

ADJOURNMENT OF THE HOUSE

HON KIM CHANCE (Agricultural — Leader of the House) [10.05 pm]: I move —

That the house do now adjourn.

HMAS Sydney II Discovery — Adjournment Debate

HON VINCENT CATANIA (Mining and Pastoral) [10.06 pm]: Firstly, I just want to say how wonderful it is to finally see the back of daylight saving for another year.

The DEPUTY CHAIRMAN (Hon George Cash): I thought you were going to say how wonderful it was to be called first!

Hon Ken Travers: Don't you mean to finally see the light?

Hon VINCENT CATANIA: As any country member will know, we are glad it has gone.

I know it has been more than a week and a half since the discovery of HMAS *Sydney II*, but I want to put on the record my congratulations to Finding the Sydney Foundation, shipwreck investigator David Mearns, and the crew of the SV *Geosounder* on their remarkable discovery of the resting place of HMAS *Sydney II* and HSK *Kormoran*. I also commend the Premier on his announcement that the state government will assist in a special commemoration service for HMAS *Sydney II*.

I wish to relate to the house the significant contribution that the Carnarvon community made at the time of the tragedy and over the years to date, and perhaps right some misconceptions that have arisen over the years. With the discovery of HMAS *Sydney II*, the significant role played by the Carnarvon community should not be understated. I am sure Hon Ken Baston can tell members a few stories about it, as he has a family connection to the *Sydney*.

The discovery has confirmed that the action took place off the Gascoyne coast, which is where the wrecks lie. It is recorded that the intended mission of the HSK *Kormoran* was to lay explosive mines in the port of Carnarvon, which would have effectively closed off Shark Bay to shipping. On Saturday, 22 November 1941, Carnarvon became the centre for the search and recovery of HMAS *Sydney II* and HSK *Kormoran* following a battle that had taken place on the previous Wednesday. The Carnarvon Home Guard, comprising members of the Carnarvon Rifle Club under the command of Police Sergeant Anderson and equipped with Gascoyne Traders' trucks and drivers, went to 17 Mile Well, north of Carnarvon, to pick up German survivors. Further German survivors were collected from Red Bluff and ferried to Carnarvon. Coastal shipping also picked up German survivors at sea, and they disembarked at the port of Carnarvon. Those prisoners were held at the Carnarvon Police Station lockup under the guard of the Home Guard until regular forces arrived three days later.

At this stage it must be pointed out that the population of Carnarvon in 1941 was 300, and the number of captured German prisoners from the HSK *Kormoran* equalled the population. The largest number of enemy combatants ever to land on Australian soil was taken by prisoner by the Carnarvon Home Guard.

Residents of Carnarvon, together with the Gascoyne sub-branch of the Returned and Services League, and the Naval Association of Australia (WA) Division, have long been acutely aware of the role that HMAS *Sydney II* had in defending the port. Had the Germans been able to carry out the task of mining the channel, WA would have lost countless tonnes of shipping and many lives from the Gascoyne region.

In the early 1980s the Carnarvon community, led by Keith Hasleby, a local businessman, together with the Carnarvon sub-branch of the Naval Association of Australia (WA) Division and the Gascoyne sub-branch of the Returned and Services League of Australia, constructed a memorial cairn to HMAS *Sydney* at Quobba station, north of Carnarvon, which was the nearest landfall to the engagement. Services of remembrance have been conducted there annually. At the same time, a memorial wall containing the names of all HMAS *Sydney* crew was erected at the Carnarvon cenotaph.

In 2001 the sixtieth anniversary of the sinking of HMAS *Sydney* was commemorated in Carnarvon with a civic function, a historical exhibition of HMAS *Sydney* and HSK *Kormoran*, and three days of activities. These activities were partly funded by a cheque for €2 600 from the HSK *Kormoran* Association as a token of esteem for the townsfolk of Carnarvon. HMAS *Sydney* Memorial Drive was also commissioned at this time, with the unveiling of 645 plaques by Hon Tom Stephens, MLC. Thanks must be given to local businessman and RSL President, Lex Fullarton, whose vision and drive created the memorial. The manpower was supplied by members of the Carnarvon Apex Club, who toiled for many weeks pouring concrete for the 645 plaques. The sixtieth anniversary was broadcast live by the ABC and attended by survivors of HSK *Kormoran* and former crewmen of HMAS *Sydney*. A lifeboat from HSK *Kormoran* remains on display at the Carnarvon Heritage Precinct at

