6. Adding a new value to raw materials/commodities (eg. harvesting apples but making apple juice before exporting to an outside market).

7. New training/retraining of employees or local workforce

8. Joint partnerships/ventures where two organisations or individuals bring their best skills together to add value to a product.

9. Upgrading/improving/automating the tools and/or technology to do a task, job, make a product, deliver a service better, faster, cheaper, more cost-effective, etc.

10. Improve the quality of K-12 instruction

11. Improve the capacity of local government economic development and manage long term strategies.

Please make a note in your diaries that the next Annual Conference of the ANZRSA will be held in or around Rockhampton, Queensland in the second week of December 1995.

The call for papers and program details will be circulated in the coming months. If you have any suggestions as to the meeting's structure or content please contact either Liam Ryan (one of the contributors to this issue) at the University of Central Queensland or Wal Taylor of the Queensland Department of Primary Industries, both located in Rockhampton.

Our annual conferences are an excellent opportunity to hear about both the latest developments in regional development practice and analyses of regional conditions. They bring together practitioners, government and academics.

---

THE ISSUE-ATTENTION CYCLE AND REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT: IS IT REALLY BACK ON THE POLITICAL AGENDA?

Frank Hurley

Ballarat University

[Editorial Note: This article was presented as a paper at the ANZRSA Armidale conference in December 1993]

REGIONAL POLICY AND THE POLITICAL AGENDA

The starting point for this paper was the assertion that "Regional policy is now more firmly on the political agenda than it has been for twenty years". This brought two things to my mind. The first was the question posed by Dorothy Parker, the American writer, when told that President Coolidge had died. She asked: "How can you tell?" The second was recollection of a 1970s article by Anthony Downs in the journal The Public Interest called "Up and down with ecology - the 'issue attention' cycle?" Downs used the rise to prominence of environmental issues on the political agenda to discuss how a "problem suddenly leaps into prominence, remains there for a short time, and then - though still largely unresolved - gradually fades from the centre of public attention". I shall return later to the five stages Downs identified in the "issue-attention cycle".

Let us accept that there is recognisable political agenda at any given time. How can we tell whether a policy area is on it and how we measure that area's purchase on public attention, its ranking on the agenda relative to other issues jostling for place? Rural development, regional development, balanced development, decentralisation, regional adjustment - under one label or another for over a hundred years these regional policy issues have been in and out of the parking lot from which the issues to construct and reconstruct the political agenda in Australia are drawn. Always a throng of journalists, academics, consultants, bureaucrats and politicians hovers around waiting to propel their favoured issue onto and up the agenda.

Some issues are mere ephemera: selection of a table for the Lodge; diplomatic spats; scandals real or alleged. Some issues such as tariffs and
wage fixation are (or were) organised into policies as a constant with an institutional support system. Some like aboriginal land rights or regional development are intermittently on the agenda.

Occasionally an event like a Mabo judgement can define the terms of a more general issue like land rights and catapult it to the top of the agenda. "Regional development" has had generations of unproductive exposure as a policy issue. It gains a place on the agenda laboriously as a political symbol rather than a sharply defined policy issue. Like other positive political symbols such as "justice", and "democracy", it has "the key characteristic of lack of definition" (Gibson and Hodgkinson, 1980) and is amenable to symbolic policy declarations. In this context, perhaps

"By 1996, no Australian region will be in poverty"

THE ISSUE-ATTENTION CYCLE

Downs identified five stages in the issue-attention cycle in American domestic life and our political culture is sufficiently similar to allow an Australian application.

1. The pre-problem stage

"Usually, objective conditions regarding the problem are far worse during the pre-problem stage than they are by the time the public becomes interested in it".

2. Alarmed discovery and euphoric enthusiasm

"As a result of some dramatic series of events or for other reasons the public suddenly becomes aware of and alarmed about the evils of a particular problem ..., accompanied by euphoric enthusiasm about society's ability to 'solve this problem' or 'do something effective' within a relatively short time ... without any fundamental reordering of society itself ...."

3. Realising the cost of significant progress

"... a gradually spreading realisation that the cost of 'solving' the problem is very high indeed ... [and] would also require major sacrifices by large groups in the population".

4. Gradual decline of intense public interest

"As more and more people realise how difficult and costly to themselves a solution to the problem would be, three reactions set in ... discouraged ... threatened ... bored".

5. The post-problem stage "... public concern moves into a prolonged limbo - a twilight realm of lesser attention or spasmodic recurrences of interest".

