Australia's Sunbelt Migration: The Recent Growth of Brisbane and The Moreton Bay Region

Patrick Mullins

INTRODUCTION

The most significant contemporary change in Australian regional development has been the growth of the relatively underdeveloped states of Queensland and Western Australia, on the one hand, and the relative decline of the spatial core of Australian capitalism, New South Wales and Victoria, on the other. The former are developing as a result of inflows of foreign capital for the exploitation and export of mineral reserves, while the ebb in New South Wales and Victoria is a consequence of the decline in the early 1970s of Australia's manufacturing industry. Yet the development of Queensland and Western Australia is not simply a consequence of mineral expropriation since additional processes have operated. It is the purpose of this paper to analyse the other major element involved in the expansion of one of these two marginal states: Queensland.

The second and largely independent impetus to Queensland's development revolves around the rapid population growth of the dominant southeastern corner of the state; that is, the Moreton Region, comprising mainly metropolitan Brisbane, as well as the Gold Coast, 60 kilometres south, and the towns of the Sunshine Coast stretching 100 kilometres north. The rate of population growth in the Moreton Region during the 1960s and 1970s has been faster than Queensland and Australia as a whole, and Brisbane has grown faster over the same period than almost all major metropolitan centres. Other parts of the region, particularly the Gold Coast and the Sunshine Coast towns of Caloundra and Maroochydore/Mooloolaba, have experienced even faster growth, with the Gold Coast, for instance, doubling its population between 1954 and 1966 and then again, to over 100,000, between 1966 and 1976.

Giving special attention to Brisbane as the Moreton Region's major centre, this paper argues that rapid growth has been a consequence of huge direct investments in urban and regional development, rather than of specific investments of industrial capital. In other words, the Moreton Region has evolved as a consumption unit, being the third largest in Australia after the Sydney and Melbourne conurbations, rather than a combined production/consumption site, as with the latter two regions. The importance of consumption for the growth of the Moreton Region is apparent firstly in the massive residential development of metropolitan Brisbane and of the Gold and Sunshine Coasts, which was accompanied by the production and consumption of 'suburban' commodities such as cars and motor mowers, and secondly in the Region's development as Australia's major centre for tourism and recreation. Moreover, both of these consumption patterns, it will be shown, were helped along by a conducive system of local government and by the mining boom.

A COMPARATIVE FRAMEWORK: SUNBELT U.S.A.

What is striking about the rapid growth of the Moreton Region and the 'Sunshine State' as a whole, is the way it appears to parallel the post-1945 growth of areas

---

Patrick Mullins is in the Department of Anthropology and Sociology at the University of Queensland

in the south, southwest and west of the United States of America - the "Sunbelt" - and particularly the development of cities such as Atlanta, Houston and Phoenix. In both the United States and Australia there seems to have been a relative shift of capital and labour from the spatial cores to the marginal regions. In the absence of previous Australian studies, the American case provides a useful comparative framework within which to consider Brisbane and its Moreton Region: the works of Heil (1978), Gordon (1977), Hill (1976) and Mollenkopf (1975) are especially helpful in this connection.

Of course, there are important general differences between the two economies, reflecting their quite different histories and locations within world capitalism. Australia, for example, did not undergo the industrial stage of capitalism and the associated industrial urbanisation that the United States experienced from the mid-nineteenth century until the 1930s/40s, when they moved into the monopoly stage. The main thrust of industrialisation in Australia is much more recent. The United States, in addition, differs because it is a dominant capitalism country while Australia is a dependent nation: dependent upon these dominant formations through the sale of exports. However, bearing in mind such qualifications, it is still useful to develop a framework from analyses of migration to the Sunbelt; as much because the growth of the Moreton Region is unexplored and requires some relevant starting point, as for the useful contrast it provides.

Movement of capital and labour to the U.S. Sunbelt and away from the industrialised northeast was precipitated by the transformation of American capitalism, with the movement into a monopoly period. This monopoly stage is characterised by the control of capital by fewer and fewer but increasingly larger corporations, where centralised decision-making stresses rationalisation of production and distribution through corporate management and planning. Moreover, technical advances in transportation and communication permit corporations to physically separate their administrative functions from the production process itself, and it has been (partly) under these circumstances that a change in American urbanisation has occurred. Industrial plants have moved from the inner city to the suburbs, or intra-regionally to nearby cities. Meanwhile, corporate management has gravitated inwards to the sky-scrapers of the central business districts, thus allowing easy access to the headquarters of banks, insurance companies, advertising agencies, law offices, technical expertise (e.g. computer firms), and so on, as well as to governments and government departments. Accompanying this invasion, but going in the opposite direction, is the movement of the retail sector to new suburban shopping towns catering for an automobilised clientele. Under such conditions, urbanisation under monopoly capital takes the form of a system of 'corporate cities'. The significance of this for the U.S. Sunbelt is that it proves to be a particularly appropriate location for such urban transformation : corporate cities can more easily be constructed in the Sunbelt because of the relative absence of physical, social, political and economic barriers, while considerable difficulties exist in the old industrial cities of the northeast since these obstacles are ever present. Advantages offered by the Sunbelt and problems posed by industrial centres involve four related processes: differences in fixed capital; differences in the political nature of the working-class; differences in local government; differences in pro-growth coalitions involved in building corporate cities.

