

AUSTRALIA'S SUPPORT FOR UNITED STATES MILITARY ACTION IN IRAQ

Motion

Resumed from 7 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 GEORGE CASH (North Metropolitan) [3.13 pm]: Last Thursday when this motion was being discussed, I made some preliminary comments, which generally centred around the advice to me from the Prime Minister's office about the federal Government's position on Iraq. I made clear the federal Government's position on this issue, and it can be read in *Hansard*. I do not intend to re-canvass those issues. However, one matter that must be looked at is whether Saddam Hussein, the President of Iraq, is in fact the kindly person that the Greens (WA) attempted to make him out to be or whether he is a murderous dictator who will use any opportunity provided to him to murder or mutilate the citizens of Iraq; and whether, in violation of various United Nations Security Council resolutions, Saddam Hussein is engaging in the production of chemical weapons and other weapons of mass destruction for use against the rest of the world.

To answer some of those questions, it is convenient to look at the dossier that was tabled in the British House of Commons on 24 September 2002 by the British Prime Minister, Tony Blair. It is a 51-page document that sets out the position that Britain recognises in respect of the problems associated with Iraq. When I say the difficulties associated with the issues generated by Iraq, I indicate that the British Prime Minister tabled a document that was based on the work of the Joint Intelligence Committee. That agency is at the heart of British intelligence. It is chaired by the Cabinet Office and comprises the heads of the United Kingdom's three intelligence and security agencies, the Chief of Defence Intelligence and senior officials from key government departments.

The Prime Minister of Britain pointed out when he made a speech and tabled this document that for more than 60 years the JIC had been providing regular intelligence assessments to successive Prime Ministers and senior colleagues on a wide range of foreign policy and international security issues, and that it was an unusual step for a British Prime Minister to table a document that dealt directly with some highly controversial security issues affecting not only the United Kingdom but also the entire world. In fact, during his speech to the House of Commons, the Prime Minister said that much of the material that had been analysed was secret material, and it was unprecedented for the Government to publish this kind of document; but in light of the debate about Iraq and weapons of mass destruction, the Prime Minister of Great Britain wanted to share with the British public the reasons that he believed this issue was a current and serious threat to the United Kingdom's national interest.

I am happy to table the document later on, although, if members want it, it is available on the Internet. The document sets out the case against Saddam Hussein. The executive summary comprises a number of points. The first point starts by stating -

1. Under Saddam Hussein Iraq developed chemical and biological weapons, acquired missiles allowing it to attack neighbouring countries with these weapons and persistently tried to develop a nuclear bomb. Saddam has used chemical weapons, both against Iran and against his own people. Following the Gulf War, Iraq had to admit to all this.

As to the cease-fire of 1991, the dossier indicates that at that time Saddam agreed unconditionally to give up his weapons of mass destruction. We know, as an undisputed fact, that those weapons of mass destruction were not given up by Iraq and that it continues to develop weapons to be used against the international community.

The JIC report goes on to say -

As a result of the intelligence we -

That is, the JIC -

judge that Iraq has:

- . continued to produce chemical and biological agents;
- . military plans for the use of chemical and biological weapons, including against its own Shia population. Some of these weapons are deployable within 45 minutes of an order to use them;
- . command and control arrangements in place to use chemical and biological weapons. Authority ultimately resides with Saddam Hussein. (There is intelligence that he may have delegated this authority to his son Qusai);

The report also states that Iraq has -

- . developed mobile laboratories for military use, corroborating earlier reports about the mobile production of biological warfare agents;
- . pursued illegal programmes to procure controlled materials of potential use in the production of chemical and biological weapons programmes;
- . tried covertly to acquire technology and materials which could be used in the production of nuclear weapons;
- . sought significant quantities of uranium from Africa, despite having no active civil nuclear power programme that could require it;
- . recalled specialists to work on its nuclear programme;

The report also refers to some of the heavy-duty hardware; that is, the al-Hussein missiles, which have a 650-kilometre range, other liquid propellant missiles and other devastating hardware as part of the weapons of mass destruction that Iraq continues to develop.