Hon Kim Chance; Mr Vincent Catania; Deputy Chairman; Hon Simon O'Brien; Hon Peter Collier; Hon Barry House; Deputy President; Hon Ken Baston

Carnarvon jetty. To date the Carnarvon community has spent \$360 000 of its own funds plus a \$40 000 contribution from the Gascoyne Development Commission. The Premier has identified that the HMAS *Sydney* memorial in Geraldton is in need of upgrade. I am sure that the residents of Carnarvon would welcome any announcement of funding for the completion of HMAS Sydney Memorial Drive and an upgrade of HMAS *Sydney* Memorial Cairn at Quobba station. The Carnarvon community was the only community directly involved in the aftermath of the battle, and the part it played must be recognised. The community continues to be involved in all aspects of the HMAS *Sydney* tragedy and feels that its contribution is somewhat overshadowed by other interests.

Legislative Council — Business of the House — Adjournment Debate

HON SIMON O'BRIEN (South Metropolitan) [10.12 pm]: Before the house adjourns, we might just reflect on the passage earlier today of the Prostitution Amendment Bill 2007. The matter I want to bring to the house's attention is that about a month ago some extraordinary attacks were launched by the Attorney General and the Premier on the way business is conducted in this place. Since then there has been a reorganisation of the daily business program and basically the institution of a whole lot of bills that were within the province of the Attorney General. In fact we dealt with them for about three weeks solid. I know that because I was responsible for managing most of them on behalf of the opposition. Some of those bills were quite hefty in their content, and one or two also had some controversy attached to them, no more so than the Prostitution Amendment Bill.

I have had someone kindly look through the records to compare the time that was spent in the respective houses on this particular bill to compare whether or not the claims of our esteemed colleagues in another place actually stack up when one looks at the record. The Legislative Council received this bill, it was read a first time and we also received the minister's second reading speech on 15 November last year. That went for 21 minutes. In the other place that process took 14 minutes. I do not know why there should be such a discrepancy, but from there on in the position is more than reversed. The total time spent in this place on this very controversial bill in the second reading debate after the minister's speech was 315 minutes; in the other place it was 622 minutes. The Committee of the Whole in this place dealt with the bill—I thought we dealt with it very well—and made a couple of amendments, and considered a whole lot more in 257 minutes in total over two days. That is a fair slab of time—more than four hours—and it was done in a fairly intensive way; we gave the bill a good examination. Conversely, in consideration in detail the other place spent 952 minutes—15 hours and 52 minutes. Finally, our third reading debate went for 27 minutes versus the Assembly's 118 minutes. The total time that the bill spent in the Legislative Council being actively considered was 10 hours and 20 minutes. The total time the bill spent in the Assembly being actively considered was 28 hours and 26 minutes. Given that it is the same bill and the same issues—and acknowledging what I believe was the quality of the debate and the examination of the bill, even given its controversial nature, which often gives rise to raised hackles and fairly full contributions from a variety of members—it shows the efficiency of this chamber. It certainly stacks up with any other vaguely comparable show in town, and I think that is something we ought to acknowledge before the house adjourns.

Student Laptop Provision — Adjournment Debate

HON PETER COLLIER (North Metropolitan) [10.16 pm]: I rise tonight to make a few comments on Prime Minister Rudd's very ambitious plan to put a laptop in front of every student in years 9 to 12 throughout the nation. Although I applaud the move, I believe it will be virtually impossible to implement until someone takes responsibility for implementation of the program. In fact it reminds me very much of another former Prime Minister, Bob Hawke, who in 1987 said that no Australian child would live in poverty. In this instance, the Prime Minister has made a very bold statement on something that has a very noble intent. However, in terms of its implementation, I repeat that until one level of government, state or federal, takes responsibility for the implementation of this policy, it will not happen and in fact will be a disaster. I do not believe Prime Minister Rudd was told of the shortage of information technology teachers throughout the nation. He was not told of the shortage of IT technicians throughout the nation; he was not told of the enormous challenge and cost of cabling involved in the implementation of such a policy; and he was not told of the IT compatibility of such a policy. For example, the Western Australian Department of Education and Training—I got onto the website—has 61 557 students currently in years 9 to 12 in public schools at a total of almost 70 institutions. As I said, that is at public schools and does not include private schools.