<u>The absence in the Sunbelt of the fixed capital of the earlier industrial period of capitalism</u> has been one essential advantage in attracting capital. In contrast with the industrial north, Sunbelt urbanisation originally emerged from administrative and service demands of local agriculture and pastoralism, rather than from manufacturing. This meant that there was no requirement for the sophisticated infrastructure of the industrial city. It has partly been because of this that corporate cities developed here with ease and rapidity after 1945. Industrial

cities, by comparison, have been plagued with problems of the removal (through urban renewal) of the fixed capital of the industrial period. This involves the destruction of vacated factories, 'antiquated' transportation and communication facilities and the working-class residential districts surrounding these emptied factories, in order for the new commercial, transportation, communication and inner city luxury residential facilities to develop. Such attempts to remove working-class residential areas have posed further problems because community groups have frequently forced urban renewal agencies to cancel or significantly modify their original plans. The implementation of urban renewal has also been hampered by the fiscal crisis emerging in these industrial cities through losses in tax revenue following out-migration of industries and high income-earners. Revenue is now obtained from retail establishments and the working-class remaining in the inner city, who also draw heavily on revenue through 'generous' welfare provisions, and it is this small revenue base which aggravates expenditure problems for renewal. In summary, an absence of physical barriers in U.S. Sunbelt cities makes them attractive for capital investment, while physical difficulties in old industrial cities create problems.

The second element predisposing the in-migration of capital to the Sunbelt has been the political quiescence of its workers, in contrast with the militancy of proletarianised workers in old northern industrial cities. The relative absence of industry in the Sunbelt largely explains this quiescence as well as the greater social isolation and fragmentation of workers which, in turn, results in the absence of a strong labour movement. Workers therefore receive low wages, have poor working conditions and limited welfare. All of this, of course, has proved attractive for capital relocating from the north because it has offered an avenue for escaping the expensive long-standing confrontation with powerful working-class organisations which have won good wages, working conditions and welfare provisions.

Differences between local government in the Sunbelt and in the northeast form the third factor. Local government has been important in the development of corporate cities because these cities require an overall metropolitan plan. A large local government area is necessary to ensure that the metropolitan area and its region grows in a co-ordinated way. The nature of urban government in the U.S. Sunbelt fits this demand because its metropolitan areas are either unified, or capable of being unified into large local government areas. Heil (1978), for example, cites annexations (since 1960) by Charlotte, North Carolina, of 42 square miles of surrounding districts which allowed a broader source of tax revenue, thus stimulating urban development and allowing a lowering of property taxes for residents. As a consequence, the urban fiscal crisis, so apparent in the industrial north is not yet present in the Sunbelt (though it is beginning to appear as the cost of providing services rises in the increasingly sprawling cities).

In contrast, widespread fragmentation of local government in the north has become a real thorn in the side of development. The splintering of metropolitan centres into thousands of separate jurisdictions has created problems in revenue formation for the metropolis as a whole. It has also presented barriers to co-ordinated development across local government boundaries, which is necessary for building freeways, rapid transit systems, recreational facilities, etc. Such problems emerged, according to Gordon (1977), from the industrial stage of capitalism when industry realised that political unification of a metropolitan area had the effect of raising property taxes. Amalgamation, therefore, ceased from about 1900 following pressure from industry who saw the control of a small local government area close to the central city as a means of reducing property taxes. It was under such conditions that political fragmentation occurred in cities of the industrial north and not, at least to the same extent, in the non-industrial Sunbelt. Thus, co-ordinated urban planning for corporate urbanisation has been easier in Sunbelt cities.

The political force behind corporate urban development, both in the Sunbelt and in the north, has been an amalgam of pro-growth coalitions; of business interests, "progressive" local governments with their planning-oriented technocrats and construction unions. They have been more aggressive in the north because of the massive transformation required. Because of the relative ease in development in the Sunbelt, such coalitions have operated with greater ease; an access to capital and support from local government has been all that is necessary.

Urban governments have been the driving force behind pro-growth coalitions and are symbolised particularly by a new generation of mayors with a characteristic corporate, business-like efficiency, a technocratic outlook, with strong local business and real estate ties and who have entered politics from professional careers. They are usually liberals, almost invariably Democrats, with strong working-class and ethnic support. This superficially paradoxical situation is explained by Friedland, et al (1977) as expressing the way the state, at the urban level, both stimulates the investment of capital for urban development as well as ensuring political integration of the working-class during this time of urban transformation and so limit class conflict.

With these various advantages of the Sunbelt for capital investment and the difficulties of the north, capital has flowed steadily in three waves to the south, southwest and west: firstly, in the transference of labour intensive industries (e.g. garments) from the north after World War Two; secondly, with the migration of capital intensive industries (e.g. electronics), which reached a peak in the late 60s/early 70s; and thirdly, the in-migration of national corporations since 1970. All this has been further stimulated by large-scale federal expenditure in defence and space centres.

THE GROWTH OF BRISBANE AND ITS MORETON REGION: EMPIRICAL PATTERNS

In attempting to compare the growth of Brisbane and the Moreton Region with development in the U.S. Sunbelt, this section will present empirical evidence on the nature and basis of growth. It is divided into two parts. The first gives a demographic summary indicating the direction of growth, while the second provides core material on economic processes.

