

AUSTRALIA'S SUPPORT FOR UNITED STATES MILITARY ACTION IN IRAQ

Motion

Resumed from 12 November on the following motion moved by Hon Dee Margetts -

That this House notes -

- (1) The recent comments from the Prime Minister and Minister for Foreign Affairs regarding Australia's possible support for US military action in Iraq.
- (2) That these comments were made in the absence of any United Nations resolution or processes.
- (3) The threat to the livelihood of Western Australian agricultural producers and exporters in light of the Prime Minister's indication that any request for Australian assistance would be considered against the "national interest test".
- (4) The statements from Labor Leader Simon Crean that Mr Howard's and Mr Downer's statements are out of step with other international opinion.
- (5) The likely impact on the civilian population, particularly women and children.

Therefore, the Legislative Council informs the Federal Government that it does not support Australian involvement in military action in Iraq without UN backing.

HON JIM SCOTT (South Metropolitan) [3.39 pm]: Yesterday I said that quite a few countries have been in breach of United Nations resolutions, and I named a number of those countries. It is interesting that Australia is concerned about these breaches because not only has it failed to take action on breaches by quite a few other countries but also it has prevented a number of resolutions from coming into being, such as the resolution that called for war criminals to be tried before an international court. Australia supported the United States' position that it did not want its personnel subject to such a court. Australia is selective about using its vote to support human rights matters.

Some of the issues that have been raised so far in this debate need to be challenged, in particular, some information put forward by Hon George Cash about the reasons for going to war with Iraq. The official reason has changed over time. Initially, it was a war on terror and Iraq had links to terrorist organisations like al-Qaida. However, when the US was unable to prove that, the reason was then that Iraq could not be trusted to have in its possession weapons of mass destruction. We were shown a photograph of a very large shed and we were told by Tony Blair and others that this constituted definite proof that weapons of mass destruction were being built in Iraq. The fact that the United States has pumped \$80 billion worth of weapons into this area since the last Gulf War, and that quite a few other countries, including the United States, seem to be intent on building up a store of these weapons of mass destruction in their own countries and are refusing, in the case of chemical warfare, to allow any inspection of those sites seems to have escaped people's notice. In fact, there has been an attempt over a long time to put in place an inspection regime under the United Nations for those sort of facilities.

Hon Dee Margetts interjected.

Hon JIM SCOTT: Hon Dee Margetts points out that she believes the US blocked the last treaty on the prevention of the development of chemical weapons.

We have a strange way of looking at this. There needs to be a lot more proof.

I would like to comment on the issue of ballistic missiles. Hon George Cash talked about the concern of countries that they will be attacked by Iraq's ballistic missiles. I will quote from an article by Stephen Zunes from AlterNet, who is the Middle East editor of "Foreign Policy in Focus", the author of "Tinderbox: U.S. Middle Eastern Policy and the Roots of Terrorism" and associate professor of politics and chair of the peace and justice studies program at the University of San Francisco. The article is titled "President Bush fails to make his case" and reads -

The weakness of the administration's position is apparent in its insistence of repeating stories of Iraqi atrocities from more than 10 to 20 years ago, such as its support for international terrorist groups like Abu Nidal and its use of chemical weapons. It was during this period when the United States was quietly supporting the Iraqi regime, covering up reports of its use of chemical weapons and even providing intelligence for Iraqi forces that used such weapons against Iranian troops.

There did not seem to be too much concern about them then. It continues -

Though the 1980s marked the peak of Iraq's support for terrorist groups, the U.S. government actually dropped Iraq from its list of states sponsoring terrorism because of its own ties to the Iraqi war effort.

The villains were suddenly on our side, so they were not villains any more because they were going to strike down the dreaded uprising that had occurred in Iran which, incidentally, was an uprising against a dictatorial leader who had been put in place by the United States. The article continues -

Two decades later, in its annual report, "Patterns of Global Terrorism," the State Department presented no evidence of any current Iraqi support for active terrorist groups, only the granting of sanctuary to some aging leaders of dormant groups.