Having taught for almost a quarter of a century, I can assure the house that I am well attuned to the needs and aspirations of IT departments in our schools. Servicing the computer network of any school is as important and challenging as is the actual implementation of learning through teaching. When Prime Minister Rudd made the very bold claim in his so-called education revolution that every student in years 9 to 12 would have a computer in the next four years, it made a great headline. However, as I said, those in the know at the coalface know that it will be very difficult to implement. I therefore asked the Minister for Education and Training on 12 March 2008

Hon Kim Chance; Mr Vincent Catania; Deputy Chairman; Hon Simon O'Brien; Hon Peter Collier; Hon Barry House; Deputy President; Hon Ken Baston

a question: had the Department of Education and Training made provision for the implementation of a computer for every student in years 9 to 12; and, if not, why not? The Minister for Education and Training's response was —

Major investments in information and communications technology infrastructure, operations and supporting services have already been established and are continually being improved. These include a standard operating environment for ICT in public schools to improve technology management and to reduce the need for local technical support; centrally managed contracts to provide schools with easy access to hardware, software and technical support services; ICT technical support services for all centrally managed school computers; high-speed, centrally managed broadband internet access to impartial ICT consultancy and advice services; and ICT professional learning and support for teachers and school leaders.

Anyone who read that would assume that the Minister for Education and Training does assume that our education system is adequately provided for in terms of Prime Minister Rudd's commitment. Obviously, the Minister for Education and Training has not been into too many IT centres recently. He also has not been communicating with his Premier, because on 27 March 2008 the Premier took the federal government to task over the implementation of this program and essentially said that unless the federal government funds it, this government will not implement it.

I refer to an article in *The West Australian* on 27 March, headed "Carpenter baulks at Rudd's classroom computers" —

Kevin Rudd's \$1 billion pre-election pledge to ensure every high school student had access to a computer was in tatters last night after Alan Carpenter refused to implement the plan unless the Federal Government significantly increased its share of the expected costs.

The Premier told Mr Rudd at the Council of Australian Governments meeting in Adelaide that WA was not prepared to meet the cost of installing and operating the computers, which form the centrepiece of the Federal Government's "education revolution".

He said for every dollar the Prime Minister was planning to spend, it would cost the States three to four dollars for extras such as cabling, internet connection and power.

"The Federal Government might have a simplistic approach to delivering computers in order to keep an election promise but the States should not be expected to pay to keep that promise and this State won't," Mr Carpenter said.

The impasse has dented Mr Rudd's plan to end the "blame game" between Canberra and the States and intensifies the pressure on the Federal Government to identify further savings in the May Budget as part of its strategy to increase the surplus and reduce the pressure on inflation.

In one week we have the Minister for Education and Training saying that everything is rosy, wonderful plans are in place and there are no problems with the gartel internet connection. In the same week we have the Premier saying that we cannot adequately cope with it and it is up to the federal government to fund it. I wonder who is telling the truth. All I can say is, obviously the Premier knows more about the costs of implementing that program than the Minister for Education and Training.

Yesterday, the federal Minister for Education came on the scene because other people are starting to wake up to what is going on with this very bold and ambitious plan to put a computer in front of every child in years 9 to 12. I will refer to a transcript of a press conference that Julia Gillard did yesterday, 31 March 2008 —

JOURNALIST:

Ms Gillard, on COAG, the states insistence in the communiqué, putting a line in that said, the Commonwealth should pay for its own policies how will that affect the rollout of your computer program, your trade centre program now that the states believe there's a greater onus on you paying more of the costs of those particular programs?

There is a bit of polly speak here, so I will not go through the whole lot —

JULIA GILLARD:

Well around the COAG table and around the table of the working party which it's been my great pleasure and privilege to chair, the productivity working group that has dealt with the implementation of these promises. . .

Then she goes on —

So they were investing; they're delighted to see a federal government that's prepared to work in partnership with them and invest an extra billion dollars that would not have been available to them had it not been for the Rudd Labor government's promise. We have indicated to them, we understand that to make sure computers are available in circumstances where they can be used, to make sure that maintenance occurs, to make sure that professional development occurs for teachers so the computers are fully integrated into the learning environment, that that takes a strategic co-investment. And we are talking to them about the nature of that strategic partnership.

That is code for saying they have not decided yet how they are going to fund that —

JOURNALIST:

Why should they be funding your election promises? They've got their own programs for which they are accountable to their voters and you've got yours. It certainly seems, please tell me if I'm wrong, that the states are saying, well no, these are your policies, you fund them.

Julia Gillard later states —

And then of course they see the election of the federal government that says, we not only want to work in partnership with you, we want to put a billion dollars on the table to get this shared objective done. And when you have those sorts of discussions, then clearly you want to work together in a strategic partnership and you want to deal with the co-investment issues. That's what we're going to do.