1. The Pattern of Population Growth

The Moreton Region contains 57 per cent of the State's population (1976) while metropolitan Brisbane alone holds 47 per cent. Like other state capitals, this share has increased over past decades, although it is still considerably less than other state capitals' share of their state populations. Metropolitan Brisbane (the Brisbane Statistical Division) dominates the Moreton Region and in 1976 accounted for 82 per cent of the 1,170,987 population, with Brisbane City by itself comprising 60 per cent. The metropolitan Gold Coast (Gold Coast Statistical Division) comprised 9 per cent and the major towns of the Sunshine Coast - Buderim, Caloundra, Maroochydore/Mooloolaba and Nambour - a further 3 per cent. Therefore, two metropolitan centres and five towns accounted for 94 per cent of the Region's population.

The Moreton Region has been one of the fastest growing areas within Australia. A recent Australian Institute of Urban Studies report (1978), for instance, predicted a continuation of the rapid growth of Brisbane and Perth, such that the two would be the principal growth centres in Australia over the next 20 years, while, conversely, there would be a relative decline of Melbourne and Sydney.

The rapid population growth of Brisbane and the rest of Moreton Region began in the early 1960s. Table 1 shows how, from 1947 to 1961, Brisbane had the lowest or second lowest rate of growth of all six state capitals, but during the 1960s and 1970s this pattern was reversed, for it recorded the second highest growth rate. Table 2, shows how, since the 1940s, the Moreton Region has had a faster rate of growth than Queensland as a whole.

Table 1: Annual Percentage Growth Rates: State Capitals 1947-76

	1947-54	1954-61	1961-66	1966-71	1971-76*
Brisbane	3.2	2.3	4.0	2.7	2.0
Perth	3.6	2.8	3.4	5.1	2.7
Hobart	3.2	2.1	1.6	1.7	1.1
Adelaide	3.4	2.7	4.7	2.2	1.3
Sydney	3.3	2.4	2.2	2.2	1.5
Melbourne	3.2	2.8	2.6	2.6	0.8

* Based on unadjusted 1976 Census data.

Source: Adapted from Neutze (1977:49) for years 1947-71 and from 1976 Census for 1971-76.

Table 2: Annual Percentage Growth Rates: Brisbane, the Moreton Region and Queensland, 1947-76.

	1947-54	1954-61	1961-66	1966-71	1971-76*
Brisbane	3.2	2.3	4.0	2.7	2.0
Moreton Region (including Brisbane)	2.9	2.6	2.5	2.4	2.5
Queensland	2.5	2.0	1.8	1.8	2.2

* Based on unadjusted 1976 Census data.

Source: For Brisbane, Neutze (1977:49) and 1976 Census. For Moreton Region and Queensland, Co-ordinator General's Department, Queensland (1973:91) and 1976 Census.

Table 3 gives more detail of population changes within the Moreton Region for the period from the early 1960s. It shows how the fastest urban development was in the Gold Coast and the towns of the Sunshine Coast, with Gold Coast expansion between 1971 and 1976 being particularly apparent in the Albert Shire, while on the Sunshine Coast, towns such as Caloundra, Buderim and Marrochydore/Mooloolaba have also had marked increases. In contrast, the growth of the major locus of population, metropolitan Brisbane, while being significant, was not as rapid and this has largely been associated with the slowing down of the growth of Brisbane City. The fastest growing areas within metropolitan Brisbane (and within the Moreton Region as a whole) have been the suburbanising southern shires contiguous to Brisbane City - Beaudesert, Moreton and Albert. Moreover, Brisbane City's share of the metropolitan population has fallen quite dramatically over the 1970s. It contained 84 per cent of the population in 1966, 81 per cent in 1971, but only 73 per cent in 1976. Again this reflects the very high rate of growth at the outskirts.

Table 3: Population Increases: Moreton Region (Major Areas) 1961-1966, 1966-1971, 1971-76

	Population 1966	% increase 1961-1966	Population 1971	% increase 1966-1971	Population 1976	% increase 1971-1976
I: Brisbane Statistical Division (Metropolitan Brisbane)						
Brisbane City	656,612	11	700,620	7	717,170	2
Ipswich City	54,592	12	61,582	13	71,270	16
Beaudesert (Part A)	2,353	64	3,503	49	9,200	163
Moreton (Part A)	948	19	1,592	68	8,125	410
Albert (Part A)	7,355	38	19,195	161	54,900	186
Redland (Part A)	11,547	26	14,928	29	28,345	90
Redcliffe City	27,345	26	34,561	26	40,220	16
Caboolture (Part A)	5,195	25	6,682	29	11,395	71
Pine Rivers (Part A)	12,246	59	25,121	105	45,295	80
Total Brisbane Statistical Division	778,193	12	867,784	12	985,920	14
II: Gold Coast Statistical Division (Metropolitan Gold Coast)						
Gold Coast City	49,485	47	66,697	35	87,510	31*
Albert (Part B)	6,437	21	7,538	17	15,495	106*
Total Gold Coast Statistical Division	55,922	43	74,235	33	103,005	39*
III: Sunshine Coast						
Buderim	1,063	27	1,763	66	2,863	62*
Maroochydore/Mooloolaba	4,107	34	6,374	55	10,283	61*
Nambour	6,220	1	6,807	9	7,435	9*
Total Maroochy Shire (incl. rural areas)	21,465	13	25,522	19	35,266	38*
Caloundra	3,661	29	6,150	68	10,602	72
Total Landsborough Shire (including rural areas)	8,319	6	8,802	29	11,314	50

* Based on unadjusted Census figures.
Sources: Queensland Yearbook 1974, 1976 Census.