The report is broken into three parts. In fact, part 3 deals with Saddam's rise to power, the nature of his regime and the history of regional aggression. It deals also with Saddam's human rights abuses, including his record of torture, mass arrests and summary executions. It is interesting to note in the report the record of Iraq's chemical warfare research program between 1971 and 1998. The report states that this program started in 1971. It was relatively small at that stage of its development. However, in the meantime it has developed into a very significant chemical warfare program, which Saddam is prepared to use on not only his own people but also, as I said earlier, the global community.

One of the chemical weapons which are said to be retained and which in fact continue to be produced by Iraq is mustard gas. It is a liquid agent that gives off a hazardous vapour, causing burns and blisters to exposed skin. The report indicates that when inhaled, mustard gas damages the respiratory tract. When it is ingested, it causes vomiting and diarrhoea and it attacks and damages the eyes, the mucous membrane, the lungs, skin and blood-forming organs. Tabun, sarin and VX are all nerve agents, of which VX is the most toxic. They all damage the nervous system. They are designed to produce muscular spasms and paralysis. The report indicates that as little as 10 milligrams of VX on the skin can cause a rapid death. Those are some of the chemical weapons that are available.

The report refers to the production of the anthrax agent and describes anthrax as a disease caused by the bacterium bacillus anthracis. It indicates that inhalation anthrax is the manifestation of the disease likely to be expected in biological warfare. The symptoms may vary but can include fever and internal bleeding. The incubation period for anthrax is between one and seven days, with most cases occurring within two days of exposure. Of the other biological agents, the botulism toxin is one of the most toxic substances known to man. The first symptom of poisoning may appear as early as one hour after exposure or as late as eight days after exposure. The incubation period is between 12 and 22 hours and paralysis leads to death by suffocation.

Other biological agents that Saddam is continuing to produce against the resolutions of the United Nations Security Council, in particular United Nations Security Council resolution No 687, are the aflatoxins. They are fungal toxins, which are potent carcinogens. Most symptoms take a long time to show, and food products contaminated by aflatoxins can cause liver inflammation and cancer. They also can affect pregnant women, leading to stillborn babies and children born with mutations. Ricin is one of the other biological agents known to be possessed by Saddam Hussein. Ricin is derived from the castor bean plant and can cause multiple organ failure leading to death within one or two days of inhalation. That is just a short summary of some of the chemical and biological agents that continue to be produced by Saddam Hussein.

The other side, of course, is the heavy-duty missiles that are being produced; for instance, the scud missiles, which have a relatively short range but which can be usefully deployed against adjoining countries. It should be noted that Saddam Hussein is on record as having used these chemical weapons not only during the Iran-Iraq war but also against the Iraqi Kurds at Halabja, which is located in northern Iraq. On Friday, 17 March 1988 Saddam Hussein directed that fighter-bombers of the Iraqi air force should fly to Halabja and bomb the village, which comprised Iraqi Kurds. The raid was over in minutes. Chemical weapons were used against the Iraqi Kurds. One Kurd described the effects of the chemical attack on the village of Halabja in the following terms -

“My brothers and my wife had blood and vomit running from their noses and their mouths. Their heads were tilted to one side. They were groaning. I couldn’t do much, just clean up the blood and vomit from their mouths and try in every way to make them breathe again. I did artificial respiration on them and then I gave them two injections each. I also rubbed creams on my wife and two brothers.”

Although that is recorded in the document tabled by the Prime Minister of Britain, it was taken from “Crimes Against Humanity” from the Iraqi National Congress. It was said that 5 000 Kurds were killed as a result of that attack, which was at the direction of Saddam Hussein. Anyone who comes into this Parliament and acts as an apologist for someone whom I see as a murderous dictator needs to carefully go back and monitor -

Hon Dee Margetts: Who exactly has been acting as an apologist for a murderous dictator?

Hon GEORGE CASH: I am making the point that anyone -

Hon Dee Margetts: No. Who exactly has been acting as an apologist?

Hon GEORGE CASH: Many people around the world act as apologists for Saddam Hussein.

Hon Dee Margetts: But not in this Chamber.

Hon GEORGE CASH: Are they not?