The journalist continued, as he was a persistent little devil —

There was no talk of sharing though during the election campaign when you went to all of those schools and you and Kevin Rudd were photographed with kids with computers promising this. There was no talk of sharing then.

Julia Gillard said —

Well I think when you see our election promises rolling out you would have seen much commentary from our state and territory colleagues. And that commentary, whether it was in education or whether it was in health or whether it was in water . . .

She goes on—blah, blah, blah. Again, she will not commit to who will take responsibility for it. The journalist asked —

Have the existing state programs failed? Is that why you have such a large number of schools with such poor ratios of less than 1 in 4. Have the states not spent the money wisely?

Julia Gillard replied —

This is a huge capital task. It's a huge task to move from a situation where our schools didn't have access to computers to a situation where computer technology for upper secondary students is embedded into the curriculum in everything they do. It's an enormous task.

Again, she still will not say who is responsible, because she knows that it is a huge additional cost that Prime Minister Rudd had not counted on when he made this very bold claim. I now draw from an article in *The West Australian* of 29 March which reads —

Education Minister Mark McGowan says the State Government has thrown its full support behind Kevin Rudd's pledge to give every high school student access to a computer, even though Alan Carpenter has refused to implement the plan unless the Federal Government significantly increases its share of the expected costs.

The Premier told Mr Rudd at the Council of Australian Government meeting in Adelaide this week that WA was not prepared to meet the extra cost of installing and operating the computers. He said the States should not be expected to pay for extra infrastructure such as cabling, internet connection and power.

Mr McGowan refused to respond to questions on how much extra the computer initiative was likely to cost WA. "The Premier, Alan Carpenter, and the State Government fully support the Rudd Government's computers in schools commitment," he said.

"(The) COAG discussions resulted in an agreement that the implementation costs would be subject to negotiations during the development of the new model for special purpose payments."

Hon Kim Chance; Mr Vincent Catania; Deputy Chairman; Hon Simon O'Brien; Hon Peter Collier; Hon Barry House; Deputy President; Hon Ken Baston

Of course, it is open to negotiation but, quite frankly, it is an additional burden on teachers, and particularly on Catholic education and independent schools, which will not be funded and inevitably their fees will increase. The policy will, therefore, be virtually impossible to implement unless one level of government takes responsibility for implementation procedures.

Shire of Augusta-Margaret River — District Planning Scheme — Adjournment Debate

HON BARRY HOUSE (South West) [10.28 pm]: At the beginning of today's proceedings, Hon Giz Watson tabled a petition that called for an inquiry into the Shire of Augusta-Margaret River on the basis of some totally unsubstantiated allegations of some apparent discrepancies in the planning process. In the usual style, this had already been preceded in the local press by her Greens (WA) colleague Hon Paul Llewellyn quoting some pretty sensational things about the shire. The *Augusta Margaret River Times* of Friday, 28 March carried a big banner headline on the front page "Council inquiry call by South West MLC". The paper contained an article quoting Hon Paul Llewellyn, stating that he was seeking an inquiry into the affairs of the Augusta-Margaret River shire council. I will pick out a couple of sentences from the article that will illustrate the motives of certain people. It states —

He —

That is Hon Paul Llewellyn —

told the *Times* he didn't claim the expertise to suggest there was definitely anything untoward in the behaviour of the Augusta-Margaret River Shire Council.

That was very wise on the part of Hon Paul Llewellyn. The article states that he said that he had been approached by a host of Margaret River people in the past year. It also states —

Shire president Steve Harrison said the council would always make available any information asked of it by the State Government, but there had been no approach from Mr Llewellyn or mention of a petition.

He was exposed pretty badly at that point. The next paragraph states —

Mr Llewellyn said he believed the work of earlier councils to constrain development in the shire had been "side-stepped" by the present council.

This gives away the agenda of the Augusta-Margaret River shire council of three or four years ago, which I will refer to in a few minutes.

Hon Kate Doust: Will you table that article?

Hon BARRY HOUSE: I am happy to table the newspaper article. I seek leave to table the article.

THE DEPUTY PRESIDENT (Hon George Cash): Hon Barry House seeks to table the document, which he has identified as a newspaper article.

Hon BARRY HOUSE: It is from the *Augusta Margaret River Times* dated Friday, 28 March 2008.

Leave granted. [See paper 3841.]