2. The Pattern of Economic Development

Although there has been significant population growth of Brisbane and the rest of the Moreton Region over the past couple of decades, Queensland's economic power has not historically resided here in the same way as New South Wales' has in Sydney and Victoria's in Melbourne. Until the late 1960s, Queensland's economy was based almost totally on the production of wool, meat and sugar. Since agriculture and pastoralism is scattered throughout the State, this meant that wealth and political power was distributed in relatively dispersed spatial fashion, contrasting with the way manufacturing industry had caused Sydney, Melbourne and Adelaide to overwhelmingly dominate their states (See Harris, 1971). This, of course, does not deny the power resting in Brisbane as the State's major business centre, principal port and state capital. The point at issue is its relative position in the State in comparison with other capital cities' role within their states.

The economic strength of regions outside Moreton began to recede during the 1950s as farming declined in relative importance. By the mid-1960s, Brisbane and the rest of the Moreton Region had come to hold a more dominant place within the State and it was the only region to have any significant growth in employment, while all other regions (but one) experienced net losses of labour (Harris, 1971). The basis for this growth was urban-based employment: in finance, commerce, community and business activity. This was a pattern shared with other state capitals, except that tertiary sector employment has always been more important in Brisbane (and Perth and Hobart) than in the dominant cities of Sydney, Melbourne and Adelaide where manufacturing has been far more influential (See Table 4). Manufacturing industry has always had a relatively insignificant influence in Brisbane. This is also reflected in the share of manufacturing employment in the state capital city. In 1971, for instance, 34 per cent of Queensland's manufacturing employment was based outside Brisbane, compared with only 24 per cent of New South Wales manufacturing employment based outside Sydney, 15 per cent in Victoria outside Melbourne, 17 per cent in South Australia outside Adelaide and 23 per cent in Western Australia outside Perth. (Linge, 1977)

Table 4: Employment in Brisbane and other State Capitals, 1954-1976 (percentages)

		Brisbane	Perth	Hobart	Adelaide	Sydney	Melbourne
Manufacturing	1954	28	25	26	36	37	40
	1966	25	22	23	32	34	38
	1971	21	18	19	29	28	32
	1976+	17	16	15	23	23	27
Tertiary*	1954	48	49	49	43	43	40
	1966	53	57	55	48	46	44
	1971	60	61	60	53	55	53
	1976+	61	64	66	59	60	57

* Includes: Finance and Property; Commerce (retail trade, wholesale trade, primary produce dealing); public authority and defence community and business services; amusements, hotels, cafes, personnel services; and 'other'.

+ Based on unadjusted 1976 Census data.

Source: Adapted from Stilwell (1974a, 1974b) and 1976 Census.

Thus, the development of Brisbane did not result from the growth of manufacturing industry as in the U.S. Sunbelt. Rather, it has been investments in urban development which formed the basis of Brisbane's and the rest of the Moreton Region's growth, with the bulk (77 per cent) of private investment in 1976, for example, going into residential development (See Table 5). This compares strikingly with private investment in the regions of northern and central Queensland (which received 49 per cent of total State private investment in 1976) where mining accounted for 77 per cent and 94 per cent respectively (State Public Relations Bureau, 1976).

Within the Moreton Region, there were certain variations in the direction of 1976 private investment. On the Gold and Sunshine Coasts, almost all went into residential construction which in a number of cases also included suburban shopping centres (See Table 5). Similarly the bulk of investment in those part of metropolitan Brisbane outside Brisbane City went into this sector. Only Brisbane City had significant heterogeneity of investment, although the largest proportion (47 per cent) was still in residential growth, with a significant amount (22 per cent) going into offices. Most of this latter category comprised high-rise office blocks located in the centre of the City, 98 per cent of which was the result of investments by finance capital, specifically banks and insurance companies (State Public Relations Bureau, 1976). A significant percentage also went into hospitals, nursing homes, etc., and this may partly reflect a retired population settling in Brisbane. Finally, there was only a very small amount invested in manufacturing industry.

Table 5: Commitments of Private Investment: Moreton Region, 1976 (Percentages)

	Brisbane City	Other Metropolitan Brisbane	Total Metropolitan Brisbane	Metropolitan Gold Coast	Sunshine Coast	Total Moreton
Residential	47	89	68	93	100	77
Offices	22		11			8
Hospitals, nursing homes etc.	13		7			4
Shops	7	2	5	2		4
Manufacturing	7	6	7	1		5
Transport & Storage	3		2			1
Recreation				4		1
Other		3	1			1
Total percentage	99	100	101	100	100	101
Total value ($000)	410,000	405,000	815,000	245,000	165,000	1,225,000

Source: Adapted from State Public Relations Bureau, 1976.

