlier date and longer association of the 1940s parts. The length of association is certainly a factor and on this basis alone, the 1940s parts may be considered to have some greater historical significance. In addition, the 1943 part is important as the first of the major extensions to the building.

However, the 1965 part of the Wing has substantial historical associations deriving from its 23 year use by the Parliament. Importantly, it has particular historical values as it provided a lot of ministerial accommodation. The 1965 part is also substantial evidence of the ongoing program of extensions to Old Parliament House, being a response to accommodation pressures and changing standards.

Given these similar and differing values, it is probably not useful to think simply in terms of greater and lesser significance when comparing parts of the Wing. Rather, each part has some similar and some different values, and within the similar values there is some differing strengths.

## **4.2 AESTHETIC VALUE INCLUDING ARCHITECTURE**

Aesthetic values, as they relate to heritage places, are described in several Register of the National Estate criteria. The aesthetic value of a place can relate to:

‘Its importance in demonstrating the principal characteristics of:

- (i) a class of Australia's natural or cultural places; or
- (ii) a class of Australia's natural or cultural environments.

Its importance in exhibiting particular aesthetic characteristics valued by a community or cultural group.

Its importance in demonstrating a high degree of creative or technical achievement at a particular period.’

The *Guidelines to the Burra Charter: Cultural significance* provides some text expanding on the definition of aesthetic value in the heritage context;

‘Aesthetic value includes aspects of sensory perception for which criteria can and should be stated. Such criteria may include consideration of the form, scale, colour, texture, and material of the fabric; the smells and sounds associated with the place and its use.’

‘Aesthetic value’ in a heritage assessment context may extend beyond the dictionary definition of the word, to include aspects of sensory perceptions that characterise the human experience of a place and add to its heritage value. These sensory perceptions may not always relate to beauty or formal design qualities.

In this heritage context, the Wing has some aesthetic value related to:

- its overall exterior form and detailing;
- the 1943/1948 interiors;

- the 1965 interiors; and
- one room which has a special quality within the context of the OPH.

These are discussed below.

### **Exterior**

The exterior of the Wing continues, to some extent, the form, massing and style of the earlier components of the building. The three storey bulk, red brick plinth, rendered upper walls and parapet reflect the design of the original building. Similarly, the prominent cornice on the Wing echoes that found on the 1927 building. The Wing has other subtle features such as the breakfront façade on the east elevation, and the use of architraves around selected windows.

All of these elements may be seen as continuing or sympathetically responding to the Inter War Stripped Classical style of the 1927 building, although in the case of the Wing, the style is even further stripped of ornamentation.

One special external architectural feature are the wall bracket lights, one in the Wing Courtyard and two in the House of Representatives courtyard. They relate to the 1940s part. These prominent lights are large in scale and display complex mouldings.

### **Interiors**

As with the exterior, so the 1943/1948 interiors reflect the 1927 interiors in other parts of the building. The subtle use of moulded render to create skirtings, architraves and picture rails is similar to the earlier interiors. In both cases, the interiors relate to the Inter War Stripped Classical style.

The interiors of the 1965 part of the Wing depart from the earlier designs. While remaining simple, the interiors reflect contemporary design ideas. So the use of simple stained timber panelling surfaces, and the light colour of the timber work continues the idea of stained timber as a marker of the status of rooms in Old Parliament House, while at the same time expressing a contemporary approach in detailing and colouring. As with the slightly later interiors in the North Wing, such as the Prime Minister's office, the 1965 interiors are a reflection of a contemporary design aesthetic at the time.

In addition to these general comments about the interiors of the Wing, there is one other room which is of interest because of its particular architectural character. This is Room M74 in the 1943 part of the Wing. Although a small room, this interior is much closer in design to the 1970s executive rooms of special architectural character in the North Wing, though more modest in scale. This is evident by the dark stained, simply detailed timberwork and the suspended ceiling light diffuser. The room was probably refurbished for occupation by former Prime Minister Gough Whitlam, following his resignation as leader of the Labor Party after the loss of the 1977 election.

### **4.3 SCIENTIFIC VALUE**

The Register of the National Estate criterion for the scientific value of a place is:

Its potential to yield information that will contribute to an understanding of Australia's...cultural history.

The Conservation Management Plan indicated that Old Parliament House does not have any substantial scientific value. This assessment holds true for the South East Wing. The building is well documented, and there is little if anything that the fabric could provide evidence for that would be considered of high research significance.

### **4.4 SOCIAL VALUE**

The Register of the National Estate criterion for the social value of a place is:

Its strong or special associations with a particular community or cultural group for social, cultural or spiritual reasons.

Old Parliament House has strong and special associations with the broad Australian community because of its social value as a strong symbol of the Commonwealth Government and Parliament and related events until at least 1988. While this value in a generic sense extends to the South East Wing, the Wing has little presence in the public mind, and has no outstanding associations to make it particularly significant socially to the broader community.

The Wing would appear to have strong and special associations to not insubstantial community made up of former Ministers, Members, staffers, journalists and public servants who worked in the wing before 1988, many of whom have bitter-sweet memories of the crowded conditions of the old House. These associations are reinforced because the changed access conditions in the new Parliament House meant that the free-and-easy bustle of the old House became a thing of the past when Parliament moved.

## **5. STATEMENT OF SIGNIFICANCE**

The South East Wing is a significant component of Old Parliament House which is, overall, a place of outstanding heritage values. The Wing makes a significant contribution to these heritage values: it has very important historic values related to a number of the principal historic themes of Old Parliament House; the Wing has moderate social values; and it has modest aesthetic qualities which are sympathetic to the overall qualities of the building. These values are detailed below.

The South East Wing is historically significant as a major physical expression of the continuous expansion of parliament over the 61 years of its occupation of the building. The increasing incorporation of executive functions in the building is highlighted in the Wing because of its ministerial accommodation function. The 1943, 1948 and 1965 sections all reflect the growth of departmental support staff for ministers. The 1943 section also has close associations with the expansion of ministers responsible for new departments required for war-time operations, seventeen new departments being added during WWII.

