

teaching post, as his anti-Semitic views harmed the students in his classroom. Even in the *Amselem* and *Multani* decisions, religious freedom was not absolute, and factors relating to safety and security were considered. Mr. Singh Multani had already agreed to certain conditions in being allowed to wear his kirpan, such as ensuring that it was worn under his clothes, carried in a wooden rather than a metal sheath, and was securely wrapped and sewn to prevent it from falling out or being taken by another student. The co-owners in the *Amselem* case had undertaken to set up their succahs in such a way that they would not block doors, obstruct fire lanes or otherwise pose a threat to safety or security.

In *Multani*, the Supreme Court of Canada assigned an important role to schools in the transmission of Charter values. It stated that if the school in question were to completely ban kirpans, it would — and I quote:

. . . stifle the promotion of values such as multiculturalism, diversity, and the development of an educational culture respectful of the rights of others.

**The Hon. the Speaker *pro tempore*:** Honourable senator, are you asking for more time?

**Senator Cools:** Agreed.

**Senator Comeau:** Five minutes.

**Senator Cools:** As much as he needs!

**Senator Corbin:** Same rights!

**Senator Comeau:** The Charter of Rights and Freedoms?

**Senator Kinsella:** Honourable senators, as stated in the February 2007 report of the Special Senate Committee on the Anti-Terrorism Act, the targeting of individuals based on race, religion or ethnicity does not enhance Canada's anti-terrorism goals; rather, it leads to the deterioration of government-community relationships. If certain communities believe they are unfairly targeted by our criminal laws, they may be less likely to interact with police and security intelligence agencies in order to share information regarding actual terrorism.

All of this is to say that a society that promotes religious freedom to the greatest extent possible — that is, provided that the exercise of an individual's freedom does not harm others — is likely to be a safe and secure society. If, for example, succahs are seen annually by neighbours as part of a religious festival or kirpans are valued as a religious symbol by schools and inevitably students, familiarity and respect will replace fear and mistrust — the latter being at the root of many threats to our safety and security. By accommodating and promoting religious diversity, curtailing intolerant religious speech where it harms others and ensuring that our laws do not disproportionately target members of certain religious groups, Canadian society is able to protect both religious freedom and collective security. Given 25 years of the Charter, our courts, our legislators and our policy-makers have the capacity and responsibility to reconcile valid competing human rights claims in order to recognize each of them as fully possible.

Honourable senators, I am confident that Canada and Canadians, with the support of distinguished parliamentarians such as all present in this chamber, will continue to grow our freedom.

**Hon. Anne C. Cools:** I should like to ask Senator Kinsella a question, if I may. It is more than a question. I want to acknowledge —

**The Hon. the Speaker *pro tempore*:** The table indicates that Senator Kinsella has time for one question.

**Senator Cools:** This was more in line of an expression of appreciation, in that Senator Kinsella is one of the last members of this place who played an active role around the events in 1982 in repatriation and in the Charter. I thought I should draw that to the attention of honourable senators and to thank Senator Kinsella for his contribution in that period of time.

On motion of Senator Joyal, debate adjourned.

• (1730)

### CONTRIBUTIONS OF THE HONOURABLE HOWARD CHARLES GREEN TO CANADIAN PUBLIC LIFE

INQUIRY—DEBATE CONTINUED

On the Order:

Resuming debate on the inquiry of the Honourable Senator Murray, P.C., calling the attention of the Senate to issues concerning the faithful and exemplary service to Canada, during his entire adult lifetime, of the late Honourable Howard Charles Green of British Columbia.  
—(Honourable Senator Stratton)

**Hon. Terry Stratton:** Honourable senators, this inquiry has been standing in my name for some time. I was reminded by Senator Murray today that it is day 15, and I would like to speak to it. Therefore, with the permission of the chamber, I would like to speak to it in the next couple of days.

**The Hon. the Speaker *pro tempore*:** Is it your pleasure, honourable senators, to adopt the motion?

Motion agreed to.

### THE SENATE

#### MOTION URGING GOVERNMENT TO TAKE LEADING ROLE IN REINVIGORATING NUCLEAR DISARMAMENT—DEBATE ADJOURNED

**Hon. Roméo Antonius Dallaire,** pursuant to notice of March 29, 2007, moved:

That the Senate call on the Government of Canada to take a leading role in the reinvigoration of the urgent matter of nuclear disarmament in accordance with the *Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty* at the Preparatory Committee Meetings scheduled to convene April 30 to May 11, 2007 in Vienna which act as a prelude to the next Treaty Review Conference in 2010; and

That the Senate urge the Government of Canada to take a global leadership role in the campaign of eradicating the dire threat to humanity posed by nuclear weapons.