The president's speech again presented no evidence that the decidedly secular Baath regime of Saddam Hussein and the Islamist al-Qaeda had overcome their longstanding hostility toward one another.

Rather than being friends with al-Qaida they are enemies. To continue -

The only charge that appears to have any credibility is that of al-Qaeda operatives from Afghanistan being seen inside Iraq, yet all of these sightings have taken place in Kurdish areas in the north that are beyond Baghdad's control.

This should be pertinent to Hon George Cash because of the comments that he made. To continue -

Accusations of Iraqi possession of ballistic missiles are similarly outdated: According to a 1998 report by the UN Special Commission on Iraq (UNSCOM), 817 of Iraq's 819 Soviet-build ballistic missiles have been accounted for and destroyed. Iraq may possess up to a couple of dozen homemade versions, but these have not been tested and it is questionable whether they have any functional launchers.

One of the few new threats mentioned in the president's speech is the alleged development by Iraq of unmanned aerial vehicles capable of distributing chemical or biological agents over a wide area. Given that virtually all of Iraq's neighbors have sophisticated anti-aircraft defenses, however, and that the U.S. Air Force rules the skies in that part of the world, such slow-moving UAVS would likely be shot down before they even left Iraqi air space.

This article goes on and on showing that the Iraqis' ability to mount attacks on anyone is extremely limited given that they have had suffered incredible bombing - the most massive bombing campaign undertaken on this planet; greater than the Vietnam War and any of the World Wars that preceded them.

Hon George Cash: Saddam Hussein can put to rest the concerns of the rest of the international community if he allows weapons inspectors to come in and check stocks.

Hon JIM SCOTT: Hon George Cash is right and certainly that should occur. The Greens (WA) agree that there should be weapons inspections. We are also asking why only Iraq? A lot of other places pose a much greater threat than Iraq. From reading a number of articles on Iraq, I note that the experts are saying this is not the way to fight a war on terrorism. A war on terrorism is not a national-type war. What needs to be done when dealing with these international terrorist groups is quite different from a major attack on a single country. It would appear that al-Qaida is still managing to carry out its work right now despite the war that we have seen in Afghanistan.

In that regard, I refer to an article. I have not checked the veracity of all the information contained in it, but it is very interesting. It would be worthwhile checking the claims. I know that some are correct but I have not checked all of them. This article came from the Internet and was written by a person called Joseph Clifford for the Media Monitors Network. Most of the paragraphs end with the phrase "Isn't that strange?" I will not repeat those. The article states -

Did you know that . . . the US supported Bin Laden and the Taliban for years, and viewed them as freedom fighters against the Russians? Isn't that strange?

As late as 1998, the US was paying the salary of every single Taliban official in Afghanistan? . . .

There is more oil and gas in the Caspian Sea area than in Saudi Arabia, but you need a pipeline through Afghanistan to get the oil out . . .

UNOCAL, a giant American Oil conglomerate, wanted to build a 1000 mile long pipeline from the Caspian Sea through Afghanistan to the Arabian Sea . . .

UNOCAL spent \$10,000,000,000 on geological surveys for the pipeline construction and very nicely courted the Taliban for their support in allowing the construction to begin . . .

All of the leading Taliban officials were in Texas negotiating with UNOCAL in 1998 . . .

1998-1999 the Taliban changed its mind and threw UNOCAL out of the country and awarded the pipeline project to a company from Argentina . . .

John Maresca VP of UNOCAL testified before Congress and said no pipeline until the Taliban was gone and a more friendly government was established . . .

1999-2000 The Taliban became the most evil people in the world . . .

In a year, America went from negotiating with Taliban officials and supporting them financially to declaring them the most evil people in the world.

Hon Barry House: That is probably the same as those people who initially supported the Greens party without knowing what it would turn into.