The Wing has some significance as the earlier of the large extensions in the several campaigns which saw the construction of extensions to the four corners of Old Parliament House. The Wing, in retaining much of its internal layout and some fittings, is an evocative and valuable physical record of the working conditions of parliamentarians and staff over the period 1943-88.

The 1948 extensions of the Wing also demonstrate the increase in the number of members by 60%, which took place in that year. The 1965 section of the Wing reflects the continued growth of ministerial support staff accommodated in OPH, and the desire to provide ordinary members with office accommodation. The physical demonstration of this history of expansion is better demonstrated in the South East Wing than in any other part of Old Parliament House (the capacity of the and South West Wing to demonstrate this aspect of significance being substantially diminished by recent adaptive work). As the South East Wing provided ministerial and member accommodation, it was integral to the parliamentary operations of the House, rather than just being an overflow accommodation block for staff or other functions.

The South East Wing provides extensive and relatively intact evidence of the accommodation provided for Members at various periods, and also extensive evidence of Ministerial accommodation. The latter reflects the substantial presence of Executive Government in the building, and the South East Wing only rivalled the north east corner of the North Wing in terms of the area of Ministerial accommodation provided. (Criteria A4, D2)<sup>56</sup>

---

<sup>56</sup> These and other references to criteria relate to the Register of the National Estate criteria.

The South East Wing has close associations with the staff, members and ministers who occupied it. Prominent ministers and members associated with the Wing include Dame Enid Lyons, Arthur Calwell, Jack McEwen, W.M. Hughes, J.H. Scullin, Paul Hasluck, Don Chipp, Doug Anthony, and others. While ministers and members commonly occupied rooms elsewhere in Old Parliament House during their parliamentary careers, the sequence of occupation in the South East Wing is comparatively well documented and some members are particularly associated with the Wing. (Criterion H1)

The South East Wing, as part of Old Parliament House, shares the overall regard which is felt for the place by the Australian community: ie its social significance. There is also a particular association through personal memories of the occupation of the Wing and Old Parliament House generally with the staff, members and ministers who occupied it. These former occupants constitute a substantial group in the community, and their association with the wing and the building generally constitutes a part of the place's social significance. (Criterion G1)

The Wing has modest aesthetic qualities relating to its exterior and interiors. The exterior of the Wing expresses in a simplified way the Inter War Stripped Classical style of the original 1927 building, reflecting the limited budget provided by Parliament to solve its accommodation problems. However, the simple style helps retain the visual unity of the whole building. It embraces classical symmetry and forms without the adoption of the full classical vocabulary, and in this way the Wing expresses a modest but refined architectural style. Key features of the style displayed by the Wing include: symmetrical façade, especially the east elevation; division into vertical bays, through the use of a breakfront design, indicating classical origins; vestigial classical entablature, being the cornice; and simple surfaces.

The wall bracket lights on the 1940s part of the Wing are also features of particular design interest.

The 1943/1948 interiors of the Wing continue the simple Inter War Stripped Classical style interiors found in the 1927 building through the subtle use of moulded render to create skirtings, architraves and picture rails. The 1965 interiors are also simple but reflect contemporary design ideas. As with the 1927 building, stained timberwork reflects the status of the room, but the simple detailing and lighter colouring is a contemporary response.

In addition, there is one other room which is of interest because of its particular architectural character, when considered in the context of the social ranking of rooms within Old Parliament House. This is Room M74 in the 1943 part of the Wing. This room is much closer in design to the 1970s high status rooms in the North Wing with its dark stained, simply detailed timberwork and the suspended ceiling light diffuser.

(Criteria D2 and E1)

## **6. OPPORTUNITIES AND CONSTRAINTS**

### **6.1 IMPLICATIONS ARISING FROM SIGNIFICANCE**

The South East Wing's chief significance lies in its physical expression of the growth and evolution of Parliament over a 45 year period. The Wing is closely associated with the provision of, and growth in, ministerial and ministerial staff accommodation, as well as the provision of basic office accommodation for ordinary members. It was, for its entire life, an office block integral to the operations of Parliament and government administration. It is also closely associated with a number of historically significant parliamentarians, who occupied identified rooms.

The implications arising from this history are that:

- the Wing should retain externally the rhythm of windows that reflects its office use in the need for light in each room;
- the Wing should retain the central courtyard / light well, which provided light to offices in the 1940s section and the corridors in the 1960s section. The existence of the courtyard space allows the two main sections of the Wing to be seen and its sequence of development to be demonstrated;
- the internal arrangement within the Wing should allow for presentation to visitors the feeling of office accommodation. This would include retention of corridors with rooms off them. The use of existing rooms without major modification of the office accommodation scale and rhythms would be most desirable. Should decisions be made to substantially alter the arrangement of walls within the wing, the retention of at least a substantial representative sample of ministerial and member accommodation in each of the development stages of the Wing should be a priority;
- the offices with strong associations with historically prominent occupants should be, where feasible, conserved and where possible interpreted now or in the future; and
- post 1988 modifications are not related to the significance of the Wing, and where intrusive to the heritage values and not clearly contributing to the ongoing conservation, presentation and management of the place should be removed.

In addition, the aesthetic values of the Wing should be conserved. Though these aesthetic values are modest, they contribute to the overall unity of Old Parliament House as a building, help distinguish the development sequence of the Wing, and demonstrate aspects of social ranking within the parliament. The aesthetic values relate to:

- the exterior expression of the Inter War Stripped Classical style of the original 1927 building through: the symmetrical façade, especially the east elevation; division into vertical bays, through the use of a breakfront design; the cornice; and simple surfaces;
- the wall bracket lights on the 1940s part of the Wing;
- the moulded render to create skirtings, architraves and picture rails in the 1943/1948 part of the Wing;
- the stained timberwork in the 1965 part including its simple detailing and lighter colouring; and
- the special character of Room M74 in the 1943 part of the Wing relating to its dark stained, simply detailed timberwork and the suspended ceiling light diffuser, linking it to the high-ranking rooms in the North Wing..