He said: Honourable senators, may I first, before introducing the subject, recognize that in the gallery we still have our ex-colleague Senator Roche and representatives of non-governmental organizations who are involved in the efforts to eliminate the use of nuclear weapons. They have demonstrated an enormous amount of patience, and I applaud them and thank them for staying on and demonstrating that perseverance as we have an opportunity to discuss and present this motion.

I present this motion in regard to non-nuclear proliferation and, ultimately, the eradication of the use of nuclear weapons. Today is the twenty-fifth anniversary of the Charter of Rights and Freedoms, and I consider the presence and use of nuclear weapons to be an aberration of human rights. It is also the fiftieth anniversary of the Pugwash movement to control and, ultimately, eradicate the use of nuclear weapons, so it is in that atmosphere that I would like to present this motion.

Nuclear weapons are the most extreme, massive violation of human rights imaginable. These weapons of mass destruction are immoral, indiscriminate, and they violate the right of every human being to basic peace and security.

In its advisory opinion in 1996, the International Court of Justice ruled unanimously that the threat or use of nuclear weapons “would generally be contrary” to humanitarian and other international law regulating the conduct of warfare and that states have a legal obligation to disarm.

Only nuclear weapons can kill hundreds of millions of people in a few hours and potentially bring about the end of life on our planet, and we discussed Kyoto. Contrary to popular propaganda, it is the nature of these weapons themselves that is evil and not certain peoples who may acquire them. Any possession of weapons designed to cause the massive annihilation of human beings is wrong and cannot be made right by specious arguments regarding deterrence. We have reached the point where no single state can operate alone; we must work together to create global security and to prevent global destruction.

The public of Canada and around the world are grossly uninformed as to the dire situation we all face, which has been compared to being asleep at the controls of a fast moving aircraft that is running rapidly out of fuel. Each day we are threatened with 27,000 nuclear weapons; approximately 2,500 of these are capable of being fired in less than 30 minutes. The number of nuclear-capable states is in danger of increasing well beyond eight or nine, and the potential exists for many regional nuclear arms races.

More than 30 countries, including Canada, are members of alliances that rely on nuclear weapons as part of their security.

The North Korean nuclear test of October 9, 2006, uncertainty concerning Iran’s nuclear program, proposed modernization of nuclear weapons at extensive costs and the threat of nuclear terrorism pose new security challenges to us all.

The nuclear non-proliferation regime created in 1970 is in danger due to the following: a failed 2005 review conference — they are held every five years; states that possess nuclear weapons or who refuse to sign the treaty; the 2006 United States-India

nuclear deal, which permits India to produce more nuclear weapons; and, a denial by nuclear weapons states to honour their legal obligations to reduce and eliminate their nuclear arsenals, essentially, to disarm in the nuclear sense. We are poised precariously on the precipice of a frightening cascade of nuclear weapons proliferation.

At the end of January this year, the bulletin of the atomic scientists advanced the hand of its doomsday clock to five minutes to nuclear midnight due to the increased potential of accidental or intentional nuclear exchange. Leading scientists around the globe agree that a nuclear incident is inevitable through deliberate acts or accident. We have narrowly escaped nuclear Holocaust on several occasions due to computer or human error in the past, and trust me when I state that.

Bipartisan, distinguished American cold warriors such as Mr. Schultz, Mr. Perry, Mr. Kissinger and even Mr. Nunn have recently made 180-degree turns and now cry out against the myth of nuclear deterrence and plead for abolition of “the world’s most suicidal, genocidal and ecocidal weapons” systems. The moral weight of the Nobel Peace Laureates has been applied recently to an international appeal calling for the reduction of nuclear threat. The warning signs are all there.

• (1730)

[*Translation*]

The world has finally become aware of the threat humans pose to the environment. There are inherent links between the environment and nuclear weapons. Without global security, it is simply impossible to achieve the cooperation that must exist between countries to remedy environmental problems. Scientists agree that a single, isolated nuclear accident could cause irreversible damage to our already fragile climate. If we do not take action immediately, it may become impossible to correct environmental problems. The world must immediately recognize the threat that nuclear weapons pose to the survival of humanity, and to what extent the environment could be permanently destroyed by the use of these weapons. What is more, these weapons are not free.

