

VII. CANADIAN AND INTERNATIONAL SECURITY

There was a strong consensus among the groups that the Canadian Armed Forces are seriously underequipped and generally inadequate. This consensus, however, did not translate into a unanimous demand that this problem be solved through a major effort to re-equip and update. While most people seemed to feel that improvements should be made, a significant minority argued that spending money on arms and equipment was wasteful and only contributed to the increasing threat of war.

This latter response generally seemed more prevalent among women and in Vancouver. Some others who opposed major expenditures, particularly in Toronto, argued that since the Americans will find it in their interest to defend Canada, "why not let them spend their money," rather than spend our own. The majority view nevertheless was that mutual security arrangements such as NATO and NORAD were very much in Canada's interests and that our commitments must be honoured.

Surprisingly though, there was relatively little awareness of criticisms leveled at Canada (by NATO allies) over its perceived declining commitment of resources, and of course still less understanding of what type of specific commitments Canada has made other than participation in any war involving NATO countries.

Participants seemed convinced that Canada could never adequately defend herself without enormous help from the United States, and appeared to see no logic in trying to reach a point where such help was not needed. Most recognized immediately the prohibitive costs that would entail. Nevertheless, it should be noted that there was a clear perception in the minds of many that military procurement and expansion was an effective way to stimu-