Some of these characteristics of significance were shared by the South West Wing, though that wing was less related to ministerial operations and expansion. However, the recent substantial adaptation of the South West Wing has substantially reduced its potential to interpret the nature of member accommodation and the expansion of Parliament. This increases the significance of the South East Wing as the clearest expression of the expansion of parliamentary accommodation surviving in Old Parliament House.

## **6.2 OPH CONSERVATION MANAGEMENT PLAN POLICIES**

The Conservation Management Plan (CMP) (Pearson, Betteridge, O’Keefe, Marshall and Young 2000) is the primary conservation planning document for Old Parliament House, and the policies in the CMP provide the context for the more detailed conservation actions proposed in this study. This heritage study elaborates and expands upon policies and strategies contained in the CMP. The breadth of the CMP in covering the whole building ensures that the significance assessment and implementation proposals in this study are formulated in the knowledge of the significance of and conservation policies for other areas of the building.

## **6.3 MANAGEMENT’S REQUIREMENTS AND ASPIRATIONS**

Overall, Old Parliament House is subject to a range of constraints and presents a range of opportunities. These matters are dealt with in an overview fashion in the Conservation Management Plan (Pearson, Betteridge, Marshall, O’Keefe and Young 2000). This section does not generally seek to repeat the information presented in that plan although some information is cross referenced.

### **Legislative Requirements**

Three key Acts or legislative requirements discussed in the context of conservation planning are the:

- Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act 1999;
- Australian Heritage Commission Act 1975; and the

- Building Code of Australia.

### ***Management Situation***

Old Parliament House is managed by the Department of Communications, Information Technology and the Arts (DOCITA). Broad policy direction is provided by a non statutory Governing Council and day to day management of Old Parliament House is undertaken by staff of DOCITA. The South East Wing is used for storage, some office accommodation, and occasionally for meetings. The National Portrait Gallery has a proposal to develop a new exhibition gallery in the Wing, subject to funding being provided. This is discussed further below.

A significant factor constraining physical changes in the Wing is the presence of asbestos in the ceilings. This issue is also discussed below.

### **Overview of Users and Uses**

The Commonwealth Government has decided that Old Parliament House should be used to present Australia's political history and to accommodate the National Portrait Gallery. Both of these functions are undertaken by the Department of Communications, Information Technology and the Arts (DOCITA) which also has overall control of Old Parliament House. DOCITA is therefore the primary user of the building and operates display, interpretation and gallery areas within the building, runs tours and has offices within the building.

The Wing is currently used as follows:

- staff of the Centenary of Federation organisation, part of DOCITA, use all of the office accommodation on the lower floor of the 1965 part of the Wing;
- the conference rooms on the lower floor are operated as conference rooms for use by or hire from OPH;
- other DOCITA staff use two offices on the lower floor in the 1943 part;
- staff of the National Australia Day Council, a government organisation, use six rooms on the main floor in the 1965 part;
- the Order of Australia Association uses two rooms on the main floor of the 1965 part;
- a number of other rooms on the main floor of the 1965 part of set up as small meeting rooms; and
- the remaining rooms are used for storage or are empty.

Some of these uses involve external users of the Wing. These include people attending special functions or meetings being held in the Wing. There are also occasional public tours conducted of the Wing, interpreting it as part of OPH.

In both cases, these external users have access to the South East Wing only occasionally, such as during conventions or as part of special guided tours.

The extensive current use of the Wing for storage needs to be stressed as any changes in use may require substantial alternative storage to be found.

The office accommodation in the Wing is generally of a lesser standard than contemporary office accommodation. Its long term use for offices is not appropriate unless airconditioning and other occupational, health and safety issues are addressed. The presence of asbestos in the ceilings is a significant factor to be considered in contemplating any changes to the Wing.

## **Future Requirements and Aspirations**

### *Services*

The nature and extent of building services to be provided depends, to some extent, on the proposed use of the Wing. However, in general terms most of the existing services are considered to be substandard, either in absolute terms (such as original electrical wiring and fire egress), or in terms of asbestos-related limitations on operation or upgrade (as in the case of airconditioning and to some extent lighting), and would require upgrading or replacement to meet standards for most adapted reuse, such as office use or public display. This relates to the following services:

- electrical;
- lighting;
- data;
- fire/emergency; and
- airconditioning.

Specific issues related to fire services/protection include:

- replacing substandard sprinkler heads;
- upgrading of fire mains;
- relocating the fire valve set;
- installing fire doors between the North Wing and the South East Wing; and
- fire isolation of the upper floor of the Wing from the South Wing.

### *Access including fire egress*

It is understood there are two access issues related to the Wing. These are:

- fire egress from the southern end of the Wing and the current stairs; and
- toilet facilities for people with disabilities.

There may be other access issues for people with disabilities and a further detailed study should be undertaken to identify these, if any.

The current stairs at the southern end of the Wing in the 1965 part do not provide satisfactory egress because they do not discharge to an area outside the building, and they extend through four storeys. In order to provide a complying escape route, it seems possible both of these problems can be solved through one solution involving some changes to the fabric. In essence, this solution involves extending the lower

floor landing to the outer wall and creating a fire exit in this wall, to a new lowered ground level outside. New stairs would then be formed to the basement in the void under the existing stairs. These new stairs would have to discharge through an outside door also.

There are currently no toilet facilities in the wing for people with disabilities. The nearest facilities are either in the South or North Wings of the 1927 building. The resolution of this issue depends in part on the future use of the Wing, and guidance may also be obtained from the detailed study mentioned above, about whether the South and North Wing facilities might satisfy requirements.

### *Asbestos removal*

There have been a series of studies and actions taken relating to the presence of asbestos fire insulation, and other asbestos products, in the Wing. The most significant of these matters is the fire insulation.

The fire insulation is on all four floors of the Wing. On the basement, lower and main floors, the asbestos has been used to coat the exposed bottom flange of the steel I-beams which run east-west and are located at about 1,200 mm centres. On the upper floor, asbestos fully coats the steel beams which support the roof framing.

