

- We have no history of hegemony in the world, no history of imperialist practices. Consequently we have a more credible voice among Third World countries than most other developed countries.
- We are members of two extensive international networks, the Commonwealth and the Francophonie.
- We have the federal experience in Canada. We have the experience of working within an institutional framework between and among two different cultures. We are philosophically versed in the problems of that, and the principles involved, and so are exceptionally well-suited to provide leadership toward world federation.

The evolution of a common security world order may take several decades, perhaps several generations, but it is no less "realistic" as a foreign policy goal on that account. In the area of social goals, and especially in international affairs, there is an inclination to downgrade epic goals as *ipso facto* not realistic. We tend to dismiss as far-fetched policy objectives that look too far beyond about one term of office. We truncate our ambitions along with our idealism and our imagination, and never develop much of a sense of where we ultimately are heading. (This is a tendency of our Western democracies. Communist societies, for instance, are more practiced at setting millennial goals.)

Curiously, in the area of technology, idealism knows no such bounds. When it comes to epic technologies, we don't ask to have all the engineering problems worked out before we set off. We begin, hoping that science will discover solutions as we go along. Kennedy was hailed as a man of heroic vision when he committed the U.S. to landing a man on the moon within a decade. Many countries are working on fusion energy, a goal that will take half-a-century. Reagan's Strategic Defense Initiative is criticized as being theoretically impossible, but seldom as being too lofty a goal.

In proposing a common security world order as a policy objective, we are asking Canada to propose to the world a strategic defense initiative of social and political engineering. It would be immensely cheaper and less dangerous than a strategic defense initiative of the Star Wars variety. It promises, on reflection, to be much more feasible and achievable, not to mention permanent. And it would have many more spin-offs in terms of the good-will generated and the new institutions and relationships developed at every stage of the process.

Support for the U.N. has long been a leg of Canadian foreign policy, but it's been the weakest one. In ball-park figures, our support for the U.N. with all its agencies is currently about \$500 million per year. By comparison our budget for national defense is about \$10 billion. We are expending about 20 times more on the pursuit of security through institutions which threaten war (i.e., "deterrence") than on the institutions of peaceful international cooperation and international law which might eventually provide us with enduring security and ultimately spare us the annual expenditures on national defense. Even if we add the budget of CIDA to the U.N./common security side, the disparity is between 5 and 10 to 1. (These of course are only the budget figures. They over-look the vast hidden costs of the war system, as mentioned earlier.)

The first requirement of a common security policy must be a commitment to fund it. We believe that in principle Canada should be prepared to budget at least as much for common