Since the end of the Cold War, some \$12 billion has been spent on developing technology that is powerful enough to blow up our planet several times over. This disgraceful and immoral waste of global resources continues to escalate today. Countries that already have nuclear weapons want to modernize them. To what end? Consider how these funds could be used to promote peace and security around the world, if only they were used to feed, educate, care for and create jobs for the less fortunate.

What steps should we be taking? What tools do we have at our disposal? A nuclear non-proliferation treaty — the last, best hope the world has of eliminating the nuclear nightmare — is within reach. The Non-Proliferation Treaty is the most powerful international treaty. In October 2006, the UN General Assembly voted 168 to 4 in favour of abolishing nuclear weapons.

Canada must take a leadership role at the Non-Proliferation Treaty preparatory committee meetings to be held in Vienna from April 30 to May 11, in order to champion not proliferation, but eradication, which is covered by this treaty.

[ Senator Dallaire ]

Recently, attention has focussed on the threat of proliferation, to the point where people have forgotten the crucial issue of nuclear disarmament. In the treaty, these two issues are inextricably linked. States that do not possess nuclear weapons have agreed not to acquire any, although they still have the right to use peaceful, civilian applications of nuclear technology such as nuclear energy and medicine, whereas states that do possess nuclear weapons have agreed to eliminate their nuclear arsenal. Nevertheless, we are modernizing our nuclear weapons.

Non-proliferation requires disarmament. We have to continue to exert pressure so that states possessing nuclear weapons comply with both aspects of the treaty and, in due course, keep the promise they made more than 35 years ago to disarm. Canada must urge all the other non-nuclear-weapon states to adopt and implement the additional protocol of the International Atomic Energy Agency, which today constitutes the benchmark for monitoring compliance with the treaty.

Inspections must be carried out, and states that violate the terms of the treaty must be condemned and held to account before the international community. I suggest that we must negotiate the abolition of nuclear weapons by means of a convention like the treaties against land mines and chemical and biological weapons. The treaty simply does not go far enough. It lacks the teeth to enforce the basic expression of our human right to security: disarmament and the destruction of nuclear weapons. It does not prohibit outright the possession of nuclear weapons and makes no reference to their legality. This is not covered in the treaty.

Most member states of the United Nations are calling for immediate negotiations on a convention on nuclear weapons that would ban the development, production, testing, deployment, stockpiling, transfer, threat and even the ultimate use of nuclear weapons. No physical or financial obstacle is preventing us, within a decade or less, from freeing the world from the man-made scourge of nuclear weapons. The only things lacking are moral leadership and political will.

Why does Canada, as a middle power that does not have any nuclear weapons, not take this leadership role and initiate the process to abolish and eliminate these nuclear weapons? In my opinion, we should intensify our efforts to ensure the coming into force of the Comprehensive Nuclear Test Ban Treaty and thereby prevent the proliferation of nuclear weapons and a possible arms race. Some 177 countries have signed the treaty, but ten more must ratify it for it to come into force. A treaty banning the production of fissile material for the purposes of weapons production must be negotiated without delay.

Have we really allowed the situation between the United States and India to get to a point where these two countries have ultimately agreed to allow India to increase its stockpile of nuclear weapons and, in doing so, create an arms race in another area of the world that is extremely sensitive to any sort of conflict?

We must intensify our campaign to decrease the alert level of the nuclear arsenal in the United States and Russia and to eliminate the option of launch-on-alert policies in nuclear war plans. This launch-on-alert option determines, in a matter of five minutes, whether the enemy threat of using nuclear weapons is legitimate or not. If the threat is legitimate and real, nuclear weapons are deployed before the enemy nuclear weapons can neutralize them.

We must also encourage all the nuclear powers to adopt non-use policies regarding non-nuclear-weapon States. Why is there such urgency when the cold war is over? Or is there another war we are unaware of and for which these nuclear stockpiles absolutely must be maintained and updated at a cost of billions of dollars?