Table 6 seeks to compare the pattern of investment in Brisbane with investment in urban Australia as a whole, by examining total private investment over the four year period from July 1970 to June 1974. This table confirms that proportionately more capital has been invested in Brisbane in dwellings (especially single-family houses) and in total business premises, while less went into factories. In summary, the population growth of Brisbane and the rest of the Moreton Region has overwhelmingly been the result of urban development not directly related to manufacturing industry. This differs markedly from the U.S. Sunbelt's development which was based on a transfer of industries from the north and, more recently, on an influx of headquarters of national corporations.

Table 6: Private Investment in the Built Environment: Total Value of Buildings completed in Metropolitan Brisbane and Total Urban Australia, 1970/71 - 1973/74 ($m and percentages)

	Metropolitan Brisbane	Total Urban Australian
Houses	481 (55)	5,843 (48)
Other dwelling	89 (10)	1,681 (14)
Total dwellings	570 (65)	7,524 (62)
Hotels	20 (2)	352 (3)
Shops	37 (4)	533 (4)
Factories	43 (5)	1,007 (8)
Offices	123 (14)	
Other business premises	50 (6)	
Total business premises	173 (20)	1,889 (16)
Religion	4	54
Entertainment	12 (1)	305 (3)
Miscellaneous	25 (3)	471 (4)
Total	884 (100)	12,135 (100)

Source: For Urban Australia, Neutze (1977:174), for Brisbane, unpublished data A.B.S.

EXPLAINING GROWTH

Urban and regional form is affected by economic development in a number of different ways. A city or region, for example, may develop because (a) it provides effective access to factors of production, and/or (b) because it helps solve some of the problems of social control which advanced industrial production poses, and/or (c) because it effectively distributes the surplus revenue from the sale of commodities among several groups such as financial and real estate interests, and/or (d) because it effectively promotes the consumption of commodities (Research Planning Group on Urban Social Services, 1978).

Within the Moreton Region, the economic roots of growth were located within three processes: a) the promotion of consumption through suburbanisation and tourism/recreation; b) investment emanating from surplus revenue produced from Australia's post-War industrialisation; and c) investment emanating from Queensland's recent mining boom. In addition there were three factors predisposing development: i) the lack of fixed capital; ii) a smoothly operating pro-growth coalition; and iii) a system of local government conducive to growth. These two sets of elements, the economic roots and predisposing processes, can be considered separately.

1. The Economic Roots of the Moreton Region's Growth

The fundamental element which determined growth was the manner in which the Region effectively promoted the consumption of commodities. The Region is Australia's third largest consumption area, with suburbanisation being the basic stimulus to growth, yet it is perhaps the most unique consumption area because it is the country's major centre for tourism and recreation.

The massive suburbanisation of all Australian cities since 1945 has been closely tied to a rapid industrialisation of Australia for the production of suburban commodities. There was a significant increase in homeownership from 63 per cent to 74 per cent between 1954 and 1966, as well as a sharp rise in the consumption of such adjunct commodities as cars, fridges, washing machines, stereo sets, etc. (See Groenewegen, 1972; Rowley, 1972). In addition, the Gold and Sunshine Coasts have developed rapidly as tourist and recreation centres for residents of the Moreton Region, as well as for interstate visitors and international tourists. Gold Coast City, for instance, had 14.2 per cent of its workforce employed in the entertainment/recreation sector in 1971, compared with 5.4 per cent for the Region as a whole.

The importance of tourism and recreation has rarely been examined in any critical fashion. Under capitalism, tourism and recreation undoubtedly provide an increasingly important avenue for the consumption of commodities (e.g. surf boards, boats, etc.). However, the structure of leisure also emerges as a distinct form of social control. This is most apparent in the highly individualised character of activities, from surfing to suntanning, a feature which complements the working-class fragmentation established in the workplace and in the residential sphere (see Alt, 1976). This also involves international workers through projects such as the construction of the large tourist complex at Yeppoon (500 kilometres north of Brisbane) by the Japanese industrialist, Iwasaki, for Japanese workers. However, this relationship between tourism/recreation and social control involves complex issues beyond the scope of this paper.

The second influence came from the investment of surplus revenue produced from Australia's post-1945 industrialisation (centred in the Melbourne and Sydney conurbations). Excess profits, rather than being reinvested in industry, came to be partially siphoned by financial and real estate organisations into investment in the built environment (See Harvey, 1978; Massey and Catalano, 1978). This contemporary situation for the Moreton Region parallels the nineteenth century pattern of investment of surplus British capital in Australian cities. Profit from burgeoning British manufacturing could not be totally absorbed by industry and, as a consequence, there was the search for new arenas for investment. Australian cities offered one such avenue (See Butlin, 1977). For the Moreton Region in the 1960s and 1970s, this pattern was replicated, but this time from manufacturing industry located in Melbourne and Sydney. The investment of surplus capital in urban development, in turn, stimulated industrial activity for the production of suburban commodities. Such a pattern of southern investment in the Moreton Region is apparent, for example, in the operation of the Sydney-based land development company, L.J. Hooker, which accounted for two thirds of total residential development in Brisbane city in 1976 (State Public Relations Bureau, 1976). Moreover, Australia's biggest property developers, based in Melbourne and Sydney, are increasingly investing in Queensland and Western Australia because these states have the fastest growing and most 'stable' economies and the fastest growing populations. Hooker, for instance, regards Queensland as second only to New South Wales as Australia's major locus of urban investment, while insurance companies such as AMP and National Mutual are making Queensland and Western Australia their major locus of investment. (The Australian, 11 May 1978)(See also Sandercock, 1978, for discussion of finance capital's involvement in urban development).