Downs suggests that issues which go through the cycle "generally possess to some degree three specific characteristics ". First, the majority of persons in society are not suffering from the problem nearly as much as some minority. Secondly the sufferings caused by the problem are generated by social arrangements that provide significant benefit to a majority. Third the problem has no intrinsically exciting qualities - or no longer has them.

"Regional development" has had generations of unproductive exposure as a policy issue. It gains a place on the agenda laboriously as a political symbol rather than a sharply defined policy issue.

With respect to regional policy, on the first characteristic we might agree with Nielson (1976) that policies on tariffs, taxation, public sector investment, communications pricing and on other fields are spatially neutral only a de jure sense. These policies have a massive spatial effect "in constructing a framework which favours metropolitan locations ". On the second, we might find the term "suffering" a little strong in respect of regional disparities yet note the Prime Minister's recent observation that the "geographic dimensions" of structural adjustment are "unemployment, hardship and disaffection". (Keating 1993).

The third characteristic also applies to regional development. Some aspects excite, at least for a while - a Tennessee Valley or Snowy scale project, a VFT, growth centres, for example, all of which had regional policy elements. When the costs became apparent and significant interest groups felt adversely affected, attention and support began to wane.
PAST HIGH POINTS ON THE POLITICAL AGENDA

In Australia, regional development has been up and down on the issue-attention cycle unevenly over a hundred year period. The period is punctuated by epochal events: the depression of the 1890s, the Great War 1914-18, the depression of the 1930s, the world war 1939-45, the post-war long economic boom to the early 1970s, the collapse of that boom. All of these events shaped the settings for concerns and policies about regional development.

The main distinguishing feature of the period from the 1880s to about 1950 was its conventional wisdom that economic growth in Australia was to be achieved by bringing the available land into maximum agricultural production (Williams 1975). This economic motivation to settle more people on the land was reinforced by contemporary social thinking which held that the rural life was best for the population's health and moral welfare (McQueen 1970). These arguments for regional development did not disappear but they had lost their ascendancy in the debate by about 1940 when the war confirmed a need and created the climate for rapidly increased industrial production. It also gave fresh impetus to the claims for regional development as part of a national security policy. These arguments were different in kind from the primarily agrarian, intensificationist ones of the previous fifty years.

In Australia, regional development has been up and down on the issue-attention cycle unevenly over a hundred year period. From about 1940, avowedly decentralist programs and agencies within the machinery of government in Victoria and New south Wales appeared for the first time. The period from about 1940 to the mid 1960s is distinguished by the push from the capitals for decentralisation in wartime for strategic defence purposes followed in the post-war decades by overt but minimal intervention policies by state governments for regional development. These were responses to the near continuous, largely ineffectual pull from the provinces for greater shares of each state's burgeoning population and economy. The governments' approaches were characterised by modest subsidies made available to country-based manufacturing industries. In the twenty years from 1945, massive overseas immigration fuelled the rapid growth of the capitals, particularly Melbourne and Sydney. Provision of social and physical infrastructure failed to keep pace with this growth. In the 1960s, social and economic critiques of the problems of the expanded capital cities were being widely mediated through a more knowledgeable society. The failure of minimal intervention policies to direct population and economic activity away from the metropolitan areas was manifest. In the later 1960s the pull from the bush for regional development was supplemented by a renewed push from the capitals.

The combination of factors outlined above shaped the circumstances for the emergence of a number of politicians, bureaucrats and agencies who put their stamp on the third period identified here. They brought about the shift to decentralisation policies which were formally, if not always substantively, different in kind from any previously adopted either state. Development in the 1960s of the so-called 'selective' approach to decentralisation and the attempts in the 1970s to implement policies which targeted some chosen centres for accelerated development through government action made the 1965-1985 period distinctive. It was an era in which the push from the capitals rather than the pull from the country was the dominant force in placing regional policy on the agenda.

THEN AND NOW.. HOW HIGH, HOW FIRM ON THE AGENDA?

Late 1940s, late 1960s, early 1990s - perhaps regional policy is on a twenty year cycle. How prominent is its contemporary place on the agenda? It has none of the mystique, the brave new world elements of post-war reconstruction, the very top bureaucrats, the great symbolic developmental Snowy River project. Despite these strengths, the regional policy programs gradually lapsed into a "twilight realm of lesser attention" with little achieved.