Especially since the procurement policies of countries with nuclear weapons accommodate processes for creating new, sophisticated, more effective nuclear weapons, if we can look at it that way. It is brazen hypocrisy to ask other countries to give up their nuclear weapons and to forego purchasing others when these weapons are given greater prominence in one's own security policies. The modernization of nuclear weapons for offensive purposes is quite simply scandalous. It is just incredible that the five permanent members of the Security Council are major users and owners of nuclear weapons. They do not see that it would be useful to promote the treaty to eliminate the use of nuclear weapons and therefore these weapons continue to be improved.

We should stop supporting the nuclear policies of NATO, which are incompatible with our obligations under the Nuclear Non-proliferation Treaty. On the one hand, we are against nuclear weapons and we say so. On the other hand, we are a member of an organization with a treaty based on the availability of nuclear weapons. There is actually an intolerable contradiction between our commitments under the treaty and our membership in an alliance which gives such importance to nuclear weapons in its security policies.

• (1750)

In the post-cold war world, there is no longer any reason to state that nuclear weapons play a vital role within the alliance.

[English]

The nuclear disarmament field is not an easy one in which to work. There is an almost pathological reaction to such a horrific topic, which is, in fact, denial. It is this riddle that can only be overcome with the help of the brave people in the NGO community who have worked selflessly for countless hours, years and, in some cases, decades to save civilization from this weapon of self-destruction.

On behalf of all Canadians, I salute Senator Roche and his colleagues for their ongoing work and for making us aware of the fact that we are living with that threat not only to our security but also to our fundamental ability to live on this planet, for the planet itself is at risk.

What is the way ahead? There is an exciting international campaign underway this month to promote global awareness of the dire threat to humanity by nuclear weapons. I am a proud endorser of the international campaign to abolish nuclear weapons, and I am excited at working with International Physicians for the Prevention of Nuclear War and Mayors for Peace in their attempt to educate a new generation of people about the true nature of nuclear weapons.

I firmly believe that Canada's youth are best suited to be the leading advocates of change. We need to demonstrate that a nuclear weapons-free world is not only within our grasp but is also absolutely essential for our common survival. Nuclear weapons are not an essential requirement of security in this era.

The Canadian launch of ICANw will be announced on April 30. Their website, [www.icanw.org](http://www.icanw.org), indicates a number of ways that each and every Canadian can participate to make a real difference.

Honourable senators, let me remind you of a bit of history and bring you to the current time with Pugwash, a great little fishing town in Nova Scotia. The Pugwash Conferences on Sciences and World Affairs was founded 50 years ago at the height of the Cold War. In 1957, Canadian industrialist Cyrus Eaton, inspired by the 1955 manifesto of Albert Einstein and Bertrand Russell, brought scientists from East and West together to his summer home in the village of Pugwash, Nova Scotia.

In 1995, the Pugwash movement and its founder, Sir Joseph Rotblat, were awarded the Nobel Peace Prize for their significant contributions toward the goal of nuclear disarmament.

From July 5 to 7 this summer, the Pugwash Peace Exchange, the Canadian Pugwash Group and the Pugwash Park Commission are celebrating the importance of this piece of Canadian history at Thinker's Lodge in Pugwash, Nova Scotia. They are celebrating the fiftieth anniversary of the efforts to move this world to a sane plane of nuclear disarmament.

The Middle Powers Initiative, MPI, chaired by Senator Douglas Roche, a former Canadian disarmament ambassador, is a key group of non-governmental organizations that works with middle power governments — of which we are not an insignificant one — to encourage nuclear weapons states to disarm. This July, MPI and Pugwash are co-sponsoring an international conference on revitalizing nuclear disarmament. Would it not be interesting to bring the 1960s “ban the bomb” effort into the modern era?

The Pugwash Peace Exchange is establishing an international peace centre on this hallowed Canadian ground where people of all ages, from all walks of life, and from all corners of the world can come to learn about peace and how they can make a difference. I am very proud to be the honorary patron of this organization, and I am excited to be taking part in these festivities.

To conclude, at the heart of this matter is the frank realization that we must invent a new kind of global security, one not based on erroneous concepts of deterrence which only serve to augment our mutual lack of security. Increasingly, our individual actions have global consequences and only a global solution can possibly extricate us from this horrible predicament of having the ability to literally eliminate ourselves.

In the words of Martin Luther King:

I refuse to accept the cynical notion that nation after nation must spiral down a militaristic stairway into the hell of nuclear annihilation.

We must all learn to live together as brothers or perish together as fools.