While the asbestos is contained by being sealed in the ceiling spaces of the Wing, it poses difficulties in undertaking almost any work in the Wing, and would have to be removed if substantial changes were proposed. As a latent health hazard, its removal is highly desirable.

In the absence of a detailed study and specification of asbestos removal needs, the exact method of removal is yet to be determined, but might involve substantial intervention in the fabric of the 1965 part. It is understood this might involve:

- removal of carpet and underlay;
- removal of any timber partition walls or timber panelling fixed to battens which is fixed to masonry walls;
- removal of ceilings;
- removal of airconditioning equipment, electrical and other wiring; and
- removing the asbestos insulation and cleaning all remaining surfaces.

Some of these elements may not be able to be successfully cleaned and reinstated, should that be desired. In particular, the original ceiling tiles are thought not to be re-useable.

However, it seems likely the basic structure of the Wing, including the internal brick walls in both parts of the Wing, could be left in place while the asbestos removal takes place.

The other asbestos in the Wing is lagging on pipes and a boiler.

An up to date study of the current asbestos problem and solutions should be undertaken.

### ***Interpretation***

Substantial consideration of the interpretation of the Wing is not within the scope of this report. However, a few brief comments are appropriate.

Interpretation of Old Parliament House, including the Wing, is generally guided by the Conservation Management Plan (Pearson and others 2000), and specifically by the Interpretation Plan (DOCITA 2000). The Interpretation Plan makes specific reference to the Wing under Primary Theme C:

#### **Interpretive Link: Representing the People, Stage 1**

A series of room interpretations and related interpretive activities linked around themes of parliamentary representation and the experience of... Members.

It is desirable that the Wing eventually be a venue for such interpretation. The extent of interpretation has not been determined although it will be influenced by several factors:

- the desirability to interpret Member and ministerial accommodation across the periods related to the Wing, 1943-65;
- the desirability to present a substantial block of rooms, not just one or a few isolated rooms; and
- the desirability to present one or several corridors.

Interpretation of the Wing is not an immediate priority but would be likely to receive attention in about 2004-05. Interpretation would also need to take into account the presentation of Senators' rooms in the Southwest Wing which are a current priority. Interpretation of the whole Wing seems unrealistic in the short or medium term.

Use of the Wing for interpretation is a compatible use.

### ***Meeting and office accommodation use***

Use has been made of the South East Wing on several occasions since 1988 as 'breakout' space for participants at various conventions and meetings, or the conference rooms have been used for meetings by OPH or hired by others for such use. This remains a possible ongoing use for at least some spaces in the South East Wing, in particular the conference rooms.

Some offices in the South East Wing are currently used by Government agencies or rented to a non government organisation. The Government agencies tend to be short-term occupants. Such use is a potential income source for ongoing management of the place, especially if upgraded to meet current health and safety standards (consistent with significance). The continued use of all or part of the Wing for this purpose is a compatible use given it essentially continues the nature of the historic use. Given the association of the building with Government, it would seem preferable that office accommodation should be provided only for government agencies or bodies working

on Government instigated or endorsed programs. Such use would be enhanced if some interpretation was also possible.

### ***DOCITA—National Portrait Gallery use***

The National Portrait Gallery in 2001 proposed the use of the South East Wing as a major extension to their exhibition space in the North Wing. While this proposal has not proceeded, in the absence of funding, the aspiration of the National Portrait Gallery to use space in the Wing may again become an issue during the life of this plan. Any new proposal for the use of the Wing should be assessed in terms of the scale of impact it would have on the significance of the Wing, including that reflected in its fabric. In terms of the scale of compatibility of changes outlined at section 7.4 below, a proposal that required substantial loss of internal walls, major changes to or impact on the appreciation of original spaces (such as the multiplicity of offices), or which proposed enclosure of part or all of the courtyard would be in the 'less' to 'least' compatible categories. Such a proposal would be far less desirable than adaptive uses that had a lesser impact on significance. A minimal-impact gallery use, using existing room spaces and especially allowing for some interpretation of the significance of the Wing, would be a more compatible adaptive use.

## **6.4 CONDITION AND INTEGRITY**

The condition and integrity of the wing relates to its building fabric, its use, furniture and objects.

### **Building Fabric**

#### ***General***

The Wing is generally in fair condition and displays moderate to high integrity. In this case the integrity of the Wing is judged against its significant period of occupation by Parliament, 1943-88. In a few common cases it is difficult to assess the exact age of a change and whether it falls within the significant period or not. These changes are discussed further below.

Although no structural assessment of the Wing has been undertaken, a few cracks were noted in the rendered brickwork – especially in the external north wall and the internal wall in the southeast corner of the 1965 part. The consequences of this cracking is not known but should be investigated by a structural engineer.

On occasions, water has built up in the trough which is part of the external cornice, and this has flowed back into the building. The roof is not fully watertight.

The possibility of the external wall render delaminating needs to be investigated.

#### ***Exteriors***

North Wall (1965) The paintwork is deteriorated on the cornice, parapet capping and timber windows. There are also several cracks in the render, especially around the windows.

East Wall (1965) The paintwork on the cornice and timber windows is very deteriorated. There is also some cracking in the render. One of the window mounted exhaust fans has collapsed.

South Wall (1965) The paintwork on the cornice and timber windows is deteriorated.

West Wall (1940s) Fair condition and high integrity (repainted 1999)

#### Wing Courtyard Walls

The elevations are in fair condition and display a high level of integrity, though some windows have been altered and flyscreens removed.

Wing Courtyard The courtyard is in fair condition and moderately intact. The paving is worn and the timber benches deteriorated. The trees appear to be healthy, but some of the shrubs in the courtyard are in poor condition and there are gaps in the plantings and the understorey is poor.

### *Interiors*

Many of the finishes in the Wing are worn or slightly deteriorated. Common examples are:

- flaking, chipped, worn or otherwise deteriorated paintwork;
- deteriorated stained finishes;
- sagging ceiling tiles; and
- broken light diffusers.