Hon Dee Margetts: No.

Hon GEORGE CASH: I see. That is pleasing to hear. However, I am saying that anyone who thinks that Saddam Hussein is a kindly gentleman who is manufacturing these weapons of mass destruction for the good of the international community is sadly mistaken. They are being manufactured to be used against the international community when it suits Saddam Hussein. His record is one of murder, torture and all other degrading things to human beings.

On the current position, it is interesting to read the various United Nations Security Council resolutions that have been passed in respect of Iraq since 1990. In fact, Saddam Hussein is violating 16 resolutions at this very minute. Those United Nations Security Council resolutions did not include the more than 30 directions that have been issued by the Secretary General of the United Nations. The first United Nations resolution that is still being violated by Iraq is resolution No 678, which was passed by the Security Council on 29 November 1990. That is an important resolution because, as a result of Iraq’s non-compliance with earlier resolutions of the Security Council, the Security Council through resolution No 678 authorised United Nations member states to use all necessary means to uphold and implement resolution No 660 and all subsequent relevant resolutions and to restore international peace and security in the area.

As a result of the passing of that resolution, the Gulf War occurred - Operation Desert Storm, as it was known at the time - which was certainly led by a coalition of forces. It is fair to say that the United States and the United Kingdom were the lead forces in the Gulf War on behalf of the United Nations member states. A coalition of forces went in and tried to liberate the people of Kuwait who were under attack by Saddam Hussein for no other reason than to seize the oil fields in Kuwait with the prime objective of using them as an economic weapon against the rest of the global community.

On 3 April 1991 the United Nations Security Council passed resolution No 687, which is perhaps the most significant resolution on Iraq that the Security Council has passed in the past 10 years. It is a fairly lengthy document, a copy of which I have here, but I can briefly describe it as requiring Iraq to unconditionally accept the destruction, removal or rendering harmless under international supervision of all chemical and biological weapons and all stocks, agents and all related sub-systems and components and all research, development, support and manufacturing facilities. That was one part of the resolution. Another part directed that Iraq must unconditionally agree not to acquire or develop nuclear weapons or nuclear weapons-useable materials or any research, development or manufacturing facilities; that Iraq must unconditionally accept the destruction, removal or rendering harmless under international supervision of all ballistic missiles with a range greater than 150 kilometres and related major parts and repair and production facilities; that Iraq must not use, develop, construct or acquire any weapons of mass destruction; and that Iraq must reaffirm its obligations under the nuclear non-proliferation treaty. Within resolution No 687 the United Nations Security Council established the United

Nations Special Commission - UNSCOM - which was established to verify the elimination of Iraq's chemical and biological weapons programs and mandated that the International Atomic Energy Agency - IAEA - verify elimination of Iraq's nuclear weapons programs.

The resolution comprises a number of pages. Part of the resolution required that Iraq must declare fully its weapons of mass destruction programs; that it must not commit or support terrorism or allow terrorist organisations to operate in Iraq; that it must cooperate in accounting for the missing and dead Kuwaitis and others as a result of its invasion of Kuwait, and that it must return the Kuwaiti property that it had seized during the Gulf War. As I have said, that is probably the most significant resolution on Iraq passed by the United Nations Security Council. However, history has shown us that almost from day one after that resolution was passed in April 1991, Iraq was thumbing its nose at the United Nations. Documentation shows that the Security Council passed a number of resolutions over the next few years to insist that Iraq comply with the requirements of the Security Council.