Hon JIM SCOTT: We have more supporters now because people know that we do not take everything we see at face value. We investigate things for ourselves and do not follow blindly like some people, who are prepared to put their own people at risk to protect the interests of American oil conglomerates. The article continues -

Senior American officials in mid-July told Niaz Naik, a former Pakistani Foreign Secretary, that military action against Afghanistan would go ahead by the middle of October . . .

Hon Dee Margetts: Would that be July 2001?

Hon JIM SCOTT: That is right. That was prior to the attack on the World Trade Center, which occurred on 11 September. Nobody from the Greens believes that that was other than an atrocious act of terrorism. The article continues -

9/11 WTC disaster . . .

Bush goes to war against Afghanistan even though none of the hijackers came from Afghanistan . . .

Bush blamed Bin Laden but has never offered any proof saying it's a "secret" . . .

Hon Frank Hough: He was in that area. They bombed him.

Hon JIM SCOTT: Apparently he was not. They are saying -

Hon Frank Hough: Are the newspapers saying that?

Hon JIM SCOTT: Two days ago, the media reported that a recorded message believed to be from bin Laden had been released. Voice patterns are being examined to determine if that is the case. I continue -

Taliban offered to negotiate to turn over bin Laden if we showed them some proof. We refused; we bombed . . .

Bush said: "This is not about nation building. It's about getting the terrorists." . . .

We have a new government in Afghanistan . . . The leader of that government formerly worked for UNOCAL . . .

That is the same company that wanted to build the pipeline -

Bush appoints a special envoy to represent the US to deal with that new government, who was formerly the "chief consultant to UNOCAL" . . .

The Bush family acquired their wealth through oil? . . .

Bush's Secretary of Interior was the President of an oil company before going to Washington . . .

George Bush Sr. now works with the "Carlyle Group" specializing in huge oil investments around the world . . .

Condoleezza Rice worked for Chevron before going to Washington . . .

Dick Cheney worked for the giant oil conglomerate Haliburton . . .

Haliburton gave Cheney \$34,000,000, as a farewell gift when he left Haliburton . . .

Haliburton is in the pipeline construction business . . .

The US government quietly announces Jan 31, 2002 we will support the construction of the Trans-Afghanistan pipeline.

I do not know whether members are concerned, but if that information is correct, I would be worried. It seems that there was an intention to attack Afghanistan before the World Trade Center was demolished. Last weekend a television program reported that the US Government had pumped more money into the plan for a pipeline through northern Afghanistan. There is some doubt about the real motives for the attack on Afghanistan.

We also have real problems in other places in the world. In Venezuela there was a US-instigated uprising in which terrorists murdered people in an attempt to get rid of the leader, Chavez. It was a coordinated campaign put in place with the help of the United States. People in two opposing political camps were shot by snipers on rooftops. Television reports about this event were made prior to it occurring by the person who took over as the

interim leader after Chavez was blamed for shooting his own people to prevent his downfall. In fact, the whole thing was instigated by people wanting to cause his downfall. The reason was that he had replaced the leaders of Venezuela's oil industry because he was concerned about the deals Venezuela was getting for the oil it was producing. The US has a great interest in rushing into countries that have oil and taking control.

I would be much more interested in supporting the US in its efforts against Iraq if it were talking about rebuilding programs in Iraq, guaranteeing the world that it would not try to take over the Iraqi oilfields after a war and saying that it would have no part in any dealings with the Iraqi oil. However, I am afraid that other motives are involved here, and I do not want Australia to get involved for that reason. I would like Australia to assist those people in Iraq who are oppressed, but I do not think we will assist them by dropping bombs on their heads and destroying the little infrastructure that the country has. I read to the House the statement by Madeleine Albright that it was worth having 50 000 children die each year as a result of US actions and sanctions - with which Australia is assisting. I do not think it is worth it. There is a better way. The way in which to deal with countries like Iraq is not to destroy everybody in that country or get rid of an evil person or regime by being even more evil ourselves.