The integrity of the Wing is diminished slightly by a few changes or missing items including:

- some missing ceiling tiles;
- some clocks are missing;
- data cabling, which is probably post 1988 and therefore not significant/slightly intrusive;
- modern surface mounted conduits; and
- missing light diffusers.

As noted above, some of the changes to the fabric are difficult to date, and therefore difficult to assess in terms of their impact on integrity. One common though minor element in this regard is the data cabling throughout the Wing. In addition to outlets there is also much surface mounted cabling or conduits. It is suspected that much of this material post dates 1988.

### *Services*

As noted above, most of the services are considered to be substandard. In terms of the condition and integrity of the existing services, the following specific comments are relevant.

- |                 |  |
|-----------------|--|
| Electrical      | The wiring in the 1943/1948 part is thought to be deteriorated.  |
| Airconditioning | The airconditioning for the 1965 part survives but is not used and sealed off because of asbestos problems. This includes the basement plant room. |

### **Use, Furniture and Objects**

Much of the significance of the Wing relates to its parliamentary use in the period 1943-88. In so far as this use has ended, so the integrity of the Wing is diminished. However, to some extent, the continuing use of the Wing for office accommodation is a sympathetic use which retains, in a general sense, some aspects of significance of the Wing.

The loss of most of the furniture and objects associated with the parliamentary use of the Wing diminishes the significance of the Wing. However, some of the furniture for the Wing is stored elsewhere.

Those few pieces of associated furniture or associated objects which remain in the Wing seem in fair condition and highly intact.

## **7. IMPLEMENTATION OF OPH CMP POLICIES AND STRATEGIES**

### **7.1 OBJECTIVE**

This heritage study elaborates and expands upon policies and strategies contained in the Old Parliament House Conservation Management Plan (CMP). The CMP policies are at a generalised level for the whole building, while this study provides detailed commentaries on policies and specific actions to implement them, consistent with the CMP, that are appropriate to the conservation management of the South East Wing.

This study does not provide new policies for Old Parliament House but relies on those contained within the CMP. Readers should rely on and refer to the policies within the CMP. However, commentaries are provided below which may repeat, paraphrase or clarify CMP policies with regard to the South East Wing. Reference to the relevant policies and strategies from the CMP are indicated in the text below in (parentheses).

A primary objective in the management of Old Parliament House is to maintain existing uses (where appropriate) and to find new uses that make a positive contribution to the conservation and presentation of the significance of the place, that are appealing to visitors and support the viability of Old Parliament House into the future.

### **7.2 GENERAL BASIS FOR PLANNING AND WORKS**

This heritage study for the South East Wing acknowledges that the CMP is the primary guide for the conservation of heritage values, and any changes to this document should be consistent with the CMP. (CMP Policy 4)

The CMP includes a range of policies and strategies which apply to the South East Wing as part of the building. These are not repeated in this study but include:

- that significance is the basis for planning and work (CMP Policy 1), the significance of the South East Wing being elaborated in Chapter 5 of this study;
- adoption of Burra Charter (CMP Policy 2);
- the need for expert heritage conservation advice (CMP Policy 7);
- the need to review the Conservation Management Plan including supplementary documents such as this study at given points in time (CMP Policy 9);
- counter-disaster plan (CMP Policy 23); and
- monitoring impact of use (CMP Policy 40).

In addition, all of the other policies in the CMP may apply to the South East Wing, whether elaborated in this study or not.

### 7.3 DEFINITIONS

The definitions for terms used in this report are those adopted by Australia ICOMOS in its *Charter for the conservation of places of cultural significance* (the Burra Charter) (as revised November 1999).

**Place** means site, area, land, landscape, building or other work, group of buildings or other works, and may include components, contents, spaces and views.

**Cultural significance** means aesthetic, historic, scientific, social or spiritual value for past, present or future generations. Cultural significance is embodied in the *place* itself, its *fabric*, *setting*, *use*, *associations*, *meanings*, records, *related places* and *related objects*.

**Fabric** means all the physical material of the *place* including fixtures, contents and objects.

**Conservation** means all the processes of looking after a *place* so as to retain its cultural significance.

**Maintenance** means the continuous protective care of the *fabric*, and *setting* of a *place*, and is to be distinguished from repair. Repair involves *restoration* or *reconstruction*.

**Preservation** means *maintaining* the *fabric* of a *place* in its existing state and retarding deterioration.

**Restoration** means returning the existing *fabric* of a *place* to a known earlier state by removing accretions or by reassembling existing components without the introduction of new material.

**Reconstruction** means returning a *place* to a known earlier state and is distinguished from *restoration* by the introduction of new material into the *fabric*.

**Adaptation** means modifying a *place* to suit the existing use or a proposed *use*.

**Use** means the functions of a *place*, as well as the activities and practices that may occur at the place.

**Compatible use** means a use which respects the *cultural significance* of a *place*. Such a use involves no, or minimal, impact on *cultural significance*.

**Setting** means the area around a *place*, which may include the visual catchment.

**Related place** means a *place* that contributes to the *cultural significance* of another place.

**Related object** means an object that contributes to the *cultural significance* of a *place* but is not at the place.

**Associations** mean the special connections that exist between people and a *place*.

**Meanings** denote what a *place* signifies, indicates, evokes or expresses.

**Interpretation** means all the ways of presenting the *cultural significance* of a *place*.

## 7.4 APPROPRIATE USES OF THE SOUTH EAST WING

### New and continuing uses compatible with significance

**Commentary** All uses of the South East Wing should be compatible with its heritage significance. Uses should contribute, directly or indirectly, to the objective of interpreting the stories and significance of OPH. Active interpretation is likely to be a limited option, at least in the short-term, but passive interpretation through new uses should be an aim. The retention of the nature and layout of office accommodation is a major factor in the understanding and interpretation of the Wing. (CMP Policies 37-38)

Compatible uses, and conservation approaches generally, in the South East Wing, and in particular in the 1965 section, are influenced by the need to remove asbestos if substantial alterations are envisaged. While at the start of this study it was believed that this would require the complete removal of all internal fabric from the 1965 section, the evidence now suggests that the internal walls are substantially masonry, and extend to the ceiling slab, removing the need to demolish them. This has an impact on the preferred means of reconstructing these spaces once asbestos has been removed. The resolution of this issue requires specialist advice on asbestos removal (see Action 6 below), but it is appropriate to identify the preferred options here, in terms of compatible uses.