By 1996 Iraq was clearly flouting the directions of the UNSCOM teams that were sent in to check on the weapons capabilities and production of Iraq. The weapons inspectors were threatened on many occasions. As a result of the threats, by 1997 the weapons inspectors were pulled out of Iraq. They were no doubt pulled out of Iraq by the United Nations because they were entitled to have their safety protected, but the bottom line is that when the weapons inspectors were pulled out of Iraq, it gave Saddam Hussein a great opportunity to continue the production of weapons of mass destruction that we as the international community know has continued. It is only in the past few months, following certain statements from the United States, that the United Nations Security Council has again seriously considered the position of the world and Iraq. Only last Friday the United Nations Security Council approved resolution No 1441 which, in short, gives the President of Iraq seven days in which to agree to the propositions that are contained in that resolution; in fact, part 1 of resolution No 1441 states that acting under chapter 7 of the charter of the United Nations, the United Nations decides that Iraq has been and remains in material breach of its obligations under relevant resolutions, including resolution No 687 of 1991, in particular through Iraq's failure to cooperate with the United Nations inspectors and the International Atomic Energy Agency and its failure to complete the actions required under paragraphs 8 to 31 of resolution No 687 of 1991. Resolution No 1441 also comprises a number of pages but is available if members are interested in its exact wording.

I think that the world breathed a sigh of relief when the Security Council passed that resolution last Friday. It was interesting to see that the 15 members who comprised the United Nations Security Council voted unanimously on the resolution. The following Sunday the Arab foreign ministers, who were meeting in Cairo, put out a statement. They said that they welcomed what was mentioned in resolution No 1441, stating that the Security Council is the only appropriate body that can evaluate the reports written by inspectors. The fact that the Arab foreign ministers again unanimously supported resolution No 1441 was a very clear indication that the Arab world, along with the non-Arab world, is very concerned at the continuing actions of Saddam Hussein and that they, along with the rest of the world, believe that it is time to call a halt to the intimidation that he clearly intends as a result of his continued production of weapons of mass destruction.

The world was pleased that the Arab foreign ministers supported resolution 1441, and believed that it was making some progress. I note that yesterday in the Iraqi Parliament, there was discussion about United Nations Security Council resolution 1441. That discussion will continue tonight our time. The indication from those who have spoken in the Iraqi Parliament is that they do not intend to recommend to the President that Iraq abide by resolution 1441. Once the Parliament makes its recommendation, the President, Saddam Hussein, will no doubt make his decision. It will be interesting to see the action necessary to have Iraq comply with not only resolution No 1441 but also the other outstanding resolutions that have been lawfully passed by the Security Council. If I did not make it clear last Thursday, I make it very clear now that I believe that if there is a need for the international community to take military action against Iraq, that action should be taken by a coalition of forces. That action should not be taken by just the United States perhaps accompanied by the United Kingdom and some other countries; the member nations of the United Nations should form that coalition so that the world knows that it is a properly authorised coalition and that it will take the necessary action to bring Iraq into line. As an individual, I am not in favour of unilateral action. I believe that it is proper to work through the United Nations processes, notwithstanding the fact that the United Nations has been very slow in requiring Iraq to comply with the resolutions it has passed over a long time. There has quite rightly been some significant criticism of the United Nations for its lack of commitment in enforcing Security Council resolutions. Of course, that in itself has sent a message to Iraq and the rest of the world that the United Nations as a group of member countries is not dinkum in dealing with what is an international emergency.

A number of questions need to be asked and answered about the position in Iraq and the position of Australia and the international community. The first question is whether Saddam Hussein poses a threat to world peace. The available evidence shows that Saddam Hussein is a sadistic dictator who has murdered many of his citizens

and who gave the orders to invade Kuwait in 1990. I make the point that Iraq invaded Kuwait for the purpose of taking over the oilfields in Kuwait and holding the international community to ransom. The evidence also shows that it was a properly constituted coalition of United Nations forces, led by the United States and the United Kingdom, that took authorised military action to liberate Kuwait and repel the invading Iraqi forces in what was then known as Operation Desert Storm.

Australia has been a member of the United Nations for many years. It has participated in United Nations peacekeeping forces over a number years. Its most recent action as a member of the United Nations has been with the United Nations coalition of forces that has been liberating the people of Afghanistan. Prior to that, Australian troops were in East Timor at the request of the United Nations.