The third economic factor which stimulated growth of the Moreton Region has been the State's mining boom. Brisbane has become a control centre for mineral development, both because State Parliament and the increasingly large State bureaucracy is located there, and because of the location of the State headquarters of various mining companies (and the head office of Mt. Isa Mines) and of finance and other organisations associated with mining. Moreover, taxes from mineral development have proved an important source of public revenue for infrastructural development and, although these royalties were very low until 1974 (1 cent per dollar of production), recent increases (to 4 cents per dollar) have helped to finance greater public expenditure in the Moreton Region. Some two thirds of total Queensland public investment in 1976 went into this southeastern corner of the State. By this means, revenues collected from mineral production in the northern and central regions of the State reappear mainly as public investment in the Moreton Region. More generally, it seems that the mining industry has a multiplier effect for Queensland's economy in that it attracts additional capital and labour to the state which further stimulates the economy and the growth of the Moreton Region specifically. It should also be noted that Queensland's mining industry is capital-intensive (e.g. open cut mining) which means that Queensland's population growth is not directly tied to the mining industry.

2. Factors Predisposing Rapid Development of the Moreton Region

While the three economic factors mentioned above form the basis for growth, rapid development has been facilitated by various predisposing elements. First, there is a relative absence of constraints imposed by fixed capital. Since Brisbane has lacked the more industrial character of Sydney, Melbourne and Adelaide, it has not had such an extensive infrastructure. Moreover, since growth on the Gold and Sunshine Coasts has been based on a series of small towns, the overall development of the Moreton Region has been achieved with considerable ease and in a fashion similar to the U.S. Sunbelt. The lack of fixed capital of an industrial period has allowed easy development. By contrast, Sydney, Melbourne and Adelaide (particularly the former two) have experienced difficulties in transformation - though only minor when compared with northern U.S. industrial cities. It is these latter cities that have had to initiate urban renewal schemes for removing old infrastructure, while such a transformation has not been required in Brisbane. However, one consequence of this relative lack of fixed capital in Brisbane, has been the squalid character of the city. One advantage industrial cities did bring workers was the greater development of residential facilities, like sewerage. This created a spinoff effect from the productive infrastructure necessary for factories. (See Harvey, 1977). In dominantly mercantile cities such as Brisbane, by contrast, residential facilities are sparsely provided because urbanisation did not require a sophisticated infrastrucutre: hence the problem of public squalor.

As recently as the early 1960s, only a third of Brisbane was sewered, the water supply was barely adequate, there were hundreds of kilometres of dirt roads (in

1961, 2125 kilometres of streets were either unsurfaced or not properly constructed), suburban streets frequently were without footpaths and sufficient lighting and, as a result of poor drainage, there was frequent flash-flooding and extensive tracts of stagnant pools following summer rains. To illustrate Brisbane's public squalor relative to other Australian cities, Table 7 compares sewerage provision. While the bulk of Sydney and Melbourne residents had use of these facilities in 1921, sewerage was first connected in Brisbane in 1923 and throughout this century there has been a general lack of provision. Only Perth has had a comparable position. From the 1960s, however, there was rapid construction of sewerage in Brisbane and by the early 1970s the bulk of residents had access. Table 7 also shows how during the 1950s the proportion of Sydney and Melbourne (and Perth) residents having sewerage dropped. This seems a consequence both of rapid suburbanisation, where difficulties existed in keeping pace with residential expansion, and perhaps more importantly, there was the channelling of increasing amounts of public funds into infrastructural developments for the new and rapidly developing industries concentrated in these two cities.

Table 7: Estimated Populations Served by Sewerage (Percentages)

	Brisbane	Perth	Sydney+	Melbourne
1921	none	NA	83	94
1931*	20	49	83	96
1951**	34	61	74	79
1961	33	63	74	70
1971	65	49	78	76

* Percentages based on populations at 1933 Census

** Percentages based on populations at 1954 Census

\+ Includes Wollongong

Source: Adapted from Neutze (1977:38)

A second element conducive to regional growth has been the pro-growth coalition operating within Brisbane and the Gold Coast, like the coalitions in Sunbelt cities (but unlike those in the old industrial cities of the U.S.'s northeast). Just as physical barriers (e.g. fixed capital) have provided little impediment to growth, political barriers (e.g. labour confrontations) have had minimal effect. In Brisbane and the Gold Coast, distinctive pro-growth coalitions, including development companies, real estate interests and building societies, emerged during the 1960s under the co-ordinating power of local governments. Large-scale finance capital, emerging from banks and insurance companies, did not make an appearance until the 1970s when it was involved in the transformation of Brisbane's central business district.

Although actions of local governments, as integral parts to these coalitions, have been clearly discernable, actions of pro-growth coalitions overall have not been so easy to identify. However, one significant incident in Brisbane does illustrate pro-growth relationships, specifically between the Brisbane City Council (BCC) and large developers. The State Government initiated a Commission of Inquiry in late 1966 following numerous accusations over favouritism shown by the BCC towards large development companies, particularly with re-zoning, resumptions of land and development initiatives. The result of the Inquiry was that in 42 of the 136 cases examined, the BCC was found to have acted improperly. However, nothing came of the report and development went ahead with greater speed than before and achieved its most intense impetus by the mid 1970s.