The compatibility of uses are ranked in the following way;

Very highly compatible: uses that retain the significant fabric and spaces of the Wing in their current state. Office accommodation or interpretation would be the most compatible uses, achievable as a long-term option in the 1943-48 sections, and as a short-term option in the 1965 section because of the eventual need to remove the asbestos.

**Highly compatible:** uses that occur in spaces reconstructed to their original configuration after the removal of asbestos. The use of post-asbestos-removal 1965 section rooms for office or interpretation use would be an example.

**Moderately compatible:** uses that required the insertion of new doorways or the removal of some internal walls between offices to create larger spaces, together with the retention of an intact sample of accommodation in each section (restored/reconstructed as necessary in areas disturbed by asbestos removal in the 1965 wing). This would apply in all sections of the Wing.

**Less compatible:** uses that required the substantial removal of walls between offices and the retention of few or no examples of accommodation in each section.

**Least compatible:** uses that required the large scale removal of walls between offices, and between corridors and offices. This option would be extremely damaging of fabric and significance in the 1943-48 sections, where the masonry internal walls are load-bearing. In the 1965 wing it is physically less damaging, but in any section of the Wing this approach would significantly reduce an understanding of the historical use and configuration of the Wing.

Moderate to very highly compatible uses might include:

- interpretation of original uses;
- office accommodation;
- meeting rooms or short-term function rooms (as individual or interlinked rooms);
- intimate exhibition spaces/gallery use (as individual or interlinked rooms);
- storage (the present use of much of the Wing), would not maximise the long-term use or interpretation of the wing, but is a low-impact short-term compatible use.

A mixture of moderate to very highly compatible uses occupying different sections and floors of the Wing would achieve conservation objectives.

If any proposals arise which involve the partial or complete removal of walls then a structural assessment should be undertaken (this is not specified as an action at this stage).

- Action 1      Develop proposals that maximise the compatible use of spaces in all sections of the South East Wing involving the following possible uses:
- interpretation of original uses;
  - office accommodation;

- meeting rooms or short-term function rooms (as individual or interlinked rooms);
- exhibition spaces/gallery use preferably involving individual or interlinked rooms/minimal impact on the Wing; and
- storage.

## **7.5 ACTIONS RELATED TO FABRIC**

### **Building**

#### **Conservation of Fabric**

Commentary The significance of Old Parliament House and conservation policies for its care are detailed in the Conservation Management Plan (CMP Policy 18, Pearson and others 2000). To some extent, these deal with the significance of the Wing.

The selection of representative examples of accommodation, as recommended below, should be made in the context of planning new uses for the Wing. The representative examples should include as many of the existing rooms as is feasible, balancing any necessary refurbishment to meet new uses, and the level of interpretation accompanying the new uses. The representative examples should be conserved as sets of rooms rather than as individual isolated rooms, so that the pattern of rooms and corridor access is able to be clearly understood. While setting a firm minimum size of the representative sample is difficult in the absence of reuse proposals, the retention of at least 20-25% in each of the construction phases of the building, of ministerial and backbencher rooms, in groups and in pre 1988 form, would appear to adequately reflect working conditions in the Wing and to meet future interpretative purposes. Such a minimum figure should not be used automatically as a target. Any loss of rooms must be fully justified.

The conservation/interpretation of representative rooms might include a mix of reconstruction of a few rooms to 1940s or 1950s appearance (especially those associated with prominent occupants in those periods), but the majority should reflect 1988 conditions. In the later case, changes, fittings and partitions present at 1988 should, OH&S allowing, be retained.

This study identifies a range of additional specific aspects or features of significance which should be conserved.

These are detailed below.

- Action 2 In addition to the general conservation policies provided in the OPH Conservation Management Plan (2000), particular aspects or features of the Wing deserving conservation include:
- the overall form and extent of the Wing as it evolved to 1988, including the courtyard, which partly demonstrates the manner in which the building grew and its final form when occupied by the Parliament;
  - representative examples of backbencher's, ministerial and staff accommodation, as they changed over time;
  - the overall form of the South East Wing;
  - the symmetrical façades, especially the east elevation;
  - its division into vertical bays, through the use of a breakfront design;
  - vestigial classical entablature, being the cornice;
  - simple external wall surfaces;
  - external wall bracket lights on the 1940s part of the Wing;
  - the internal moulded render skirtings, architraves and picture rails;
  - simply detailed and light coloured stained timberwork in the 1965 part; and
  - Room M74 in the 1943 part of the Wing with its special character related to dark stained, simply detailed timberwork and the suspended ceiling light diffuser.
- Commentary The physical survey of the Wing and consultations undertaken have identified a range of condition and integrity issues which should be addressed. In some cases, further investigations are needed.
- Action 3 Undertake conservation works to address the issues identified in Appendix 1.
- Action 4 The consequences of internal and external wall/render cracking should be investigated by a structural engineer.
- Action 5 Investigate the nature and extent of possible delamination of the external wall render.

### **Asbestos Removal**

- Commentary A discussion of the asbestos issue is provided at Section 6.3 (CMP Strategy 18.2(h)). The resolution of this issue should be preceded by a study to prepare an up to date view of the problem and possible solutions.
- Action 6 An up to date study of the current asbestos problem and solutions should be undertaken, to focus especially on the extent of fabric disturbance required to remove asbestos.

Action 7 Based on Action 6, undertake the removal of asbestos in a way that minimises the extent of fabric disturbance.

### **Access to the Wing**

Commentary Access to the Wing for people with disabilities is an issue which requires further specialist investigation (CMP Strategy 38.3). This relates both to movement around the Wing and the provision of toilet facilities.

