

clarify its political and strategic implications for both NATO and North American defence.

Mr. Halstead said Canada's response to the U.S. invitation to participate in SDI research should include two main elements: conditional support for normal research pending clarification of what development program is to follow; and second, provision for alliance examination of the longer-term implications of ballistic missile defence for NATO strategy.

The CIIA warned that unless the process set in train by the SDI program is wisely managed, it may well place disruptive strains on NATO. No outcome -- technical, financial or operational -- would be reckoned a success if the cost were alliance solidarity.

Canada, the Institute felt, should encourage creation of a NATO consultative committee on SDI to share in influencing eventual decisions about its development and deployment.

NATO consultations proposed

The Council of Canadians (Mel Hurtig and others) urged Canada to decline the U.S. invitation to participate in SDI research.

The Council also recommended early consultations within the NATO framework to evolve agreed limits to the American program; reaffirmation of strong Canadian support for the ABM treaty; no Canadian government financial or other support for Canadian firms bidding on SDI contracts.

The Council suggested SDI would almost certainly require deployment of ballistic missile defence sensors and interceptors on Canadian territory. Any deployment of an SDI system would