

Both of these groups have called for the gradual reduction of housing densities and a halt to any new developments in their affected suburbs. I support these calls. I note that the urban renewal living homes problem has stated objectives of: (1) the reduction in high concentrations of public housing; (2) the refurbishment of houses for sale, to both the public and existing tenants; (3) better land utilisation through the re-subdivision and refurbishment of public rental housing; (4) infrastructure enhancements, upgrading of streetscapes and public open space; and (5) community development.

The only such project in my electorate is the Queens Park Quattro project, which is described as an 'innovative, urban renewable project' to redevelop the former Maniana housing area. The actual project was initiated by the previous government—I will recognise that—but is being continued by the current government. The website states of this particular area:

Since the first release at Quattro: The New Queens Park in December 2008, demand for lots has been extremely strong. The latest release, Stage 2B, was no exception with all lots selling within one day!

This is a fantastic program for public housing. I have had a look through the area. It is modern, it is refreshing and it is a place that many people would like to live in. Queens Park is a suburb that is dear to me. I have many friends there who are involved with the Queens Park Football Club, the junior football club, and it is great to see that this area, Maniana, has actually been revived from its previous life of a run down state housing area. Rivervale and Manning, with 14 per cent housing density, should be considered for any future similar schemes, as long as the focus is aimed at reducing the density back to the target amount of 11 per cent. I am pleased to hear that the Minister for Housing and Works, Troy Buswell, is committed to reducing public housing in Rivervale to 11 per cent over time, but I am here to remind Troy that he needs to make sure that he keeps his promises to the people of Rivervale and Manning and to make sure that he implements that target and works towards it.

Coral Sea Heritage Park

Mr SULLIVAN (Longman) (12.45 pm)—May 2012 will mark the 70th anniversary of one of the most significant naval battles of World War II, certainly as far as Australia is concerned, as damage inflicted on the Japanese Navy altered the course of the war in the Pacific and in Papua New Guinea.

On 7 and 8 May 1942 allied and Japanese naval forces engaged in a ferocious carrier battle off the north coast of Queensland—a battle that has become an enduring symbol of the strong relationship between Australia and the United States. Three US navy ships—the destroyer *USS Sims*, the fleet oiler *USS Neosho* and the aircraft carrier *USS Lexington*—were lost in the battle and rest in Australian waters. The battle is commemorated each year by both Australians and Americans, and is regularly marked in Brisbane by visits of US warships.

The Coral Sea is now the focus of a campaign that advocates world wide the establishment of a small number of very large, world class no-take marine reserves aimed at providing ecosystem scale benefits and the conservation of global marine heritage—the Coral Sea being one such park. Former Australian naval chiefs, retired vice admirals David Shackleton and Christopher Ritchie, have leant their weight to this campaign, urging the Australian government to support the submission on a proposed Coral Sea Heritage Park sponsored by the Pew Environment Group, the Australian Marine Conservation Society and the Australian Conservation Foundation.

Not surprisingly, National Party Senator Ron Boswell has come out in opposition to the plan. Notwithstanding the involvement of distinguished retired Australian naval chiefs, the senator labels the linking of an environmental proposal with naval heritage as disgraceful. In contrast, I believe that such a heritage park would be a fitting tribute to those who lost their lives in the Battle of the Coral Sea and an acknowledgement of the special relationship between our two countries. The senator expresses concerns that such a park would mean an end to commercial fishing and the elimination of extractive industries. In both these matters, the proponents have done their homework. The two fisheries that would be affected, the northern portion of the Eastern Tuna and Billfish Fishery and the Coral Sea Fishery are modest earners with a combined annual income of less than \$10 million. The majority of licence holders in the fisheries have indicated their willingness to participate in a licence buy-out package in order to allow this proposal to go ahead, but it should be noted that three of the 13 or so participants in the Coral Sea Fishery remain opposed at this time. Game fishing within the area tends to take place within the existing Great Barrier Reef Marine Park, but there are a few charter fishing vessels—game fishing and otherwise—that do go into the Coral Sea. I am advised that the Australian Petroleum Production and Exploration Association, APPEA, have indicated that they have no strong view about the proposal to exclude the area. Although they would be naturally inclined to oppose the locking up of any area, on this one they are 'leaning more towards neutral'.

