

late the economy and create jobs. Those who were dead set against this type of spending were quick to rebut those comments, arguing that stimulus and employment would result equally well from investment in consumer goods manufacturing or any other more peaceful endeavour.

The notion of the Canadian Armed Forces being a source of national pride did not strike a responsive chord for most participants. While people were quick to say that there was a sense of pride in our contribution to Allied efforts in the Second World War they seemed to feel that in a country like Canada a very strong and highly visible armed force was a symbol of pride that was perhaps too expensive and possibly not reflective of the generally peaceable nature of the country and its peoples.

Interestingly, many people spoke of Canada's image as being one of a "neutral" country, an idea they were quite comfortable with. When pressed, they recognized that Canada is not neutral in the sense of being non-aligned but felt that our general approach to international tensions, and outbreaks of hostilities was to distance ourselves from the heat of the conflict and avoid "taking sides" wherever feasible. The motivating attitude in alluding to this "neutrality" appeared to be the contrast which many saw with the more vocal positions taken by the United States.

In the area of arms control, most people were prepared to acknowledge that Canada could do little to directly influence events, but had a moral responsibility to continue efforts aimed at achieving arms control, even if the only action was in the form of a contribution to the ongoing debate.