No doubt Australia will continue to work with the United Nations to achieve a solution to the violation by Iraq of the United Nations Security Council's resolutions. It is fair to say that the Australian people do not seek war with Iraq. They want and are entitled to have the lawful resolutions of the Security Council complied with. That is what I hope this debate is all about. Australia, along with the other members of the United Nations, must be prepared to confront Iraq's violations. I said that we are looking not for war with Iraq, but to achieve a settlement that protects peace-loving people around the world. Some people say that we in Australia should do and say nothing about Iraq's UNSC violations in the hope that Iraq will not target Australia. The Prime Minister of Australia has made the point that those who think that we in Australia can roll ourselves into a little ball and hide in the corner are not living in the world of reality. One thing is for sure: we cannot buy immunity from people like Saddam Hussein. He is a dictator who will kill his own people at the drop of a hat. The 50-page dossier tabled by the Prime Minister of Britain sets out some of the human rights atrocities that have been committed by Saddam Hussein.

Hon Dee Margetts: Indonesia does that. We are about to create a military liaison with the very people who have committed those kinds of atrocities.

Hon GEORGE CASH: If the member cares to move a motion about Indonesia next week, I will be prepared to look at that situation. One of the things I said when I started this speech is that the State Parliament is not in position to direct the Australian defence forces; defence and foreign affairs are some of the powers that were vested in the Commonwealth way back in 1901. We are entitled to speak on such issues, but all we can do is talk about them. We have no direct link in ordering the Australian military into action. I said last Thursday that members could talk to their federal colleagues about various issues; however, in the end, this is the State Parliament, which is required to attend to the residual powers.

Doing and saying nothing is not an option when it comes to Iraq. People cannot buy immunity from a dictator such as Saddam Hussein. In that regard, Australia should stand and be counted on the question of world peace. We cannot be mute on this international challenge. We are part of the international community, and we have a responsibility to act. When the Prime Minister talked only a few weeks ago about the inability of Australia to roll itself into a little ball and hide in the corner, he was at a press conference following the bombing of various places in Kuta, Bali. The Prime Minister made the point that terrorism had struck down Australian people in a very direct way, as it had on September 11 for those Australians who were either in the World Trade Center in New York or in the immediate area. Australians were lost in that action, although it is said that the action was directed specifically at the United States. The Bali bombing was directed against Australian people, notwithstanding that I have heard and the paper states that one of the suspects claimed he was aiming at American citizens. Australian citizens have been visiting Bali for a very long time. The majority of visitors to Bali are Australian citizens. It is clear to anyone who visits Bali that Australians outnumber Americans any day of the week there. Anyone who says that the bombs used in Bali were designed to kill Americans is not, in my view, speaking the truth. However, those facts will emerge in due course.

We in Australia cannot deny that Saddam Hussein poses a threat to the international community. We must continue to work with the United Nations to find a resolution to this issue. I say again that doing nothing is not an option. It appeared to me, in fact, on reading the words of the motion and listening to Hon Dee Margetts, who moved the motion, that inherent in both the words of the motion and what was said was a view that if we do nothing about Iraq, that international problem will bypass Australia.

Hon Dee Margetts: I didn't say that at all. I specifically said that we should be trying to reduce resentment in the world, and bombing Iraq will not do that. That is not to say that we should do nothing. The issue of confidence building in the world, which should be happening at the moment, is the very opposite to what is happening. It is not a do-nothing scenario at all.

Hon GEORGE CASH: I am glad that Hon Dee Margetts said it is not a do-nothing scenario, because that is the way I see the matter also. I believe we must take action to ensure that Iraq complies with the United -

Hon Dee Margetts: You and I have quite different ideas of how to build that confidence.

Hon GEORGE CASH: We appear to have differences in that area. I believe that the United Nations is an important agency and that we should work through the United Nations. Equally, if Saddam Hussein continues to violate -

Hon Jim Scott: Do you think the United States should also work through the United Nations?

Hon GEORGE CASH: Yes. If the member were to read some of the more recent speeches of President Bush he would see that he believes the United Nations is the appropriate authority to pass these resolutions.

Hon Dee Margetts: No, he has said that it is a problem anyway if Saddam Hussein does not come up with what he wants.

Hon GEORGE CASH: It is convenient for both Hon Dee Margetts and Hon Jim Scott, no matter what the issue, to find fault with the United States.

Hon Dee Margetts: In this instance that is right.