Hon BARRY HOUSE: The petition tabled today by Hon Giz Watson contained 32 signatures. That is not exactly an overwhelming number. I have a copy of it, and an examination of the signatures reveals the usual suspects. There are a couple of disgruntled former councillors, their families and a handful of friends. There is also the group who inhabit the Margaret River Regional Environment Centre. These are standard names in any minority protest in the Margaret River area. They vocally object to virtually anything progressive. This group made up the support base for the shire council of three or four years ago, which was universally acknowledged by all but this handful of people as being a total embarrassment to the Shire of Augusta-Margaret River, and to local government in general. In fact, Hon Ljiljana Ravlich, as Minister for Local Government, visited the Shire of Augusta-Margaret River to try to find out for herself what was happening. To her credit, she did find out for herself what was happening; she found out that the council was dysfunctional and a total embarrassment. Things changed at the subsequent elections and since then the council has, in my view, done an outstanding job. The people who are signatories to this petition operate on an agenda of resisting any change or any form of growth; they seem to hate even seeing the word "growth". They do not want any expansion of Margaret River, particularly to the east, to provide land and opportunities for young people.

In my view, the petition and the attendant media campaign are insulting to the present council, which is a very good council. It is led by shire president Steve Harrison, CEO James Trail, six other dedicated and hardworking councillors, and the council staff, who have done a very good job over the past couple of years restoring the council's credibility. They have gone a long way towards restoring some respect for the council. They have

Hon Kim Chance; Mr Vincent Catania; Deputy Chairman; Hon Simon O'Brien; Hon Peter Collier; Hon Barry House; Deputy President; Hon Ken Baston

rolled up their sleeves and gone into some medium to long-term planning. The district planning scheme, which is referred to in the petition, has been in draft form for 16 years. I do not feel it totally unreasonable to expect the council and the government to try to get it finalised; I think it is long overdue. The council has moved, with extensive community consultation, to town site planning strategies for the main towns in the shire, including Margaret River, Cowaramup, Witchcliffe, Karridale and Augusta. It has done an excellent job on that. The main issue in Margaret River is the perimeter road. Members who know the town will know that Bussell Highway goes through the middle of the town. As the town becomes busier, it is becoming an increasingly noisy and dangerous road. There is need for a perimeter road to the east of Margaret River to carry the heavy traffic and to restore the amenity of the main street and to improve safety within the town. The final alignment cannot be sorted out until these planning documents are finalised. Once again, this seems to have the support of 98 per cent of the Margaret River community, but is opposed by the small, local, oppose-everything brigade.

As in many other places, housing affordability in Margaret River is almost at a desperate stage. Young people cannot afford properties or houses. Rental properties are not available. There is an enormous labour shortage in the hospitality and viticultural industries in Margaret River because there is no housing.

This group of petitioners has ignored these issues because it does not rate them as important.

I applaud the action taken by the Shire of Augusta-Margaret River. The negotiations that the shire had with developers who intend to develop in the vicinity of the perimeter road have already been undertaken. I understand that the shire has entered into negotiations with three or four major landholders to the east of Margaret River who will be affected by the proposed expansion, for which the planning needs to take place as soon as possible. The shire is to be applauded, because my understanding is that it has received commitments from those three or four landholders to contribute somewhere between one-third and one-half of the cost of the perimeter road, which is in the vicinity of \$20 million. That is a huge funding model and I urge the state government to get on board as soon as the planning documents are finalised and support the perimeter road, because that would open the way for the private developers' money for that road to be forthcoming.

This group of petitioners does not want Margaret River to grow in any way. Obviously, it does not want the kids in the town to have job and housing opportunities that would give them a future in the area, and it does not want local businesses to be able to attract labour. The group appears to want Margaret River to revert to a poverty-stricken country town in which nobody, except them, wants to live. The fact is that that will not happen. Margaret River has developed a momentum of its own. It is an international brand name and a vibrant town that offers enormous potential for the future. The role of local, state and commonwealth governments is to provide support by way of infrastructure and planning mechanisms to allow that to happen in an orderly manner. That is happening at the local shire level.

In summary, I urge the Minister for Local Government and the Standing Committee on Environment and Public Affairs, when the petition is referred to it, to treat it for what it is worth. It is scaremongering at its worst and it should be given very short shrift.

Finding Sydney Foundation — Adjournment Debate

HON KEN BASTON (Mining and Pastoral) [10.37 pm]: My comments follow on from the comments made by Hon Sheila Mills in her contribution to the adjournment debate on 18 March 2008 in which she referred to the Finding Sydney Foundation on its discovery of HMAS *Sydney* II. I commend it for this discovery, because it will allow an event that took place 65 years ago to reach finality.