We need to think this through and start to talk about peaceful ways in which we can resolve these problems. The best way of doing that is what people are now trying to do with China - that is, making China part of what we consider to be the real world in terms of trade and cultural exchange - and developing sensible relationships with these countries and pointing out our concerns about their behaviour. It certainly will not be in the interests of world peace to continue this divisive sort of conflict that from the beginning has taken on the feel of a new crusade of one religion against another, and that is singling out entire races of people as expendable, worthless and evil on the basis of actions by people who are oppressing them. That is not the right way to go. Instead of living in the twenty-first century, we are going back to about the fifteenth century in the way we are behaving. I want a civilised approach to world peace, not this hillbilly, gangster and "we have bigger guns than you" approach, because we certainly will not be able to create peace through war. It will not help the Kurds and the other innocent people who are being oppressed by Saddam Hussein one little bit if their hospitals are bombed and their water supplies are wrecked.

As someone reminded me earlier, the war on Iraq has never really stopped, because the British and the Americans have been bombing that country ever since the Gulf War. Even as recently as about a week ago, a radar installation in Iraq was bombed, I think by the British. This might be seen as reducing Iraq's capacity to conduct a war. However, I remind members that radar is also used for purposes other than war. Normal domestic aircraft require the same sorts of tracking devices as military aircraft. To wipe out the whole infrastructure of Iraq every time it builds something new will not provide it with any hope that it will ever get back to a situation in which it can look after its people properly. I do not really understand the motives behind imposing sanctions on Iraq - and this is after a war in which we have destroyed its infrastructure - and to then say that Iraq must allow all these peacekeepers to come into the country, when there is no end in sight and we are not saying that if Iraq does the right thing, we will allow it step by step to make some improvements to the country. There has been none of that. It has been all stick and no carrot.

Hon John Fischer: What about all the oil that it has been selling?

Hon Dee Margetts: That is \$2 billion a year. That will never be enough to buy education and food for 19 million people.

Hon JIM SCOTT: Yes. Hon John Fischer seems to be saying that it is terrible that Iraq is trading in oil in order to buy some food, yet what will it do if it cannot trade? How can the people live if they cannot trade?

Hon Frank Hough: Get rid of their weapons!

Hon JIM SCOTT: As I have explained already, and as Scott Ritter, who is one of the people who was involved in that, has said -

Hon John Fischer: Why do you believe Scott Ritter and not Richard Butler, the Australian?

Hon Dee Margetts: Because I have met him.

Hon JIM SCOTT: Simply because Scott Ritter is prepared to take a bit of flak and stick his neck out rather than take the populist line. He is an incredibly brave person, because for him to open his mouth in the United States at a time like this puts him under a lot of pressure. It is not easy for people to not take the drum-beating line that is being put by Bush.

Hon John Fischer: I agree that it is not easy, but also it does not make it right.

Hon JIM SCOTT: Hon John Fischer would have to agree that Scott Ritter has some knowledge, having been part of the group that was charged with dismantling Iraq's war effort. It certainly did that. Both of us have seen

pictures of large numbers of weapons being destroyed. We know that ever since the Gulf War, the United States and Britain have continued to bomb targets in Iraq day after day.

Hon John Fischer: If there is nothing there, why do they not open it up to the inspectors?

Hon JIM SCOTT: The interesting thing is that if Hon John Fischer were to go back in history and check the facts he would find that the inspectors were withdrawn. They were not thrown out.

Hon Frank Hough: They were stopped.

Hon JIM SCOTT: They were stopped from going into -

Hon Frank Hough: They were stopped from going anywhere.

Hon JIM SCOTT: No. They were not stopped from going anywhere. They were stopped from going to specific places. There is no doubt that we should be suspicious about that and should continue to press for something to be done. They also said more recently when this issue first arose that the inspectors could come back and could go anywhere. However, that was not good enough for the United States. It does not want a settlement. George Bush is on the record as saying that he wants a regime change.

Hon John Fischer: That is only part of it.

Hon JIM SCOTT: That is what we are talking about. We are not talking about disarming Iraq. We are not talking about a democratic process of changing its Government. We are talking about the fact that the United States does not like Saddam Hussein any more. It used to like him and it used to support him and give him weapons. It helped him gas people with chemical weapons -

Hon Frank Hough: How do you know that?

