

Canada should not endorse SDI because it will not work as an overwhelming defence system and, even as a modest defence, it will escalate the arms race.

He added that SDI undercuts treaties and arms control negotiations in Geneva. SDI would lead to the abandonment of arms control and to argue that SDI would be good for arms reduction would be "to put the cart before the horse".

Toronto, July 25 and 26, 1985

"Only game in town"

Conference of Defence Associations (Lt.-Col. Irvine Mathieson, senior vice-chairman) advocated participation by Canada in SDI research. The Association's conference described this as a "unique" opportunity for Canada and its NATO allies to become involved in the research and decision-making process as outlined by the United States. Canada's future security might well depend on it. In any event, the U.S. was going ahead with SDI and Canada could not afford to remain detached.

The defence conference spokesperson said new methods had to be found to neutralize the Soviet missile strike force -- and the "only game in town" was the development of a ballistic missile defence program such as SDI.

A reliable defence system would enhance deterrence and hence alliance security. Moreover, a ballistic missile defence program could result in a huge reduction in production and deployment of offensive missiles. This in turn could open the door to serious negotiation for large reductions in offensive weapons.

The conference noted that Canadian participation in the SDI program would ensure further development of Canada's high tech