So, in virtually ruling out any commercial opposition to this proposal, we should at least consider the benefits. First, as I said earlier, it would be a fitting tribute to those who lost their lives in the Battle of the Coral Sea. Second, as a relatively untouched or intact ecosystem, it is both rare and has what is regarded as high conservation values. Protecting such land-base areas is well established in principle and in practice. Third, to effectively con-

serve pelagic fish species which move large distances requires a large area. Fourth, the Coral Sea contains some 70 of the 440 demersal fish species found in the Coral Sea that are not found anywhere else on the planet. At a time when we bemoan the rapid rate of extinction of various species, this is of great importance. Fifth, while this is a distinct ecosystem to the Great Barrier Reef, there are synergies between the two such that a healthy Coral Sea is important for the continuing health of the Great Barrier Reef. Sixth, it is an important nesting and breeding area for sea birds, 14 species of which nest and forage there—including the threatened green turtle. And seventh, the spectacular underwater mountain landscape and remote reefs and caves, as well as providing refuge, breeding and feeding grounds for a large variety of ocean life, also provide outstanding opportunities to develop tourism products complementary to those on the Great Barrier Reef. The Coral Sea is acknowledged as among the top ten dive locations in the world.

While this is not an exhaustive listing of the benefits, when coupled with the very limited opposition remaining among those with commercial interests in the Coral Sea, these alone should indicate that there is a case worthy of consideration. A hundred years ago, in 1908, US President Theodore Roosevelt did two things relevant to this discussion today: he declared the world's first marine park in Key West, Florida and, at the invitation of Prime Minister Alfred Deakin, sent 16 ships of the US Navy—the Great White Fleet—to Australia, thus beginning 100 years of naval alliance between our countries. There could be no more fitting symbol of that alliance than a marine park on the site of the battle where many lives paid great dividends for our country. (*Time expired*)

Western Australia

Dr JENSEN (Tangney) (12.50 pm)—I rise to speak on behalf of my state. Western Australia has long driven this nation's economic development. Blessed with some of the world's richest resource deposits and backed up with an enormous agricultural sector, Western Australia has, for decades, been putting the shirts on all Australians' backs—and giving them trousers, and shoes, and socks, and hats. The tremendous Western Australia-driven national boom of recent years was curtailed only by the global economic crisis, and already there are indications of a mining-led recovery in my state while most of Australia and most of the world remain in the doldrums. We are rich in Western Australia partly because we have been blessed by nature, but also because we have worked hard and worked smart to get where we are. A strong entrepreneurial streak and the willingness to take on some of the toughest environmental conditions in the world have played a large part in our success.

We have been generous with our wealth, accepting almost without question that with such progress comes responsibility, and that it is reasonable to expect Western Australia to help out less fortunate states. We have poured billions into the federation and into other states and territories of this nation, consistently contributing far more than is proportionate to our population. The advent of the GST saw the extent of the subsidy by Western Australia to the rest of the country clearly demonstrated. For every dollar in GST Western Australia contributes to the federal coffers, more than 40c goes to subsidise the rest of the country. We get back only a little over 50 per cent of the GST we pay, and, at the same time, this must be used to finance massive infrastructure projects spanning vast distances in harsh environmental conditions in order to maintain economic output and growth. The rest of Australia then double dips in Western Australia, siphoning off the high level of income tax drawn from our strong economy and its generous wages.

On a per capita basis, our gross state product is about a third higher than the national average. More than one-third of Australia's exports come from Western Australia. The state produces more than 20 per cent of the world's alumina, 15 per cent of iron ore and 75 per cent of Australia's gold. Oil, gas, uranium and coal are all in abundance. The state produces half of Australia's wheat and 50 per cent of live cattle exports. It also has significant wool and lamb sectors.

So when you collect your pension in Melbourne, or drive down a new highway in Sydney; when you see a new school in Hobart or go to school in Adelaide, remember that the men and women of Western Australia are paying your way. We are happy to continue to do so. The days when Western Australia would vote overwhelmingly to secede from the rest of Australia, as 68 per cent did in 1933, have long since passed. But what we will not tolerate today is being taken for a ride by slothful elements in what one of my state party colleagues in Perth last week called the 'rust bucket' states.

The New South Wales Treasurer was engaging in the most pathetic form of parochial politics when he recently branded WA and Queensland 'the axis of evil' because the Commonwealth Grants Commission had decided to return a little more of the GST contributions made by these two states—the two which have done the most to drive economic development which has given all Australians the quality of life we enjoy today. That decision came just a year after the commission actually cut the amount returned to WA. But the changes in both directions have made no difference to the simple fact that WA receives substantially less per capita than it contributes. We get little more than a taste of the vast sums we hand over every year in GST so that the rest of Australia can share in our good