Hon John Fischer: Hitler felt the same way about Stalin, but that did not make either of them any better or any worse.

Hon JIM SCOTT: The point I am making is simply that we should not be changing our principles over time just because somebody is no longer a part of our favourite camp. We should be prepared to criticise not just our enemies but also our friends, because if we are not brave enough to criticise our friends, then they are not very good friends at all. We should be prepared to stand up for what we believe is the truth in this world, rather than go along blindly with every bit of propaganda that is fed to us. We in this country are all fed loads of propaganda, as are the people everywhere else. We need to try to look beyond that and find the proper and only way of dealing with the issues and not simply agree to run off on every little adventure that people would have us run off on. We need to find out for ourselves. I disagree with the comment of the Leader of the House that this is not the place for this debate. The Leader of the House may be aware that the Prime Minister has been asked a number of times about whether he will support a unilateral attack by the United States on Iraq, and his answer is always that it is hypothetical and we cannot talk about it.

Hon Murray Criddle: What is your position on giving the President of the upper House a vote?

Hon JIM SCOTT: I will reveal that in time.

Hon Frank Hough: But it is hypothetical at this time, is it not?

Hon JIM SCOTT: It is not hypothetical at this time. It will be told and we will have that discussion soon.

In reality we have two options. We will support a unilateral attack or we will not. I do not support a unilateral attack because it will totally undermine the role of the United Nations. If members cannot see that unilateral attacks would undermine the UN, they should not be in this place. They should be outside playing marbles because they do not have the maturity to understand what the United States is planning to do.

Hon Simon O'Brien: That is very strong language, Jim!

Hon JIM SCOTT: Yes.

Several members interjected.

The PRESIDENT: Order! I do not want to dissuade members from listening intently. It is a good thing that they have changed their ways!

Hon JIM SCOTT: A worldwide organisation was set up because countries of the world did not want to get into the situations that they got into during the world wars. It was set up so that every country could be involved in making the world more peaceful by their making decisions on behaviours that should be outlawed. One of the major players in that organisation - the leading power in the world in terms of its armies and influence - will undermine the whole process and cause big problems if it does not play by the rules.

Members have talked about Hitler, who was also known for using religious groups as scapegoats, as we are now seeing in Iraq. Members who look to Hitler to see where the right-wingers come from are looking on the wrong side of the fence.

Hon John Fischer: I haven't said anything about right-wingers. I was talking about people changing their mind and alliances being broken. You seem to think the Americans have done a terrible thing by changing their mind about Saddam Hussein; but that has happened throughout history.

Hon JIM SCOTT: I do not mind the Americans changing their mind but I cannot stand their hypocrisy. They have not apologised for giving Saddam Hussein weapons, helicopters and intelligence to help him gas his opponents.

Hon John Fischer: The fact that he gassed his opponents says more about Saddam Hussein than it does about the Americans.

Hon JIM SCOTT: It says something about both Saddam Hussein and the Americans. The fact that Americans supported him, and Reagan prevented any censure against him when he did that, tells me something about not only the attitude of Saddam Hussein but also the American psyche. We should be brave enough to say to our friends such as America that we do not believe this is appropriate behaviour, that it should abide by the UN resolutions and that it should try to resolve these matters without bombing thousands of innocent people, ending their lives and destroying their country without at this time an adequate reason being put forward for doing so.

I totally support the motion; it is a very relevant one. If Parliaments around this country do not debate it, the Prime Minister will have no meaningful debate on their views on unilateral action by the US until it is about to happen; then we will get all the moral blackmail in the world to join in on that action that I regard as an outlaw escapade.

HON FRANK HOUGH (Agricultural) [4.14 pm]: To the honourable member who moved the motion I start by quoting Thomas Jefferson who said that the cost of liberty is constant vigilance. That quote is most important to this motion. The motion moved is similar to old stock on a supermarket shelf that was past its use-by date by the time the member started speaking about it. The Prime Minister has already had several discussions in the five areas mentioned in the motion. This motion is long gone and obsolete. The motion moved by the honourable member will not be supported by One Nation.

