

A participant suggested that Canada could play a role in reviving the OSCE. Prof. Keating added that a benefit of the OSCE over NATO is that it includes Russia.

A representative of Canada's Department of Foreign Affairs told delegates that Canada has acted in good faith and that it takes the ICJ Opinion very seriously. He interpreted the unfolding of the Malaysia initiative differently from Ambassador Roche, and said that this conference had failed to note the achievements of START.

Ambassador Roche responded that the positive initiatives of the Canadian government are appreciated. He continued discussion of the Malaysia initiative, and reiterated his opinion that the START talks were inadequate. Despite the advances under START, he said, there will still be 13,000 nuclear weapons in the year 2003, while NATO expansion plans threaten previous arms control agreements with Russia.

The Canadian government representative added that he was also disturbed by an apparent lack of unanimity among the judges of the World Court and the participants at the Ottawa meeting. He questioned whether Ambassador Roche's summary was representative of the views of the group. He also referred to Prof. Le Bouthillier's quote from the Court decision -- the phrase, "neither a red light nor a green light" -- to suggest that the Court was ambiguous in its ruling.

Prof. Le Bouthillier clarified that the remark, made by one of the judges, referred to a specific legal argument, and that the judge was adamant about the illegality of nuclear weapons. Several delegates pointed out that the Court had ruled unanimously on some key questions, notably the need for the use of nuclear weapons to conform to humanitarian law, and the legal obligation to negotiate in good faith for comprehensive nuclear disarmament.

In response to the suggestion that Ambassador Roche's summary did not reflect the opinion of the meeting, there were no words of dissent when participants were asked if they disagreed with any of the points Ambassador Roche had made.

A participant asked if Prof. Keating and Ambassador Roche believed that Canada should get out of NATO. Prof. Keating replied that although he was worried by NATO policy, he believed that leaving the alliance would diminish Canada's stature and impair its ability to use its influence in other areas, such as landmines. "We could make a principled stand and get out of NATO, but would it be worth it?" he asked.

Ambassador Roche took a different approach. Although he said he does not favour leaving NATO at this time, he added that "if at some point -- after re-examination -- NATO affirms its position, it becomes a question of conscience, where we either follow international law or the policy of NATO."

Responding to a remark about the gulf between NATO's public relations image and its