The prominence of regional policy issues or the political agenda in the later 1960s (pre problem/alarmed discovery stages in Downs' terms) and early 1970s (euphoric enthusiasm/realisation of cost/gradual decline) was much greater on any measure than it has been in recent times. This high profile stemmed from numerous reinforcing influences:
significant media interest with frequent articles and decentralisation supplements in The Age and The Australian and concentrated attention from senior journalists like Christopher Jay in the Australian Financial Review; global concerns about personal welfare and security in burgeoning metropolises (Sundquist 1975); conference and symposia themes of organisations like AIPS and AIUS; reports of inquiries including the infamously dilatory (1964-1972) Committee of Commonwealth/State Officials on Decentralisation; the writing of high profile academics - Stretton, Sandercock, Troy, Neutze for example. It culminated in the formation of the peak bureaucracies - NURDA, the Cities Commission and DURD, and a program - the growth centres. The period was characterised by a "bureaucratic/academic consensus" as Searle (1991) noted and he might have added a supportive press.

We are not much into performance indicators of the effectiveness of regional development policy. But if we ask what did these periods of a high place on the political agenda achieve, we probably have to say not very much. Of the later period and with a slight variation of Downs stage 1, we might say that by the time policy action was initiated in 1973/74, it was too late. Population and economic growth had collapsed and the urban and regional program hit stage 4 of Downs cycle "at a time when the conditions in which it was conceived were being rapidly undermined" (Whitlam 1985).

Civic euphoria and civic agony mark the beginnings and ends of these cycles of promised great developments.

The issue attention cycle has often been apparent in these and other periods at the state and local level. It has been most apparent in what I have called the imminent development syndrome (Hurley 1989). At the state level, it takes the form of a minister's statement likely to generate euphoria. In Victoria, for example, Murray Byrne led the contemporary mood of concern about a mega-metropolis in the 1970s and generally escaped careful scrutiny because of that prevailing mood. He talked of the "removal" of 500,000 people from Melbourne by the year 2000. Large numbers of public servants would be transferred to provincial cities. "12,000 in one department alone would go to the country ... in a plan that would be operating in three weeks". (Latrobe Valley Express, 11 April 1973).

Local politicians and party leaders tend to be prominent at the announcement, mysterious during the middle period and muted, defeated or replaced by the end of the cycle.

At the local level, probably every community has had frequent experience of the "imminent development" syndrome. Civic euphoria and civic agony mark the beginnings and ends of these cycles of promised great developments. Most have their conceptions with the announcement in glowing terms of a large, usually unnamed, corporation's intention to build a factory employing hundreds (at least!) in the regional centre. The gestation might extend over several years keeping local development on the agenda - but end in stillbirth. Local politicians and party leaders tend to be prominent at the announcement, mysterious during the middle period and muted, defeated or replaced by the end of the cycle. Appendix 2 provides a vignette of the imminent development syndrome featuring Sir Henry Bolte, the legendary Premier of Victoria 1955-1972.

"REGIONAL" AND "DEVELOPMENT" IN CURRENT USAGE

For the purposes of this paper let me give some spatial and substantive definition to regional development. Spatially, the level of aggregation in our usage of regional is sub-state. It is not standardised or necessarily intra-state although some usages, such as that employed in reports of Salt's work on recent population movements rather strain the concept of a region (The Australian, 10 November 1993). It is also largely non-metropolitan in focus. Metropolises and districts within them are, of course, legitimate subjects of study by regional analysts in this context. The Australian recently carried a headline "Beazley to boost regional campuses". This might have excited academics in Armidale, Lismore, Bathurst, Wagga Wagga, Ballarat, Toowoomba, Rockhampton and Townsville but Mr Beazley was speaking at the University of Western Sydney of the DEET policy response to "the huge development south of Brisbane."
north of Sydney and in outer Perth attracting people at a rapid pace". If "regional policy" is back prominently on the political agenda, I do not believe it is widely inclusive of this type of metropolitan regional concern. The thrust of the recommendations in the Draft Impediment to Regional Industry Adjustment Report suggest that the paradigm of "regional" policy on the political agenda is non-metropolitan.

What are the substantive regional policy issues allegedly so firmly back on the political agenda? How is "regional development" implicitly being conceptualised given that the rhetoric suggests infinitely receding horizons for "development"? A region may be judged to be in or at one of many states or stages of "development".

The list would include:
• no development (pristine?)
• under development
• too rapid development
• optimal development
• arrested development (sub-optimal)
• over development
• reverse development (in "decline")
• post development (terminal decline)

Lumpen "regional policy" or "regional development" has been propelled back on to the agenda by articulated perceptions of non-development ...