The discovery was 112 nautical miles off Steep Point in 2 500 metres of water, which is obviously a great depth. The discovery of the *Sydney* is dear to my heart, because, for me, the loss of that ship has always been surrounded in mystique. My late father, Keith Baston, held the pastoral lease over Quobba Station and was the first person to find the survivors of HSK *Kormoran*. He had been told that there may be some survivors from HMAS *Sydney*. While he was carrying out a mill run at the 17-mile out-camp, he came across 47 survivors from HSK *Kormoran* who came ashore in a lifeboat. The out-camp had a rainwater tank and a set of sheep yards. The survivors had rounded up some sheep and already had a couple strung up when my father found them. They had obviously settled in very well. They were very pleased to see somebody and very few of them could speak English. I remember my father telling me that one of the fellows had been a shearer in the district and he knew his way around. One of the Germans had a pet monkey. My father always wanted a pet monkey and took it back to the station and kept it for a while until it was quarantined. I guess members know what happened to the monkey after that. A lot of old timers said that it was the only invasion of Australia by the enemy and my father had single-handedly held them off.

It is interesting to note that a security officer—I guess we would call him an intelligence officer—interviewed all the Germans. He actually took from a journalist who was on the HSK *Komorán* a diary that had a lot of cryptic

Hon Kim Chance; Mr Vincent Catania; Deputy Chairman; Hon Simon O'Brien; Hon Peter Collier; Hon Barry House; Deputy President; Hon Ken Baston

pictures in it. He believed those pictures were a code for where a film of the sinking of HMAS *Sydney* had been buried. Between the time I was born and when I was 21 years old, this fellow had earned enough money working on the wheat bins to enable him to spend some three months during each winter searching for this film of the sinking of HMAS *Sydney*. He was also writing a book about it. I assure members that by the end of those 21 years, he was quite eccentric. He was an Englishman, by the way.

A large number of Germans ended up in Carnarvon. I was interested to find in some research that I did that the *Centaur* picked up one lifeboat and landed 60 men at Carnarvon, the *Koolinda* picked up one lifeboat and landed 31 men at Carnarvon, and the *Yandra* picked up one lifeboat and landed 72 men at Carnarvon. The other two landings were at 17 Mile and Red Bluff, both of which are on the Quobba pastoral lease, and they landed another 103 survivors. A total of 263 survivors ended up in Carnarvon. When the people in Perth heard that the first lot of survivors had been found at 17 Mile, they sent up reserves from Geraldton. Their orders were to retreat to Geraldton if they were attacked. Of course, that was some feat, because they had to travel 500 kilometres on dirt roads to get to Geraldton.

Many stories were going around at the time. I am told that some people at the Carnarvon Club had managed to get the captain of the *Kormoran* to sit on a stool with a noose around his neck after they had had quite a few sherbets together, and they reckoned they would have managed to get the story out of him and solve the mystery had the police not come in and saved him.

I believe that Carnarvon should be considered as a site for a service to celebrate the finding of these two ships and the important role they played, and to commemorate the loss of lives of the men on these ships. I was very pleased to read in the paper today that an inquiry will be held into the sinking of the *Sydney*. The person who has been appointed to head that inquiry is none other than New South Wales judge Terence Cole. Terence Cole, who is well known for heading the inquiry into the Australian Wheat Board oil-for-wheat scandal, will need to pore through some 23 kilometres of files as part of his inquiry into this matter. The article states in part —

Defence head Air Chief Marshal Angus Houston said it was vital to establish what happened.

“Strange as it may seem, no board of inquiry was conducted during World War II after the loss of Sydney,” he said, “So this is very much unfinished business.”

I guess that bearing in mind that the Germans were the only ones who actually saw what happened, that added to the mystique. It is interesting that the captain of the *Kormoran*, who gave the latitude and longitude of where the event took place, was actually correct, because the *Kormoran* was found in virtually the exact spot that he had originally said it was in. Many people believe that the *Sydney* was sunk by Japanese submarines. A story was even going around that the British were involved. These stories have been going around for ages.

The most important thing is that some form of event funding be made available to the Shire of Carnarvon so that it can participate in this event to properly commemorate what actually happened to both these ships.

Hon Ed Dermer: Do you know how many HSK *Kormoran* survivors are still alive?

Hon KEN BASTON: No, I do not. It would be very interesting to find that out.

Question put and passed.

House adjourned at 10.44 pm