Action 7 A detailed study should be undertaken to identify any access issues for people with disabilities, and it should consider solutions which minimise impact on the significance of the Wing.

Commentary The existing southern stair in 1965 part of the Wing is believed not to comply with current standards. A possible solution is outlined in Section 6.3 but this needs to be further considered in detail.

Action 8 Fire egress from the southern end of the Wing should be further investigated and solutions which minimise impact on significance considered.

### **Building Services**

#### **Retention of current and redundant Building Services**

Commentary Where possible, existing building services should be used and maintained where these can contribute to the required level of service required (eg the hot water radiators). Where service upgrades require changes to be made, existing fittings and fixtures should be used consistent with safety and efficiency (such as upgrade of lighting using existing light fittings) (CMP Policy 24).

Action 9 Examples of current or redundant services that should be retained include:

- radiators, if in the future they cannot be maintained in operation;
- division bells and lights; and
- clocks.

#### **Upgrading or Replacement of Services**

Commentary The current services in the Wing are, in many cases, substandard and, depending of the proposed use of the Wing, they need to be upgraded or replaced (CMP Strategies 29.1 and 38.2).

The decommissioned window mounted fan coil units (airconditioners) do not appear to be of special engineering interest but they do have

some historic significance in being an example of the inelegant, ad hoc solutions which were undertaken to solve specific accommodation problems—in this case probably the sealing of the centralised system due to the presence of asbestos. As such the existing units offer an opportunity for future use in interpretation. Should the use of all or part of the Wing become interpretation, this aspect of the history of the place would be worth telling, using at least some examples of the fan coil units for that purpose. There are other such airconditioners located in OPH, but not as many as in the South East Wing..

Should the use of the Wing or parts of it not include an interpretative function, the retention of the units for interpretation becomes less critical, though a sample needs to be retained (see below). However, until decisions are made and works funded for major new uses of the Wing involving rooms with fan coil units, they should be left in position.

The policy guidance provided by the Conservation Management Plan suggests five points:

- such fabric is part of the significance of OPH, albeit each instance is of minor interest;
- this fabric should remain unless there are strong reasons for its removal;
- such reasons might include that the fabric of an fan coil unit has deteriorated to the point where it threatens to collapse or otherwise harm surrounding fabric; or there are strong reasons to adapt a window which would require the removal of a fan coil unit;
- a survey of building services should be undertaken to identify services of heritage significance (see also below);
- it may be desirable to retain at least a sample of such fabric, if removal is undertaken after each of the above points has been addressed;

Accordingly, and at this stage, until there is some clear reason to remove them, the airconditioners should be retained.

Other services will need upgrading as and when new uses are introduced. the Conservation Management Plan policy guidance outlined above should be applied to these services as well.

- Action 10      Depending on the proposed use of the Wing, upgrade or replace the following services to achieve a reasonable contemporary standard, achieved with careful regard for the heritage significance of the Wing:
- electrical;
  - lighting;
  - data;
  - fire/emergency; and
  - airconditioning.

As necessary, such upgrading should be preceded by appropriate professional assessments/studies.

Specific issues related to fire services/protection include:

- replacing substandard sprinkler heads;
- upgrading of fire mains;
- relocating the fire valve set;
- installing fire doors between the North Wing and the Southeast Wing; and
- fire isolation of the upper floor of the Wing from the South Wing.

Retain the decommissioned window fan coil units (airconditioners) unless;

- there are strong reasons for their removal;
- a survey of building services has been undertaken to identify services of heritage significance, and this survey finds that the airconditioners to be of no significance;
- the fate of these airconditioners is considered in the context of the other examples of such airconditioners in OPH, including the question of retaining at least a sample.

## **Movable Items**

Commentary As part of an integrated approach to the Wing and its movable items, it is appropriate to undertake research to establish what items held by DOCITA relate specifically to the Wing (CMP Policy 31).

Action 11 An attempt should be made to identify furniture and objects held by DOCITA which specifically relate to the Wing.

## **8. RECOMMENDATIONS**

### **Recommendation 1 Update of Conservation Management Plan**

The Conservation Management Plan for OPH (Pearson and others 2000) should be reviewed in the light of this heritage study to ensure consistency and that the Plan is updated where necessary.

### **Recommendation 2 Further Historical Research**

Further specific or opportunistic historical research should be undertaken to obtain further information on the following matters.

- The introduction of airconditioning into the Wing, and associated changes such as the installation of suspended ceilings.
- The installation of the fan coil units on the cornice of the Wing (to confirm presumed 1984 date).
- The acoustic treatment of doors in the 1940s parts.
- The removal of flyscreens from the 1940s parts, except for those known to have been removed in 2000.
- Upgrading of interior finishes, such as those in Room M74, and the replacement of carpets to the lower and main floors.
- The exterior paint colour of the rendered walls of the Wing and whether it was always white or an off-white.
- Whether the timber windows were always white painted externally. Were the windows of the 1943/48 parts of the Wing originally clear/stain finished, and when were some of them painted?
- The history of movement of particular member's accommodation around the House.

## **9. BIBLIOGRAPHY**

### **WRITTEN SOURCES**

Australian Construction Services 1991, 'Asbestos Survey, Old Parliament House Redevelopment', unpublished report prepared for the Australian Property Group.

Department of Communications, Information Technology and the Arts, nd, 'Old Parliament House Interpretation Plan 2000-2005'.

Gutteridge Haskins and Davey 1999, 'Old Parliament House South West Wing Heritage Study', report for DOCITA.

Pearson, M, M Betteridge, D Marshall, B O'Keefe and L Young 2000, 'Old Parliament House Conservation Management Plan', report for the Department of Communications, Information Technology and the Arts.

