Mr. Polanyi was disturbed by an argument, made by US officials, which was taking hold in Canada: namely, that SDI was a necessary response to Soviet research into strategic defence. He cited an article in the Ottawa Citizen which claimed that the Soviet Union had spent as much on strategic defence as on offensive weaponry. To support this argument, the article had said that Moscow had the only operational ABM system. Polanyi noted that the Soviet ABM system around Moscow was "virtually useless", and the same could be said of their anti-satellite system. The article went on to say that the Soviet Union had made 100 space launches last year, of which 80 were military. Professor Polanyi reminded conference participants that the United States simply did not need to make as many launches to accomplish its goals. These arguments were politically motivated, said Professor Polanyi, and people with technical background should use their expertise to counter them.

Alton Frye echoed comments made earlier by William Epstein and Denis Healey, to the effect that its allies could have an impact on the political debate within the United States. Frye argued that because Prime Minister Mulroney was seen as a kindred soul by President Reagan, he had a chance of influencing the latter. By way of example he pointed out that another "kindred soul", Margaret Thatcher, had managed to elicit a clarification from the Reagan Administration regarding the purpose of SDI, namely that its goal was to enhance deterrence rather than to escape from it. That demand had had an impact on subsequent US statements about SDI.

Dr. Stuart Smith, of the Science Council of Canada, was struck by parallels between the military and the economic aspects of the Canadian-American relationship. As America moved towards protectionism, panic ensued in Canada and it found itself with no other option but to fuse its economy with that of the United States. In the same way, the closer the United States moved towards unilateralism in its defence policies and away from multilateralism, the more it would become necessary for Canada to fuse its policies with those of our "big neighbour to the South." In that case our influence would disappear. He warned that Canada's opportunity for changing the direction of US policy would be of brief duration.