Hon GEORGE CASH: Both members agree with that proposition by nodding and making an interjection that I did not hear. I do not see the world through those glasses. The other day I did not have an opportunity to speak on the motion moved by Hon Dee Margetts about the use of the Garden Island naval base for United States sea-swap arrangements for US sailors. I will state my position, as it directly affects the motion before us. I strongly support the use of Garden Island as an Australian military base for a sea-swap facility. One reason I support it is that I recognise that Australia is a party to the Australia, New Zealand and United States defence treaty. I spoke about the ANZUS treaty last year and made the point that it had just celebrated its fiftieth year commemorating the signing of that treaty. That treaty, which is now supported by the United States and Australia - regrettably New Zealand has pulled back on its obligations in the treaty - was to provide an umbrella defence for Australia so that Australia would be protected against military action by other countries. Equally Australia said that should America be attacked, it would assist America.

Hon Jim Scott: That has occurred, hasn't it?

Hon GEORGE CASH: It has occurred, certainly since ANZUS has been in place. There is no doubt that both countries have supported each other in various operations. However, the mere existence of ANZUS as a treaty has been a signal to other countries that there is an alliance between the United States and Australia. As far as the United States coming to the assistance of Australia is concerned, I indicate to Hon Jim Scott that the Battle of the Coral Sea is perhaps the most obvious wartime assistance that America afforded Australia. Admittedly that it was more than 50 years ago, but flowing from incidents such as that, the ANZUS treaty was developed - now 51 years ago. I therefore support the sea-swap proposition that might occur. I do not believe that my supporting the sea-swap operation at Garden Island will, in itself, encourage Iraq to take action against Australia. Saddam Hussein should be under no misapprehension about where Australia stands on his violation of the United Nations Security Council resolutions. Clearly he should be under no misapprehension about where the United States and the United Kingdom stand on those violations.

Hon Dee Margetts: Are you honestly saying that Iraq is the only country that will feel threatened and angry if Australia joins with the United States in an invasion of Iraq?

Hon GEORGE CASH: I believe Australia has an obligation under an international treaty with the United States to abide by the terms of that treaty. It is within the terms of that treaty that a sea-swap arrangement can be established. I am very happy that that occur. I also recognise and accept as a possibility that any action on the west coast here in Western Australia is likely to occur in the area of the naval base, which also houses within a few kilometres an oil refinery and a very significant industrial area. However, I said earlier that to do nothing is not an option. By doing nothing, Saddam Hussein in the past 10 years has continued to build his stocks of weapons of mass destruction; continued to hide them from the world and from the weapons inspectors who were sent there to find them; and developed sites of enormous size, for the purpose not of building a presidential palace on them, but of storing those weapons of mass destruction and the chemical and biological agents that will be used against the international community.

We must be realists. Saddam Hussein is not a kindly leader who is there to protect his people; he is there because he is a dictator and he does the things that dictators do. The report that was tabled by Mr Blair sets out a small summary of the human rights abuses under Saddam Hussein as follows -

- . 4000 prisoners were executed at the Abu Ghraib Prison in 1984.
- . 3000 prisoners were executed at the Mahjar Prison between 1983 and 1998.
- . About 2500 prisoners were executed between 1997 and 1999 in a "prison cleansing" campaign.

- . 122 male prisoners were executed at Abu Ghraib prison in February/March 2000. A further 23 political prisoners were executed there in October 2001.
- . In October 2000 dozens of women accused of prostitution were beheaded without any judicial process. Some were accused for political reasons.
- . Women prisoners at Mahjar are routinely raped by their guards.
- . Methods of torture used in Iraqi jails include using electric drills to mutilate hands, pulling out fingernails, knife cuts, sexual attacks and 'official rape'.
- . Prisoners at the Qurtiyya Prison in Baghdad and elsewhere are kept in metal boxes the size of tea chests. If they do not confess they are left to die.

According to this report, Saddam Hussein has issued a series of decrees for criminal offences, which includes amputation, branding, cutting off ears and other forms of mutilation. Anyone found guilty of slandering the president has his tongue removed. Those are the things the dictator, Saddam Hussein, continues to inflict on his people. It seems to me that, as part of the international community, we in Australia have an obligation to stand up for world peace. If that means -

Hon Jim Scott interjected.