### **PLANS RELATING TO THE SOUTH EAST WING**

## **APPENDIX 1: DETAILED CONDITION AND INTEGRITY ISSUES**

### **EXTERNAL ISSUES**

- Possible delamination of the render.
- Minor roof leaks.
- Paint finishes are deteriorated, especially on the cornice, parapet capping and timber windows.
- The cornice is clearly a maintenance problem given water penetration into the building and the paintwork deterioration.
- There are several cracks in the render, especially around the north elevation windows and on the east elevation.
- One of the window mounted exhaust fans has collapsed on the east elevation.
- The timber benches in the Wing Courtyard are very deteriorated.
- Some of the shrubs in the courtyard are in poor condition and there are gaps in the plantings.
- Some damaged flyscreens have been recently removed from the windows facing the House of Representatives courtyard, and these have not been repaired and/or replaced.

### **INTERNAL ISSUES**

#### **Common Internal Issues**

- Paint finishes beginning to show signs of deterioration.
- Stain finishes generally showing more marked deterioration.
- Data cabling is probably post 1988 and therefore not significant/slightly intrusive.
- Modern surface mounted conduits.
- There are a number of clocks missing.
- Sagging or missing ceiling tiles.
- Broken or missing light diffusers.
- Counter balance mechanism for windows probably needs replacement throughout.

#### **Specific comments relating to Rooms**

##### **Room L86**

- Clock missing from division lights box.

##### **Room L88A**

- Part of the timber skirting is missing.

##### **Room L92**

- Clock missing.

#### **Room L100**

- Carpet unfixed and deteriorated.
- Electrical/data wiring loose.

Possibly pre 1988 changes:

- Timber panel affixed to inside of door, obscuring glass panel.
- Security screen fixed to inside of window.

#### **Room L139**

- Replace missing light diffuser.
- Repair base of external door.

#### **Room L140**

- Replace missing vent(?) in cupboard door.
- Replace missing light diffuser.

#### **Room L141**

- Refix sagging ceiling tiles.

#### **Room L144**

- Refix sagging ceiling tiles.

#### **Room L147**

- Replace missing clock.

#### **Room L149**

- Replace missing clock.

#### **Room L151**

- Refix sagging ceiling tile.

#### **Room L153**

- Refix downlights.

#### **Room L155**

- Refix/repair sagging ceiling tiles and refix downlights.

#### **Room L156**

- Worn finishes generally.
- Minor damage to lower wall render.

Possibly pre 1988 changes:

- Changes to ceiling/mixed used of panelling materials.

#### **Room L157**

- Access hatch in ceiling missing.

**Room L158**

- One ceiling tile is missing.
- Modern sign on wall.

**Room L159**

- One ceiling tile missing.
- Loose surface mounted conduit.
- Repair drummy render.

**Room L161**

- Install more sympathetic door release mechanism.
- Remove post 1988 surface mounted conduits.
- Install grille over duct opening.
- Repair hole in bulkhead/duct.

**Room L162**

- Repair large hole in east wall.

**Room L163**

- Repair holes/former fixing points in walls.

**Room L164**

- Replace one cracked glass pane.
- Wall grille needs to be refixed.
- Repair/replace/refix damaged/loose ceiling tiles.

**Room L165**

- Replace missing mosaic tiles.

**Room L166**

- Refix loose soap holder.
- Repair hole in ceiling.

**Room L167**

- Repair venetian blind.

**Room L169**

- Replace missing diffuser.
- Repair venetian blind.

**Room L171**

- Replace broken GPO.

**Room L174**

- Replace missing mosaic tiles.

**Room M63**

- Replace missing light diffuser.

**Room M65**

- Replace missing light diffuser.

**Room M69**

- Reinstate basin/sink unit.

**Room M70**

- Replace missing light diffuser.

**Room M72**

- Replace short section of missing timber skirting.

**Room M73**

- Replace missing skirting.

**Room M77**

- Replace missing clock.

**Room M110**

- Replace missing or refix detached skirting.
- Secure loose wires.

**Room M111.1**

- Replace chipped tiles.

**Room M112**

- Replace missing clock.

**Room M113**

- Refix sagging ceiling tiles.
- Replace missing clock.

**Room M114**

- Refix sagging ceiling tiles.

**Room M118**

- Refix skirting.

**Room M126**

- Repair window mounted exhaust fan.

**Room M127**

- Regrout floor tiles.

**Room M127.1**

- Regrout floor tiles.

**Room M127.2**

- Replace missing floor tiles and regrout.

- Replace cracked light diffuser.

**Room M129**

- Patch hole in wall.

**Room M200**

- Replace missing ceiling tiles.
- Replace missing light diffuser.

**Room U52**

- Replace broken/delaminating section of laminate on cupboard.

**Room U57**

- Replace/refix access panels below basins.

**Room U57.1**

- Replace missing toilet pans, urinal and cistern.

**Room U60**

- Repaint walls.
- Repair damaged ceiling.

**Room U61**

- Replace broken light switch.

**Room U62**

- Replace missing light diffusers.

**Room U66**

- Reattach acoustic hood to door.

**Room U68**

- Repair render around door frame.

**Room U71**

- Refix/replace one light diffuser.

**Room U97.1**

- Replace missing toilet pans.

**Room U98.1**

- Replace missing light diffuser.

**Room U111**

- Replace missing light diffuser and data outlet cover plate.
- Remove electrical distribution board and conduit.

**Rooms U112 and U113**

- Repaint walls.

**Room U114.1**

- Replace missing floor tiles and regrout tiles.
- Replace missing shower arm.

**Room U114.2**

- Replace missing floor tiles and regrout.
- Replace missing urinal and cistern, and missing toilet pans.

**Room U116**

- Replace missing acoustic hood on door.
- Replace missing division lights box cover and clock.
- Replace missing light diffuser.

**Room U116.1**

- Replace missing ceiling tiles.
- Replace missing tubes and diffuser.

**Room U118**

- Replace broken GPO.

**Room U127**

- Repair broken shelves.

**Room U128**

- Replace missing part of door jamb.

**Room U129**

- Refix loose light.

**Room U200**

- Repair worn carpet joint.
- Replace missing ceiling tile.

**Room U200.3**

- Repair damaged carpet.
- Replace missing ceiling tiles.

**Room U200.4**

- Replace missing ceiling tiles.

**SERVICES**

- Electrical wiring in the 1943/1948 part of the Wing is thought to be deteriorated.