

recognized that the developing countries needed to move toward self-sufficiency in food production and Canada was urged to assist in this process. It was suggested that the world would have to learn to "live with one another, not off one another." It was believed that Canada had a significant role to play in promoting policies -- domestically and internationally -- and Canada was urged to resist U.S. tendencies to undermine the U.N. and its agencies and instead foster such a situation which would strengthen and reinforce global agencies such as the GATT and the U.N.

There was some concern expressed about Canada's own military spending as well as its involvement in defence industries and arms exports. Whilst some considered Canada's defence spending (2.2% of GNP) to be excessive, others noted that, in the absence of true collective security as envisaged in the U.N. Charter, the primary goal of states would continue to be survival, security and sovereignty -- these necessitated defence spending of some magnitude. It was further stressed that "no state can be neutral when it comes to its own independence." Some considered Canada's international credibility to be diminished because of its defence spending and arms exports. Others believed such expenditure to be necessary and, in fact, rather modest in the global context.

Some were concerned about the apparent "militarisation" of the Canadian economy as seen in the recent Litton decision and as was perceived as ongoing in the case of uranium exports. As well as being considered inappropriate models of economic development for Canada, they were also considered to be symptomatic of a Canadian foreign and economy policy which was "entirely submissive to U.S. policy." In this context the question of free trade was raised, with some expressing deep concern that such an arrangement would "transfer Canada's sovereignty" to U.S. political and economic managers. It was suggested that this would draw Canada into closer involvement with the U.S. military-industrial complex.

Many expressed concern over Canada's apparent lack of independence in foreign policy decisions. The Government's support of U.S. actions in Libya was seen as but one of many manifestations of Canada's willingness to compromise its traditional policies in order to support the U.S. It was suggested that, whilst Canada had an excellent international reputation and record, this was being steadily eroded by recent foreign policy decisions which appeared to place Canada more firmly in a defence-focussed, U.S. camp. It was