

so many people killed before that conference is convened? How many dead Palestinians and Arabs? How many casualties among Israeli men and women? How many casualties among the Americans, French and English? How many casualties among Canadians and Quebecers before people finally accept to sit around the same table, examine the problems, and look for solutions? This is called a peace conference. You might say: Yes, France tried today and yesterday but had to withdraw its proposal plan. Some might say: "Yes, but Canada agrees, because the Prime Minister wrote a letter to Mr. de Cuellar and there was a recent statement from the Security Council". We are all aware that these are nothing but tricks. A policy is something else.

The government claims that it has a policy. Nowhere in the resolution which defines the policy do I see the notion of a peace conference. It would be to the honour of Canada, even if it does not take place tomorrow, to write into a resolution that Canada wants a peace conference, that it wants it now, and not "in due course", a favorite expression among diplomats bankrupt of ideas. "In due course" is an expression which we find in all resolutions. Everybody is well aware that it vaguely means at some later point in time, if ever. We wish we had introduced such a resolution before the NDP did, but what matters is that it was done.

Let us, the Canadian Parliament, on the eve of looming catastrophic events, say in a resolution that we want a conference on peace, and Canada will then rise to the occasion. People will recognize that Canada had and still has the potential to show leadership. No matter who we are or however different our opinions, all of us in Canada, on the government side as well as on ours, want peace. Let us act so it will happen, Mr. Speaker.

I speak for myself and I think for the majority of the Bloc Québécois. Well, it is a free vote and, as you know, we vote freely. We hope for and will support the Canadian government's final attempt for peace, and we will vote for the government's resolution, completed by the Liberal amendment and made better still by the amendment of the New Democratic Party.

**Mr. Svend Robinson (Burnaby—Kingsway):** Mr. Speaker, I wish to commend the hon. member for his

### *Government Orders*

excellent speech, a speech that is clear and courageous. I also want to say that I agree completely with the comments of the hon. member on the importance of an international peace conference.

Indeed, when I was in Iraq, I met several people. In Jordan, I met with the Minister of External Affairs and, in Iraq, I met with Kuwaiti women, Iraqis, and Palestinians, including President Yasser Arafat. I did so because it seemed essential to me to underline the fact that Palestinians are also victims of what happened in Kuwait, and that Palestinians of the occupied territories are also victims. We have several victims. Yesterday, two PLO leaders were added to the list.

A conference was essential before August 2 and it is even more so today. I wish to congratulate the hon. member for pointing out this fact. I know very well that he was going to propose an amendment and I hope that his colleagues will support our amendment if it is found in order.

I also have a question for the member. The member knows very well that last Sunday, there was a very large demonstration in Montreal where more than 6,000 men, women, and children demonstrated for peace and against a catastrophic war. There were several groups. It was organised by the group *Échec à la guerre* and among participants, there were *Artistes pour la paix*, Lorraine Pagé of CEQ, Pierre Paquette of CSN, and several members of the Parti Québécois. I had the honour to deliver a speech. Unfortunately, there were no representatives from the Bloc Québécois, the Liberal Party, or the Progressive Conservative Party. Nevertheless, I would like to ask the hon. member whether he agrees with the demands made during this important demonstration? Does he agree with the men, women and children who shouted: "No war for oil. No blood for oil"?

Does he not agree as well that Quebec is also distinct in that a larger proportion of voters is in favour of a peaceful solution, according to polls? It is not a distinct society just from a linguistic point of view. It is also a