I have seen with my own eyes genocide by machete. Although the machete would certainly not be perceived as a weapon of mass destruction, in 100 days it was able to kill 800,000 people. Imagine

what nuclear genocide would look like. Any peace based upon the threat of genocide is an immoral bastardization of the concept of peace.

Honourable senators, we have reached a fork in the road of humanity. One path leads to certain apocalypse, the other to a peaceful cooperative world. Let Canada, this leading middle power, blaze the trail down the road of a sustainable future by respecting human rights and doing all in our power to eliminate, to eradicate, to destroy nuclear weapons.

I am not an alarmist. I am a soldier, conscious of the capabilities and the vulnerabilities of those systems. This is the number one threat to the future of mankind. In the past, my warnings have fallen on deaf ears, with tragic results in Africa. I implore each and every person who hears my words today to take them to heart and to learn more, and to take action on the fact that we are more vulnerable to self-destruction in this era than we were in an era that we considered very dangerous, that is, the Cold War.

One advantage of our technological age is that people can make their political voices heard and governments have no choice but to listen or fall. Significant expressions of public concern, both in quality and quantity, can spur governments to increase funding and take actions in response. Our time is running out. The nuclear arms race can have no winner but will lead to the loss of all that we cherish. The very future of our children, grandchildren and the not-yet-born swings in the balance. Surely our destructive capability will not overcome our desire to live, love and prosper. Disarmament is the litmus test of our humanity. We cannot afford to fail in this era. We must not fail, for we are committing genocide upon ourselves.

**Hon. Lowell Murray:** Honourable senators, we are almost at six o'clock. I will take the occasion to make one or two brief preliminary remarks, after which, with your indulgence, I shall propose the adjournment of the debate and return to it on another day.

Let me join with Senator Dallaire in greeting our old friend Senator Doug Roche. Senator Roche served through five Parliaments, I believe, as an elected member of the House of Commons and through several Parliaments here in the Senate. Between times he was, as Senator Dallaire noted, Canada's ambassador for disarmament, in which capacity his passionate commitment and advocacy at home and abroad to the cause of nuclear disarmament is well remembered and well respected and appreciated.

I want to thank Senator Dallaire for bringing this motion forward. It could not be more timely. This is a cause that desperately needs now a strong injection of new intellectual and political energy, and I will argue that there is a terrific opportunity and responsibility for Canada, and for the present government of Canada in the present circumstances, to take the leadership on this matter, if it chooses to do so.

• (1800)

We have moved on from the days when we had a Cold War standoff between the two superpowers with the doctrine of mutually assured destruction. There was some strategic coherence or rationale to that doctrine, but as we were reminded by the

former cabinet secretaries, Kissinger, Schultz and Perry, and former Senator Nunn in the declaration to which Senator Dallaire referred, that doctrine is obsolete and we are now perhaps arguably in a situation far more dangerous than we knew even during the Cold War.

I do not have the military or defence policy background of Senator Dallaire, but I will argue the case for an injection of new energy and especially of political will in this country and elsewhere, for it has been political in the past. Any reading of history tells us that political will has been the prime contributing

factor whenever we have been able to make progress in this world on arms control and disarmament.

With those few remarks, honourable senators, and with your indulgence, I will propose the adjournment of the debate.

On motion of Senator Murray, debate adjourned.

The Senate adjourned until Wednesday, April 18, 2007, at 1:30 p.m.

---

[Translation]

Having disposed of the various points raised in Senator Cools' point of order, I wish to consider the two issues raised by Senator Murray. First, he questioned the manner in which Senator Cools called the Senate's attention to her concerns. In Senator Murray's opinion, it appeared to him that Senator Cools followed a novel approach whereby she debated the merits of the motion, before signalling that she objected to its procedural acceptability. The Senator then concluded by again debating the subject of the motion.

In my reading of the *Debates*, I will accept that Senator Cools' concluding remarks may have strayed back into the merits of the motion, but I will also accept her contention that they did so in the context of her point of order. Nonetheless, Senator Murray's point is logical: any honourable senator, being of the opinion that an item on the Order Paper is not procedurally correct, should ask that the matter be resolved first, before entering into debate on the merits of the motion. I would, therefore, ask Honourable senators to bear this in mind in the future.