We should consider the character we are talking about - Saddam Insane or Saddam Hussein, depending on where one comes from. As members know, Saddam Hussein was recently re-elected to lead Iraq. The election was obviously run very well because Saddam got 100 per cent of the vote. Most western countries and other countries throughout the world have an attrition rate when people vote. In Western Australia, which has mandatory voting, some people make mistakes on their ballot paper when they vote. I must say that Western Australians are good, decent and intelligent people. Seven per cent of people nationally in Australia make mistakes on their ballot paper when they vote. Saddam has said to the world that Iraqis are totally and utterly perfect. Can members imagine that probably 10 million or 11 million voters in a population of 19 million did not make one mistake - 100 per cent voted for Saddam. Ironically, he was the only candidate. It would have been hard to vote for anyone else, but no-one made a mistake.

Hon Dee Margetts interjected.

Hon FRANK HOUGH: I guess there might have been a different outcome if the Greens (WA) had stood as candidates in Iraq!

About 250 members were elected to Iraq's Parliament, who are now voting on whether Iraq should or should not allow weapons inspections by the United Nations. It is just a charade. If they all voted in support of the United Nations, Saddam Hussein would override that vote. Although the vote would be 250 to one, that one vote would win. He will win no matter what the result of the vote is.

I do not know why the Iraqis elected 250 people. It is incredible to think about the atrocities committed against people who disagree with Saddam Hussein. I recall Hon Dee Margetts in her speech on this motion asking why we will not take Saddam's word on these sites, why we must invade Iraq and why we must create a war because we do not believe him. I suppose the reason is contained in Blair's 51-page document entitled "Iraq's Weapons of Mass Destruction: The Assessment of the British Government", in which he clearly states that the British Government knows that Saddam has weapons of mass destruction. Hon Dee Margetts knows that when we know something about a person, particularly where that person stores his arms, we should not announce it to the world and put secret agents who are probably already in Iraq under pressure or under the threat of death. For God's sake, if we said that we knew that Saddam's chemical weapons and rockets were at locations A, B, C and D, I guarantee that Saddam would move them within 24 hours. Why would we tell him what we know? It would be like my walking into a room where my two grandchildren are hiding, asking where they are, saying

that I am coming for them, and one of them saying that he is in the wardrobe. I might ask if he is behind the bed, and he might say that he is in the wardrobe. I might say that I will look in the corner, and he might say he is not in the corner. I know where he is. It is silly. What do we do? Do we tell Saddam Hussein what we know? Machiavelli speaking on the art of war said that no enterprise is more likely to succeed than one that is concealed from the enemy until it is ripe for execution. I think he said that in about 1469.

Hon Jim Scott: That is where your thinking is from.

Hon FRANK HOUGH: The Greens know more than everyone. What an intelligent group of people they are! How privileged we are! Everything that anyone else says in this place is wrong.

Probably never a truer word was said than that said by Omar Bradley. He was born in 1893 and probably said this at a later date! He said that the way to win an atomic war is to make certain it never starts. Omar Bradley lived from 1893 to 1981, so he lived to a ripe old age.

Hon Dee Margetts: In 1893, atomic weapons had not been invented.

Hon FRANK HOUGH: Of course. That is why I threw the date in to see if members were listening. The member obviously was. I am privileged to have such a good audience at long last.

The West Australian of 28 October 2002 contains an article headed "Being Green is just too easy". The Greens are the greatest con artists since Houdini. They have people believing that theirs is an environmental party, but it is not. It is a great ploy. One newspaper article states clearly what is happening over the Government's latest proposal to increase local servicing of the United States navy vessels under the sea-swap exercise. The Greens totally and utterly oppose it. It stands for Fremantle, tourism in this State, jobs and many other things. Every time something that is any good looks like coming into this State, the Greens must poke their noses into it and then start speaking. Their mouths are in fifth gear overdrive and their brain is still dribbling in first gear.