Hon GEORGE CASH: Not necessarily. I do not like the idea of war. However, equally I do not like the idea of a dictator torturing his people on a daily basis.

Hon Dee Margetts: Neither do we.

Hon GEORGE CASH: I am not sure about that. When Hon Dee Margetts spoke the other day I thought she was acting as an apologist for Saddam Hussein and for what he has done to his people over many years. If the member says that is not the case I accept that, but the impression I gained when she spoke was that she believed that Saddam Hussein was a kindly man who had the best interests of the people of Iraq uppermost in his mind. I do not think that is the case, nor, clearly, do many people in the international community.

In agreeing with the Government that this motion should be rejected, I say to the Parliament, that Australia must stand up for world peace. We need to support the United Nations; we particularly need to ensure that Iraq complies with the lawful resolutions of the United Nations Security Council. If we are not prepared to do that as Australians, we do not deserve to live in what we believe to be a free and democratic nation. Terrorism has already touched the shores of Australia through the recent bombings in Bali. It certainly affected us when the United States suffered the World Trade Center tragedy on September 11 last year. The world as a community must stand up and be counted. I am pleased as a member of this Parliament to understand and support the comments of the Australian Prime Minister when he said, "Don't think you can roll yourself into a little ball and hide; we are part of the international community; and we are part of the responsibility of ensuring world peace."

Hon Dee Margetts interjected.

The PRESIDENT: Order, members!

Hon GEORGE CASH: Again, I am not sure what was said then, but the member sounded like an apologist for Saddam Hussein.

Hon Dee Margetts: Nonsense.

Hon GEORGE CASH: If that is what she is all about, I will buy a ticket for her and she can go to Baghdad and see how Saddam Hussein treats his people.

Hon Dee Margetts: How dare you accuse me of being an apologist.

The PRESIDENT: Order! Hon George Cash will address the Chair and Hon Dee Margetts will cease her interjections, having already spoken on this motion.

Hon GEORGE CASH: I need say no more because I believe the Chamber supports me in wanting world peace. The only way we will get world peace in the immediate term is to ensure that Iraq complies with the resolutions of the United Nations Security Council. For the reasons I have given, the Opposition opposes the motion.

HON JIM SCOTT (South Metropolitan) [4.04 pm]: I have just listened to some of the most blatant hypocrisy I have ever heard in my life. Apart from attributing many incorrect motives to my colleague, Hon George Cash seems to have only one eyeglass left in his glasses. He seems to think that the only way to gain world peace, to help George Bush in his aims, and to follow Hon George Cash's leader in Canberra is to bomb the heck out of many innocent people. Incidentally, the Prime Minister is so concerned about the Kurds who escaped from the dictatorship of Hussein that his Government and his side of politics want to lock them up and send them back as soon as possible.

In her remarks, my colleague Hon Dee Margetts was trying to point out to members that although we abhor the appalling behaviour of Saddam Hussein, many other countries are in breach of the United Nations Security Council resolutions and UN resolutions as a whole. In fact, far worse breaches are constantly committed by a number of countries. We could provide a list. In a number of those cases, the US has been at the forefront to prevent action being taken against those countries by the UN. Some are obvious and some are less obvious; for example, Morocco has invaded Sudan, and Israel is responsible for breaching many UN resolutions, but George Bush has not mentioned bombing Israel. We must examine the differences in attitude towards one dictator and another and ask ourselves if this is a reasonable way to solve the problem.