[English]

The second matter raised by Senator Murray was whether a committee such as the Human Rights Committee needs an order of reference in order to consider a matter as is put forward in the motion. In his comments, Senator Murray noted that only two committees are explicitly authorized to undertake work of their own volition — the Rules Committee and the Committee on Internal Economy, Budgets and Administration. Despite this limitation, Senator Murray noted that "some committees allow themselves a great deal of latitude in discussing and reporting on matters within their mandate without a specific order of reference." For the record, I should like to remind senators that the *Rules of the Senate* also authorize the Committee on Conflict of Interest for Senators to initiate work within its areas of responsibility.

The *Rules of the Senate* are clear that it is only these three committees that can initiate consideration of matters that fall within the mandate spelled out in the rules. All other committees must have their matters referred to them by the Senate.

There is no question that there is a wide range in the specificity of orders of reference given to committees. As noted by Senator Murray, some orders of reference are very broad and give committees a great deal of latitude, while others are more narrowly focused.

For example, the Foreign Affairs Committee has an order of reference authorizing it to "examine such issues as may arise from time to time relating to foreign relations generally" — a very broad order of reference. Others, such as the order of reference to the Transport and Communications Committee to examine and report on the objectives, operation and governance of the Canadian Television Fund, are more specific.

[Translation]

In his intervention, Senator Murray asked me to reflect on "the extent to which the Senate wishes to keep its standing committees on a short leash." While the Senator raises an interesting issue, it is not a matter for me, as Speaker, to decide. Rather, it is a matter only the Senate can decide when it considers proposed orders of reference.

[The Hon. the Speaker]

[English]

In conclusion, debate on the motion may continue, but amendments relating to the reporting date and the name of the OSCE Parliamentary Assembly should be moved to correct it.

## THE SENATE

### MOTION URGING GOVERNMENT TO TAKE LEADING ROLE IN REINVIGORATING NUCLEAR DISARMAMENT—DEBATE CONTINUED

On the Order:

Resuming debate on the motion of the Honourable Senator Dallaire, seconded by the Honourable Senator Robichaud, P.C.:

That the Senate call on the Government of Canada to take a leading role in the reinvigoration of the urgent matter of nuclear disarmament in accordance with the *Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty* at the Preparatory Committee Meetings scheduled to convene April 30 to May 11, 2007 in Vienna which act as a prelude to the next Treaty Review Conference in 2010; and

That the Senate urge the Government of Canada to take a global leadership role in the campaign of eradicating the dire threat to humanity posed by nuclear weapons.  
—(Honourable Senator Murray, P.C.)

**Hon. Lowell Murray:** Honourable senators, I shall take up where I left off on April 17. I thank Senator Dallaire, whose motion provides the occasion for us to reflect on recent circumstances that have brought us closer to nuclear destruction, not farther away from it. The increased threat is graphically illustrated, as Senator Dallaire reminded us, by the famous doomsday clock, which the atomic scientists advanced from 12 minutes to nuclear midnight, where it stood a while ago, to 7 minutes, and then to 5 minutes in January of this year. The question that demands the attention of all who have political responsibility of any kind is how to turn the hands of that metaphorical clock back by changing the dangerous reality it represents.

Senator Dallaire told us that the nuclear non-proliferation regime established in 1970 is in danger. Action and inaction by signatories and non-signatories have eroded and weakened it. The review conference of 2005 failed. The next such review is scheduled for 2010. Meanwhile, the opportunity to reverse course, to restore the effectiveness and credibility of that treaty, comes next month at preparatory committee meetings in Vienna. I trust Canada will spare no effort to try to revive the process and save the treaty from a descent into irrelevance.

Senator Dallaire reminded us that, in the treaty, the issue of non-proliferation — non-nuclear countries obtaining nuclear weapons — is inextricably linked to that of nuclear disarmament, disarmament by states that presently have nuclear weapons. That element, disarmament, has waxed and waned over the years, but it seems to have achieved renewed prominence in the declaration made last January by the former United States cabinet secretaries George Shultz, Henry Kissinger and William Perry, with former senator Sam Nunn. Those U.S. statesmen

recommended a series of steps that need to be taken — “concrete stages,” they called them — to achieve the promise of the non-proliferation treaty. However, they acknowledge that none of these steps by themselves is adequate to the present danger. About 20 years ago, President Reagan and the Soviet Union’s Mr. Gorbachev had come to Reykjavik with the goal of eliminating nuclear weapons altogether. They had not succeeded; however, as the statement recalls, their vision “shocked experts in the doctrine of nuclear deterrence but galvanized the hopes of people around the world.” I believe I counted, in a three-page statement, eight times that Secretary Schultz and the others came back to this objective — “a world without nuclear weapons.”