Leadership of the pro-growth coalition, resting in local government, was symbolised by the dynamism of the pro-growth mayors of Brisbane (Clem Jones) and the Gold Coast (Bruce Small). Both of these mayors were personally linked to development companies and real estate interests. Small had a family development company and Jones was a principal partner in Brisbane's largest firm of surveyors. The Clem Jones' Administration expressed the most dynamic role played by local government in urban development. With the city administrator, J.C. Slaughter, Jones introduced a corporate-style administration, bringing 'business-like' efficiency to the BCC. Moreover, Jones, who was Lord Mayor from 1961 until his retirement from local politics in 1975, was a Labor Mayor. This helped to ensure the political integration of the working-class which is necessary for capital to transform Brisbane easily and 'successfully'. It is very similar to the political circumstances of local government in the Sunbelt (See Friedland, et al, 1977. Mollenkopf, 1975).

The final feature assisting the Moreton Region's development was the relative <u>lack of local government fragmentation</u>. Three quarters of metropolitan Brisbane is under the jurisdiction of the BCC, the rest is administered by councils in Ipswich and Redcliffe cities and in the shires surrounding Brisbane City. In 1979 two of these shires amalgamated to form the new Logan Shire. Similarly, four of the towns of the Sunshine Coast are under the Maroochy Shire Council, while the other is administered by the Landsborough Shire Council. Gold Coast City was created in 1959 from an amalgamation of several seaside towns.

The relative lack of fragmentation within metropolitan Brisbane is particularly significant since it has allowed a broader co-ordination of growth within this centre. Brisbane City, in fact, forms the largest local government area in Australia (and supposedly one of the largest in the world) - 1220 square kilometres - having been established in 1925 from two cities, several towns and shires. Why the Greater Brisbane Scheme should have been introduced at all and so early in this century, however, is not clear and only Laverty (1972; 1978) has given any attention to this issue. But Laverty's interpretations tend to be simplistic. While there is some accuracy in his claim that it was an attempt to rationalise local government, his belief that it followed a world-wide trend towards local government unification is not correct. In the U.S., as previously noted, there was increased fragmentation, not amalgamation, after 1900. Moreover, it is not clear why a poor city in a marginal state should follow an 'international fashion' when the more dominant cities in the south did not.

The development of Greater Brisbane appears to have been the result of two processes: an attempt to provide urban infrastructure in Brisbane through a co-ordinated system of revenue collection and expenditure in order to attract industry from Sydney and Melbourne; and as part of conflict between local capital and labour which became heightened in 1920 when universal suffrage at the local government level was introduced in Queensland (the first in Australia) and Labor saw amalgamation as an opportunity to provide collective consumption for workers. However, revenue was too low to allow the expansion of the interrelated systems of infrastructure and collective consumption, as shown earlier with sewerage. Even the State Government gave little assistance since public funding went primarily to non-urban infra-structure, particularly railways for transporting rural produce. Therefore, Brisbane's urban fiscal crisis has not appeared in the contemporary period, as in a number of American cities, but was apparent over the years to the 1960s.

The State Government is now attempting to establish a more unified system of development throughout the region. This has been apparent for several years at a regional planning level, specifically in transportation (See Wilbur Smith and Associates, 1970) and from programmes introduced by the Co-ordinator General's Department (See Co-ordinator General's Department, 1973), but actions by the State Government are now appearing as attempts to limit local government power and to centralise control. This is most obvious at the fiscal level with take-overs of revenue-gathering functions of local governments. It was also very visible with the introduction in 1976 of the Electricity Equalising Bill, establishing the Southeast Queensland Electricity Board, which took control of electricity supply in the Moreton Region, thereby reducing by half the BCC's revenue. In addition, there is now the probability of a takeover of the Region's water supply and, at least for Brisbane, BCC buses.

The State Government is also limiting the political power of local governments, ostensibly as a means of co-ordinating growth and removing parochial interests. Since Brisbane is the major centre in the Region, most attacks have been levelled here. In 1972 the State Government reduced the number of council wards in Brisbane from 29 to 21 and introduced a system whereby the Lord Mayor is elected by councillors rather than by the electorate. However, the most significant tool open to the State Government is the right to dissolve local councils and replace them with a State-appointed administrator. This happened in March 1978 with the sacking of the Gold Coast City Council and the handing of control to a State public servant. The other comparable situation was the sacking in 1978 of the Aurukun and Mornington Island Councils in North Queensland. Both of these cases resulted from the same basic source: problems arising from development. With the Gold Coast, local government had failed to reconcile conflicting demands in development, while in Aurukun and Mornington Island it was a response to opposition from Aborigines and Islanders to mining and mineral exploration on their land. By intervening in this manner, the State Government has attempted to ensure the rapid and co-ordinated growth of a consumption centre, on the one hand, and mining area, on the other.

The task of the State Government in these attacks upon local councils has been expedited by the fiscal control held by Australia's state governments. Unlike the American situation, state governments are far more important than local councils. In the late 1960s, for example, Australian state governments accounted for 42.6 per cent of total government expenditure, compared with only 15.7 per cent in the United States. In contrast only 7.4 per cent of total government revenue in Australia comes from local government, compared with 25.4 per cent for the United States (Stilwell, 1974a).