"Regional development" usually refers to economic development rather than social development. Each qualifier ("under", "optimal" etc.) represents a value judgement about needs and wants, about resource utilisation and conservation, about the social amenity in that region and about the environmental and social consequences of development in that region. Regions are perpetually in a state of adjustment stimulated by changes in technology, factor inputs, "corrupted" markets, and national economic policies (McGovern and Lynn 1992).

Lumpen "regional policy" or "regional development" has been propelled back on to the agenda by articulated perceptions of non-development (of some forest regions, for example?); under development (northern Australia?); too rapid development (coastal north-east and south east Queensland?); over development (some metropolitan regions?); arrested development (most inland provincial cities?); reverse development (much of rural Australia including small townships?); and post development (Broken Hill eventually?).

FEATURES OF REGIONAL POLICY IN CONTEMPORARY DISCUSSION

(i) At national level

If greater public attention to these states of development in recent times has made regional policy more prominent in the political agenda, what are the characteristics of regional policy and policy making as it is being discussed and practised around the nation?

The policy framework seems to be settled. It is "economic rationalism" also known as "market liberalism" and defined by Professor John Nevile in this year's Giblin Memorial Lecture at ANZAAS as

"a school of thought which holds that, with very few exceptions, the market is the best way of deciding what is to be produced and how it is to be produced" (The Age, 29 September 1993).

Presumably, also, where it is to be produced. With both major political parties, subsidies and protection are generally down and on the way out. The peak rural organisation, the NFF, in its pre March 1993 election manifesto endorsed deregulation and "streamlined agriculture"; Simon Crean has said Australia has "too many farmers" and up to a third might have to leave the industry. (Lawrence and Share, 1993). The argument is not entirely stilled (Stilwell 1992, Carroll and Manne, 1992) but both major parties are clearly on the dry side. Of course, floods, fires and price collapse will probably continue to bring benign intervention in the rural sector and elections - those great revivers of dormant political agenda items - will provide occasion for effectively region - specific subsidies or protection. Remember sugar?

There is no doubt which economic viewpoint is ascendant but it would be facile to accept that this is the end of ideology or that economic policy is now one of the permanently settled questions in Australian politics. Examples of market failure will, or should, elicit changes in economic and social policies (Stilwell 1992, Humphreys 1993).

At the national level, departmental advisers on regional policy have accepted a market
Discipline context. While we await the DITRD text, the text of DILGEA and its last minister was along the lines "Ask not what the commonweal can do for your region, but what your region can do for the commonweal." Indeed, the Prime Minister in mid-year used a very similar form of words (Keating 1993)

From the top, the prevailing view is that regional development is a "bottom up" task and obligation.

"With Australia becoming increasingly integrated into the global economy, local and regional communities need to rethink their role in the process of economic change if they are to survive and if the nation as a whole is to benefit fully from their indigenous physical, human and capital resource potential" (Garlick 1992A).

Thus the onus is "on the region to want to pursue competitive regional development and to take the lead role in it". (Garlick 1992B). DILGEA's regional development research was directed to developing "a methodology for matching international markets with Australian regions and overlaying this with emerging opportunities in the 1990s" (Garlick 1992B). The central government's role was "facilitative".

Thus the onus is "on the region to want to pursue competitive regional development and to take the lead role in it".

If the quantum of commissioned investigations on an issue is a partial index of the political agenda, regional development with 6 projects current last December (Simmons 1992) was competitive. Investigations, inquiries, even Royal Commissions can of course be a busy substitute for policy action. They have been so for decades at the regional level. DILGEA's projects, as reported twelve months ago, "would form the basis for a range of recommendations to go to the government early in the new year to boost the regional development process". As we know, the government went to the polls early in the new year. Post election, the regional development section of the dissolved DILGEA went not to a pre-election foreshadowed Department of Regional Development under a Prime Ministerial mate (Mr Biereton) but to an expanded Department of Industry, Technology and Regional Development. Did the "facilitative" model and the "boost to the regional development process" travel with it? Were both stillborn initiatives, displaced by the Task Force - itself another form of investigation albeit one headed by another, powerful Prime Ministerial mate? Can the current McKinsey study add to what is already known about factors determining business investment in regional Australia? (Griffiths 1993)? I expect to have heard answers by the time this paper is read at Armidale.

(ii) At state level

An insider has told us that government program managers "know nothing of the spatial implications of their actions or whether their initiatives are being enhanced or diminished by other sector initiatives". They engage in "program protectionism" (Garlick 1991). In Rod Jensen's judgement, there has been "little or no coherence" in state government programs - "regional policy has been ignored, with a number of programs as a substitute" (Jensen 1992).