• (1540)

I do not believe this was mere rhetoric on their part, nor does one have to read between the lines of their statement to understand why the ultimate objective of complete nuclear disarmament has now become much more immediate and pressing in their minds.

First, as they acknowledge, the fitful progress towards disarmament has left non-nuclear weapon states “increasingly sceptical” of the sincerity of the nuclear powers. I would add that it has probably made some of those non-nuclear states less hesitant to try to achieve their own strategic goals by going nuclear.

Second, when they refer to the Cold War deterrent strategy, they doubt whether the old Soviet-American “mutually assured destruction” factor can be replicated with an increasing number of potential nuclear enemies around the world without, as they say, “dramatically increasing the risk that nuclear weapons will be used.”

Third, they point out those new nuclear states “do not have the benefits of years of step-by-step safeguards put into effect during the Cold War to prevent nuclear accidents, misjudgments or unauthorized launches.” These former officials would know more than most of us about the false warnings and the dangerous incidents that, as Senator Dallaire said, have brought us so close to nuclear holocaust when the standoff essentially involved only two nations.

Fourth, non-state terrorist groups that might acquire nuclear weaponry “are conceptually outside the bounds of a deterrent strategy.”

The conclusion is that the various intermediate stages along the road, while necessary, are inadequate. We must be focused on the purpose and the objective — elimination of nuclear weapons.

It should also be clear to all of us that just as the danger is no longer primarily that of nuclear war between two superpowers, the remedy will not be found only in superpower negotiations. The leadership of the United States is, of course, vital. The leadership by example, and not just by resolution, of the five permanent members of the United Nations Security Council, all of whom are nuclear weapon states, will be indispensable. However, as even the former U.S. officials recognize, it will take a worldwide consensus to achieve our objective. This is where Canada comes in. There is an opportunity and a

responsibility for Canada to take the lead in rescuing a process that is now bogged down.

As honourable senators know, we were the first nuclear-capable state to decide not to develop our nuclear weapons capacity, and we were the first to divest ourselves of the nuclear weapons we had acquired from the U.S. Meanwhile, in the late 1950s and early 1960s, the late Honourable Howard Green placed arms control and disarmament at the centre of Canadian policy for the first time.

Mr. Green is properly remembered for his political leadership on the issue. Less conspicuous in the public media, now as then, was the research capacity and the technical expertise quickly assembled in our foreign service and defence establishment, initially under General E.L.M. Burns as Disarmament Advisor to the Canadian Government. These experts provided the technical and institutional support and much intellectual energy, not just for their own minister and government, but also for the multilateral negotiations at the official and political levels where the other countries acknowledged and often deferred to their leadership.

The process that is limping into Vienna at the end of this month needs a real injection of both political and intellectual energy if it is to survive. I believe Canada is well placed to take the lead and not just because of our reputation. Surely, we could assemble the expertise needed in the present circumstances — some of it is probably to be found within the government now — and provide real value-added at the technical and official levels in the multilateral negotiations that must take place.

The essential element, of course, is political leadership, and here the timing is almost perfect for the present government. They have refurbished Canada’s relationship with the United States; they are modernizing and rebuilding our Armed Forces. All that is to their credit. At some considerable political risk to themselves and at deadly risk to our serving soldiers, they have committed Canada to the NATO mission in Afghanistan. This is a government that can credibly take the lead in a renewed and concerted international effort to reduce reliance on nuclear weapons and eliminate them as a threat altogether. I suspect that much of the world community going into Vienna is waiting for someone to take the lead, and that Canada will not lack for allies, great and small, if our government stepped forward.

Nor will they lack support in Parliament and in the country. Both Houses of Parliament are represented in the Canadian chapter of the International Parliamentary Network for Nuclear Disarmament, which I commend to honourable senators as a very good forum for discussion and which I found to be also an excellent source of timely information on these issues.

[Translation]

I am convinced that a new government initiative to resuscitate the international nuclear disarmament process would be very welcomed in Canada.

Canadians know that the threat of nuclear destruction has increased in recent years, as nuclear technology has become more accessible throughout the world, nuclear ambition more prevalent among nations and security systems more diffused and therefore less effective.