Probably the greatest example of hypocrisy is that some of the most strident, hawkish members of the US Administration are calling for the world to disarm Saddam Hussein. Donald Rumsfeld went to Iraq during the conflict between Iraq and Iran and ensured that a good flow of weapons went to that same villain. In fact, American helicopters were used to poison the Kurds. I wonder whether Hon George Cash was concerned about that. The United States gave intelligence advice to the Iraqis to drop that chemical weapon on the Iranian army. However, that was all right because at that stage the Iranians were the villains. At that time the United States did not rush to the UN and say that that terrible Iraqi, who the US helped get into power, was doing terrible things and must be stopped. I refer to an article from *Foreign Policy in Focus* by Sinan Antoon, who was born in Baghdad and left Iraq in 1991. He is studying for his doctorate in Arabic literature at Harvard University and is an analyst for *Foreign Policy in Focus*. His article reads -

The U.S. had very good relations with our oppressors in the 1980s. As a teenager growing up in Baghdad, I remember watching on the nightly news Saddam receiving a man by the name of Donald Rumsfeld, who was sent by President Reagan to reestablish U.S. diplomatic relations with the Iraqi regime. When Saddam plunged Iraq and its people into an eight-year war from 1980 to 1988 against Iran, it was no secret in Iraq that the U.S. was supplying Saddam with military intelligence through Jordan to help him against the Iranians. When Saddam gassed Iraqi Kurds, the Bush I administration gave him a slap on the wrist and made sure Congress did not pass sanctions against his regime. It was only after Saddam's invasion of Kuwait that he was treated by the U.S. as the monstrous dictator that he is.

He continues -

During the Gulf War to liberate Kuwait, the U.S. bombed our country back to the pre-industrial age and decimated the rank-and-file of the Iraqi army. But it left Saddam's elite Republican Guard almost intact . . . Iraqi Shi'ites and Kurds rose up against Saddam, partly in response to Bush I's call for the Iraqi people "to take matters into their own hands." But there was no support from the U.S. then, not even symbolically. Bush I then said that it was "an internal matter."

In fact, the cease-fire agreement signed between the U.S. and Saddam's generals allowed the continued use of helicopters, which he used to crush the uprising and kill tens of thousands of Iraqi citizens. General Schwarzkopf later wrote somewhat disingenuously that he didn't think that Saddam, whose generals claimed they needed the helicopters to transfer wounded soldiers, would use the helicopters against his own people.

I also point out that, since the Gulf War, the United States has put \$80 billion worth of weapons into the Middle East. It is so concerned about peace that it has made an absolute killing - I mean killing - in the sale of weapons since that time.

This Iraqi, who is an escapee from the Iraqi regime, also points out his concerns about the sanctions. He states -

Then came the sanctions -

Which, incidentally, Australia is helping to support -

supposedly put in place to weaken the regime and prevent it from developing weapons of mass destruction. But they have only made Saddam's regime and his thuggish inner circle stronger, while claiming the lives of hundreds of thousands of innocent Iraqi civilians. Americans should know that many Iraqis have heard of the infamous words of former Secretary of State Madeline Albright on 60 Minutes about the price of sanctions - 5,000 children under ten dying every month - being "worth it."

Is that the sort of thing that members want to support? I do not want to support that.

He continues -

Now the U.S. administration tells us that it wants to "liberate" Iraq and deliver its people to a prosperous and democratic future. But recent reports and leaks about what lies in store are alarming at best.

He then describes some of the people with whom the US is considering replacing Saddam - some ex-Saddamist generals. He describes them as having impressive credentials in genocide before becoming professional opposition figures. He states -

Finally there is Ahmed Chalabi from the Iraqi National Congress (INC) who has important friends in Washington, D.C, but is unpopular, if not detested, among Iraqis in the diaspora and virtually unknown inside Iraq. Chalabi is running around Washington, D.C. promising oil executives that the U.S. will control the lion's share of Iraq's massive reserves . . .

There is considerable concern among Iraqis. He goes on to say something that is very important -

Most distressing of all is how the voices of three million of us in the Iraqi diaspora are not being heard, especially in the mainstream American media. It's clear that one reason for this is that many of our voices contradict the Bush administration's official line to the American people that all Iraqis would support a U.S. war to oust Saddam.

He says -

While we have all been yearning for Saddam's demise, most of us are aware that our liberty and a democratic future are not at the top of the U.S. wish list in Iraq, if there at all. We have seen and heard too much to fall for this line. If a war is waged, let's be honest and say that it will be for oil and American dominion in the Middle East, and not to liberate us Iraqis.

That is written by an enemy of Saddam Hussein.

Debate interrupted, pursuant to standing orders.