Hon Jim Scott interjected.

Hon FRANK HOUGH: There will be no bombing at Lancelin.

Hon Jim Scott: What a ripper!

The PRESIDENT: Order!

Hon FRANK HOUGH: I think that is very unparliamentary. I could have called the member a tree hanger, but I will not.

The Government is understandably in favour of the plan because of the potential economic benefits, especially for jobs. The Greens are not about jobs; they are about getting rid of them and planting trees where they used to be. They are against tourism, ship repair works and the replenishing of supplies on the vessels. The Greens oppose everything that is good for this State.

Hon Dee Margetts: Are you saying that war is good for the State's economy?

Hon FRANK HOUGH: I read this drivel.

The PRESIDENT: Order! Hon Frank Hough will address the Chair, not the interjectors.

Hon FRANK HOUGH: I am terribly sorry, Mr President.

I read the drivel of Hon Dee Margetts in *Hansard*. She referred to having heard some horror reports. Where? In our luncheon room or down the street? She should quote some sources of these horror reports. She said that she had heard stories that linked Kopassus to murders in West Papua. From whom did she hear them? I am referring to an uncorrected proof of *Hansard*.

Hon Jim Scott: Are you saying that it did not happen?

Hon FRANK HOUGH: I am just saying that the member said she heard. I hear lots of things. I heard which horse was going to win the Melbourne Cup, but Northerly did not run.

Hon Dee Margetts interjected.

The PRESIDENT: Order!

Hon FRANK HOUGH: Hon Dee Margetts was impassioned when she made that speech last week. However, she is very naive and lives in a world of fantasy. If she believes the drivel that she writes or states, I would be very surprised.

Let us think about the types of ploys that Saddam Hussein has used. He invited his sons-in-law back to Iraq. He granted them amnesty and said that they could return from Jordan. Members know what happened. They

arrived at the border and that is where the amnesty finished. He had them shot. Is this the type of person that the Greens would endorse?

Hon Jim Scott: No.

Hon FRANK HOUGH: It is very hard to find words to describe Saddam Hussein when one looks at some of the atrocities the man has committed.

Hon Dee Margetts: I referred to Iraq as being out of favour with the United States.

Hon FRANK HOUGH: The United States probably adopted a tough, bluff line during the initial stages of negotiations but it is now being conciliatory. The motion is long past its use-by date, because since the member moved the motion, great changes have occurred. One of the supporting states of Saddam Hussein was Syria, which was against letting the United Nations inspectors in.

Hon Dee Margetts: Where are you reading from?

Hon FRANK HOUGH: It is a news service release of 10 November 2002.

Hon Dee Margetts: You claimed that you were reading from my speech.

Hon FRANK HOUGH: I am reading from a note. The United Nations Security Council member initially said that it would oppose the measure being directed at its neighbour and fellow Arab State but now Syria has buckled and toed the line with the United Nations.

I reiterate the quote, "Being Green is just too easy". The article in *The West Australian* of 28 October 2002 reads -

Unencumbered by the responsibility of having to manage the economy and create jobs, the Greens and like-minded groups have ignored these benefits and resorted to scaremongering about potentially massive environmental, social and security impacts on the State.

Without providing any supporting evidence or even convincing arguments, they have declared that WA could become a terrorist target, created unnecessary alarm about nuclear weapons on the ships and even raised the prospect of environmental damage from non-existent plans to dredge the channel approaching Garden Island.

In the eyes of Greens MLC Dee Margetts, the plans raise the prospect of WA being used as a major military base and testing ground for US armaments.

That sort of alarmist reaction would be seen normally as just more Green hyperbole.

Several members interjected.