Statesmen and experts who are concerned about the current danger contend that nothing less than a world-wide consensus will be required to overcome that threat. It is unthinkable that, in 2007, the international community could fail as it did at the 2005 conference. The multilateral negotiations that will lead to the 2010 conference are critical. The process is in need — and very urgently so — of a new momentum. Under these circumstances, where will the required leadership come from, if not from Canada?

Canada has proven itself time and again as a NATO member and a NORAD partner. The current government — and this is to its credit — is renewing and strengthening Canada's commitment under these alliances. Disarmament is just as important to Canadians, and the international situation provides a major opportunity to our country. While there is no consensus at the international negotiating table, such a consensus is very present among Canadians. It is up to the government to take the necessary initiative.

**The Hon. the Speaker *pro tempore*:** Would Senator Murray entertain a question?

**Senator Murray:** Of course.

**Hon. Roméo Antonius Dallaire:** I would like to thank the senator for this very eloquent and well documented speech. As Senator Murray said, Canada is a country that has disposed of its nuclear weapons. However, as a NATO member, we have maintained the ability to deliver these systems through the use of aircraft, missiles, artillery, this even during the seventies. So, when it comes to nuclear weapons, the issue is one of ethics, and perhaps even of a two-prong policy.

• (1550)

[*English*]

Instead of modernizing the nuclear arms fleets, if we start to eliminate them, the need for a missile defence system would go by the wayside; there would be no nuclear weapons or nuclear delivery systems.

Recently, our NATO ally, the U.K., signed a deal to spend \$40 billion over the next 20-odd years to upgrade its nuclear submarine capability and upgrade its Trident nuclear submarine capability.

Do you think that they know something that we do not if they feel that in this post-Cold War era they must do this upgrade? I could understand doing that type of upgrade for the circumpolar Arctic North; it might make sense for us to have nuclear powered submarines to travel under the ice. To upgrade nuclear delivery submarines to the new generation seems illogical. Are we going down the wrong road or are they smoking something we do not know about?

**The Hon. the Speaker *pro tempore*:** Honourable Senator Murray, before you answer the question, you will have to ask for more time.

Is it agreed, honourable senators?

[ Senator Murray ]

**Hon. David Tkachuk (Acting Deputy Leader of the Government):** Five minutes.

**The Hon. the Speaker *pro tempore*:** You have five minutes, Senator Murray.

**Senator Murray:** Honourable senators, the last thing I would want to do is to be unkind to the British, but I am aware of the intentions announced by their government on this matter.

To put it mildly, there is an inconsistency — and not only an inconsistency but a contradiction — between the commitment of most NATO members to the objective of nuclear disarmament, on the one hand, and their inclusion of nuclear capacity as part of their strategy, on the other.

I do not understand why the British are doing what they are doing. If I were really being unkind, I would say that it is something in the nature of a status symbol that they are seeking.

On motion of Senator Tardif, debate adjourned.

## POST-SECONDARY EDUCATION

### INQUIRY—DEBATE CONTINUED

On the Order:

Resuming debate on the inquiry of the Honourable Senator Tardif calling the attention of the Senate to questions concerning post-secondary education in Canada.  
—(*Honourable Senator Callbeck*)

**Hon. Catherine S. Callbeck:** Honourable senators, I rise today to speak on the inquiry of Senator Tardif regarding the state of post-secondary education in Canada.

First, I want to thank the honourable senator for initiating this inquiry on a subject that is also of great importance to me. I want to thank Senators Trenholme Counsell, Segal, Losier-Cool and Moore, who have spoken on this inquiry. Today, I would like to further that debate and discuss the issue of broadening access to post-secondary education.

Senator Tardif reminded us that we must aim higher than our current post-secondary attainment of 44 per cent if we are to compete on the global stage with countries such as the United States, India and China. Today, we are told that 73 per cent of new jobs in our knowledge-based economy will require post-secondary education. That means that three out of four new jobs will require post-secondary education. With Canada's post-secondary attainment rate for young Canadians aged 25-34 at only 53 per cent, that means that we have a gap of 20 per cent between our current post-secondary attainment rate in that age group and the post-secondary attainment rate.

If that is not enough, certainly other numbers should alarm us. Canada's population will shift in the next decade. By 2026, there will be 300,000 fewer young adults, which means that unless we increase participation substantially, the hallways of our colleges and universities will echo for lack of students and we will have gaps in our labour market. There will not be enough graduates to fill the high-skilled jobs created by the knowledge economy or left