If regional policy is back on the political agenda, clearly there is an awesome task of policy development and implementation to be done. In Victoria the short-lived policy centrepiece - "A Place to Live" developed over five years of consultation and seriously discussed at Wagga Wagga 18 months ago (Victoria 1992) has quietly been abandoned. In the deregulatory spirit of the times, the new government's "policies and actions ... are emphasising the need for regional communities to initiate their own strategies" and "to work with indigenous businesses to achieve growth and diversity" (Reynolds and Kohut, 1992). Last month, the Minister for Regional Development announced "a nine point plan for investment and employment in provincial and rural Victoria" (Hallam 1993) in an echo in name but not in substance of Murray Byrne's "Ten Point Policy on Decentralisation" of the 1970s (Byrne 1972).

New South Wales as recently as mid 1992 was "not offering too many positive signs for regional development" (Chard 1992) in the estimation of one experienced regional manager in the Department of State Development. Beneficial containment of the metropolitan as a motive for regional development (one rationale for Victoria's "A Place to Live Strategy") is being urged from the provincial centres of...
NSW with a hint of selective decentralisation theory and arguments for revival of another program from the 1960s, the Country Industry Assistance Fund. (Chard 1992; City of Wagga Wagga 1992A, 1992B). But in NSW too, there is recognition that it is a matter of "bottom up" and that any assistance 1990s style would comprise "funds generated through local government and/or the co-operative movement" rather than the state budget. (City of Wagga Wagga 1992B).

Further north, since the mid-1980s regional policy in Queensland has not been concerned with "equity and distribution of benefit issues" but has been "clearly directed at addressing perceived market failure" (Sargent 1992). Since mid 1991 "major thrusts" of state policy have been to "be a catalyst for regions to realise their own economic potential" and "to encourage and assist indigenous economic growth and facilitate local and regional self-help initiatives".

From out of the west, comes a slightly discordant note and a curious mix of wet and dry in regional policy proposals. In his statement on "Regional Development under a Coalition Government" (Cowan 1993), the Deputy Premier of Western Australia deplores the "highly unnatural" centralisation of population in Perth and the exacerbating influence of "the more recent fetish of economic rationalism". He hints at including externalities in the "urban development equation", proposes regionally discriminating tax policies and fleeing "wages and conditions in country Western Australia" from central fixation. None of these policy issues is within his jurisdiction but the Draft Industry Commission Report clearly supported one of these proposals and it will be interesting to see whether the Task Force places any macro and/or micro policy options firmly on the agenda. Within his own domain, Mr Cowan announced formation of regional organisations (to be called Boards of Commission) smaller (9 members compared to 21) but otherwise very similar in composition to the Regional Advisory Councils which operated, very successfully in some opinions (Chard 1992), in NSW through the 1970s. He also announced empowerment of the regions: "I am inverting the chain of command on regional development". I look forward to hearing David Singe advise us at Armidale on how this systemic "bottom up" approach is progressing.

(iii) At regional and local level

At the regional level, the inevitability of the prevailing economic orthodoxy seems to be widely accepted. Are there any maverick regions organising or behaving like French farmers? Viewed from the top, the bottom has to "overcome the conservative parochialism and limited information on global and national developments that shape the nature and process of change in regional areas". (Garlick 1991).

And worse:

"The facilitators given the responsibility of working with these regional communities generally have limited if any training, little, if any, knowledge of global or national pressure or emerging opportunities and few research and analysis resources". (Garlick 1992).

In these circumstances, one dreads the consequences of the precipitate WA experiment in inversion. Clearly there is a major task for regional policy in raising the level of relevant knowledge and resources in regions.

One should note, too, the accepted view that Regions are free to make their own choices "where do we want to be?" They should learn the fundamentals of "monitoring, diagnosis, analysis" (Jensen 1992) in developing their regional strategies.

Distilled from incessant din about regional policy at state, and national and regional levels, then, clime those recurring phrases and buzz words:

- global economy
- market driven
- structural change
- competitive advantage
- indigenous industries
- facilitation (only) by the centre
- bottom up
- region's own choice/vision

CONCLUSION

Regional development concerns have edged back into some prominence in recent years. In my view, however, the place of regional policy on the political agenda is neither high nor secure. It does not have the academic, bureaucratic or media attention which raised and sustained it for a time in past periods. Regional policy does not now have any underpinning, widely-shared philosophy of ruralism or widely-felt need for non-metropolitan
development for strategic objectives or for control of explosive capital cities growth. Cash strapped state and federal governments do not have the resources to direct to substantial regional development programs. In a continuing context of deficit and tax reduction policies, provision for possibly costly Mabo claim compensation settlements, financing the Sydney Olympics and the growing lobby for an unemployment levy, to name a few high profile issues, no propitious climate for finding of overt regional development programs is in sight.