Hon FRANK HOUGH: This journalist has got it 100 per cent right. He has read the Greens like a book; they cannot hide anything from him. It is a pity that the Labor Party has not been able to read the Greens that well. I bet when Labor Party members refer to "our coalition partners", they say through gritted teeth to their families, "We are in coalition with the Greens." That is the way I would say it. The Greens know, do they not, that in the same way that people do for Saddam Hussein, the buckling-knee brigade will topple over on one vote, one value and, with a squeaky little "Yes", do what Hon Jim McGinty wants: "I am the Saddam Hussein here, and I want you to support one vote, one value. You will do as you are told as you have done on everything else."

Hon John Fischer: Labor-Green coalition.

Hon FRANK HOUGH: It is a green Labor. One thing in this Parliament that cannot be refuted is the comment by the Leader of the House, recorded in *Hansard*, that One Nation is like a breath of fresh air. I have great respect for the Leader of the House. Never a truer word was spoken. The article continues -

But in the present mood, with the public unsettled by the viciousness of the Bali terrorist attacks, and fearful of Australia being drawn unwillingly into a war between the US and Iraq, they gain more currency than they deserve.

This is what the Greens are about.

Hon Dee Margetts: That is what is upsetting you, isn't it?

Hon FRANK HOUGH: The Greens will get on the back of any issue to promote themselves. To continue -

Having won their first House of Representatives seat in the Cunningham by-election in New South Wales just over a week ago, the Greens probably are hoping to be taken more seriously as a political force in Australia.

If I were helping this journalist out I would have said, "You are joking!" It continues -

If that is to happen they will have to learn to spend more time -

It is worth reading that again. I should have read it a couple of times. I repeat -

If that is to happen they will have to learn to spend more time in the real world where governments are expected to help create jobs and alliances between nations where the same aspirations and values are taken seriously.

They certainly are not.

Hon Jim Scott: How many Australian people support going to war with Iraq?

Hon FRANK HOUGH: I know that Jim Smith does, and we cannot refute that. I quote from John Stuart Mill, 1806 to 1873, who said -

War is an ugly thing, but not the ugliest of things. The decayed and degraded state of moral and patriotic feeling which thinks that nothing is worth war is much worse. The person who has nothing for which he is willing to fight, nothing which is more important than his own personal safety, is a miserable creature and has no chance of being free unless made and kept so by the exertions of better men than himself.

The Greens should have read that. I reiterate, “unless made and kept so by the exertions of better men than himself.” I agree with this man. What a great saying.

Hon Kim Chance: He sounds like a lunatic.

Hon FRANK HOUGH: He was a great forecaster. I turn now to the Blair dossier, which states -

What I believe the assessed intelligence has established beyond doubt -

He is not saying “with some doubt” -

is that Saddam has continued to produce chemical and biological weapons, that he continues in his efforts to develop nuclear weapons, and that he has been able to extend the range of his ballistic missile programme.

Under all this scrutiny he is still out there saying, “Hi ho, hi ho, it’s off to work we go; we will make another scud.” It continues -

... Saddam will now do his utmost to try to conceal his weapons from the UN inspectors. The picture presented to me by the JIC in recent months has become more not less worrying.

He will try, like a sneaky little backhanded, dishonest person to hide. Why would we tell Saddam Hussein that we know where his weapons are concealed?

I do not agree with wars; they are a last resort. However, when push comes to shove, one must toe the line. This is not about oil; it is about some dishonest person who will ultimately start the next war. To continue -

The threat posed to international peace and security, when WMD are in the hands of a brutal and aggressive regime like Saddam’s, is real. Unless we face up to the threat, not only do we risk undermining the authority of the UN, whose resolutions he defies, but more importantly and in the longer term, we place at risk the lives and prosperity of our own people.

My God, he got that right! That is what it is all about. This is about a dishonest, barbaric killer who treats his own people with the same disrespect. He killed his two sons-in-law, for God’s sake! He endorsed women in the Mahjar Prison being habitually raped by prison officers, mutilated and tortured. In October 2000 dozens of women were beheaded for political reasons. The official line was that they were under suspicion of prostitution. All I can say is thank the Lord that we are not beheaded here for political reasons.

Debate interrupted, pursuant to standing orders.