However, the pro-growth forces have not had it all their own way. Continual urban expansion through the 1970s has brought increasing contradictions and opposition from residents. This has been most apparent in Brisbane, appearing in the form of localised urban struggles, and in recent local government decisions. Labor councillors of the ALP BCC have begun to express dissatisfaction with development. Particular criticism has been directed at the BCC's Planning Advisory Committee, a local government organisation with major structural ties to property capital and controlling the direction of growth in the city but, in effect, not answerable to the Council. The committee comprised the Lord Mayor (Jones), the city administrator, the Director of the State Department of Commercial and Industrial Development, two major retailers, a lawyer, a former alderman and a university geographer. Development conflicts came to a climax with the presentation of Brisbane's first major town plan in 1975 (formulated by the Planning Advisory Committee). This plan brought a barrage of opposition from residents, and it was largely as a consequence of this that the Planning Advisory Committee was dissolved, Clem Jones resigned from local government and the BCC reversed numerous planning directives. The days of the free-running pro-growth coalition in Brisbance had ended although it was not until late in 1978, two years after being tabled, that the State Government grudgingly passed the revised town plan.

CONCLUSION

This paper has argued that the Moreton Region has evolved rapidly as a consumption site through residential growth and tourism/recreation, and that this has been based on investments of surplus revenue generated by Sydney's and Melbourne's industries rather than from local industrial growth. Such rapid development has been made possible by the absence of physical and political barriers, by a pro-growth coalition directing development and by a form of local and State government intervention conducive to rapid growth. While these pre-disposing elements are similar to those operating in the U.S. Sunbelt, the economic roots differ markedly; one is consumption-based and the other has been centred on industrial production.

REFERENCES

Alt, John, 1976 "Beyond class: The decline of industrial labour and leisure." Telos 28 (Summer): 55-80.

Butlin, N.D., 1976 Investments in Australian Economic Development: 1861-1900, Department of Economic History, Research School of Social Sciences, Australian National University (First published by Cambridge University Press, 1964).

Co-ordinator General's Department, 1973, Moreton Region: Man Made Environment, Brisbane: Co-ordinator General's Department, Queensland.

Friedland, Roger, Frances Fox Piven and Robert R. Alford, 1977, "Political conflict, urban structure and the fiscal crisis". International Journal of Urban and Regional Research, 1 (October):447-471.

Gordon, David, 1977, "Capitalism and the roots of urban crisis", in R.A. Alcaly and D. Mermelstein (eds), The Fiscal Crisis of American Cities, New York: Random House.

Groenewegen, Peter, 1972, "Consumer capitalism" in J. Playford and D. Kirsner (eds), Australian Capitalism: Towards a Socialist Critique, Harmondsworth:Penguin.

Harris, C.P., 1971, Some Aspects of Balanced Regional Economic Development in Queensland. Paper given at the Second Conference of Economists, Sydney.

Harvey, David, 1977, "Labor, capital and class struggle around the built environment in advanced capitalist societies", Politics and Society, 6: 265-295

Harvey, David, 1978, "The urban process under capitalism: a framework for analysis", International Journal of Urban and Regional Research 2 (March): 101-131.

Heil, Brad, 1978, "Sunbelt migration", in U.S. Capitalism in Crisis, New York: Economics Education Project of the Union for Radical Political Economics.

Hill, Richard Child, 1977, "Capital accumulation and urbanisation in the United States", Comparative Urban Research IV: 39-60.

Laverty, J.R., 1972, "Greater Brisbane: A response to problems of metropolitan government", Australian Journal of History and Politics 18: 34-51.

Laverty, J.R., 1978, "Greater Brisbane in retrospect", in Library Board of Queensland, Brisbane Retrospect: Eight Aspects of Brisbane History. Brisbane: State Library of Queensland.

Linge, G.J.R., 1977, "Manufacturing", in D.N. Jeans (ed) Australia: A Geography, Sydney: Sydney University Press.

Massey, Doreen and Alejandrina Catalano, 1978, Capital and Land, London: Edward Arnold.

Mollenkopf, John, 1975, "The post-war politics or urban development", Politics and Society 5: 247-295.

Neutze, Max, 1977, Urban Development in Australia, Sydney: George Allen & Unwin.

Planning Research Group on Urban Social Services, 1978, "The political management of the urban fiscal crisis". Comparative Urban Research V: 71-84.

Rowley, Kelvin, 1972, "The political economy of Australia since the War", in J. Playford and D. Kirsner (eds) Australian Capitalism : A Socialist Critique, Harmondsworth: Penguin.

Sandercock, Leonie, "A socialist city in a capitalist society? Property ownership and urban reform in Australia", Journal of Australian Political Economy No. 3, September 1978: 66-79.

State Public Relations Bureau, 1976, Developmental Expenditure in Queensland, Brisbane: Premier's Department.

Stilwell, F.J.B., 1974a, Australian Urban and Regional Development, Sydney: Australian and New Zealand Book Company.

Stilwell, F.J.B., 1974b, "Economic factors and the growth of cities", in I.H. Burnley (ed) Urbanisation in Australia, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Wilbur Smith and Associates, 1970, South-East Queensland Brisbane Region Public Transport Study, Report prepared for the Queensland Minister of Transport.