Policies to reallocate labour have been put squarely on the agenda by the draft report of the Industry Commission on Impediments to Regional Industry Adjustment. Some recommendations in the report challenge historic social/political/cultural/institutional practice in Australia. The then Minister for Local Government in his opening address to last year's ANZRSA Conference asked: "How do we accommodate the changes that will occur if the ore bodies run out in Broken Hill?" (Simmons 1992). In his generally supportive comments on the Industry Commission's draft report, Tony Sorensen posed more generally the question of whether and where people might choose to live. "Should policy settings be ruled by the 'bottom line' or by 'compassion'?" (Sorensen 1993). I suggest that this will be a regional policy issue on the agenda for some time.

"Should policy settings be ruled by the 'bottom line' or by 'compassion'?"

Clearly the current paradigm of regional development is competitive - bottom up - indigenous industry in its focus. In their roles the state and national governments might employ some "external adjustment" policies particularly on the location of state-owned "industries". Other "provisions, taxes and subsidies" would mostly have to be provided or granted by local/regional authorities. In passing, I note that it is not clear to me that a subsidy such as, say, a local government rate reduction granted to attract or retain an industry being wooed by a neighbouring region is appropriately "competitive" and less market distorting than a subsidy from a higher level of government.

There seems to be a strong drift towards identifying the central government's role as developing the local/regional capacity, expertise and "facilitators". Provision of physical and social infrastructure has long been a regional development strategy - and often a stratagem! The emerging emphasis may be on the so-called "soft infrastructure". This includes "urban and regional planning processes, strategic managers, venture capital, local development cultures, local skills and expertise, education and training, research and development" (Murphy et al 1991).

Some genuine regional development of this kind may be an outcome of the present modest place of regional policy on the political agenda. It would be an outcome of considerable potential. This Association may play an important part in its achievement.

The emerging emphasis may be on the so-called "soft infrastructure". This includes "urban and regional planning processes, strategic managers, venture capital, local development cultures, local skills and expertise, education and training, research and development"

We should endeavour to achieve as much of this outcome as possible before the populace at large becomes "discouraged, threatened or bored" by regional policy issues and it sinks again to "a twilight realm of lesser attention".

APPENDIX 1


With his practical populism, Henry Bolte had no difficulty keeping regional development advocates, most of whom were conservative provincial and shire councillors, uncritical of the government's laissez faire location policies and minimal decentralisation programs. His home-spun approach, ruralism and readiness to use the imminent development syndrome were well illustrated in an address to the annual
conference of the Victorian Decentralisation League in Ballarat in 1960. The following three paragraphs give the flavour:

It is exhilarating to meet these people who are coming from overseas daily. To this vital country. Walk down any street, in any town or city. See the well dressed children - there are none better in the world. Australia today - a vital country. Brought about by the force of a great number of people, more so over the last few years. By developing this state we are doing our job in the interest of Australia. So don't let us be despondent.

What is decentralisation. Is it a new industry? Is it an expansion of another industry? For sure. Further than that. I would think today the greatest form of decentralisation being practised in this state is the development of the Heytesbury area in the Western District. In time, I guarantee, if present policies are continued, there will be 1,000 new farms and families in that area. This will support the population of 10,000 in the Warrnambool - Terang - Camperdown - Colac and Timboon areas ....

What is decentralisation. Is it a new industry? Is it an expansion of another industry? For sure.

There is the recent "Danloss". Just what is their future anyone can see. The parent plant in Denmark means a great deal. Over the last 12 months there were 1,000 additions to the payroll. They first contacted us when they leased premises in Melbourne for temporary operations. Danloss Melbourne. This is just an example of what we did to attract industries to the country. Even the stationery had been prepared marked "Danloss Melbourne". We told them "Before you make up your mind, would you please have a look at the various country areas in Victoria. Sometimes we achieve results. The proposition has resulted in Ballarat giving them 20 acres of crown land. Now the figures of 500 employees within 5 years, or 1,000 within 10 years have been mentioned. The effect in Ballarat could probably account for the increase in population of up to 10,000 possibly.

Danloss never became established in Ballarat.
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