

Many considerations will bear on future decisions in this area. One is whether our military assets enhance our influence on international peace and security issues to the maximum extent possible. Are there cost-effective ways of enhancing our military security and our international political influence? Peacekeeping is one way of doing so. Should we make it a greater Canadian priority? Are there other approaches we might take in support of our foreign policy objectives?

Enhancing our international influence is also important.

Another matter for consideration relates to doctrines, strategies, tactics and balance of forces. The military capabilities of East and West are in a constant state of evolution. There are new weapons and technologies in place on both sides and new approaches are contemplated. These changes merit careful examination.

New concepts of strategic defence raise important defence and arms control issues. At present, much about strategic defence remains hypothetical, and the defensive systems of both East and West are on the agenda for Soviet/American arms control negotiations. In addition, the United States is committed not to proceed beyond research (permitted under the ABM treaty) without discussion and negotiation. Since the Soviet Union has a research program of its own in this field and took up the option provided for in the ABM treaty to deploy a limited ABM system, it seems only prudent that the United States itself keep abreast of the feasibility of ballistic missile defence.

In the future, Canada may need to take decisions on some of the diverse and sometimes contradictory strategic, arms control and technological interests at stake in strategic defence. The American Strategic Defence Initiative (SDI) has been described not only as holding out the prospect of enhancing deterrence and the promise of the eventual elimination of nuclear weapons, but also as potentially undermining strategic stability. Moreover, it could turn out to be a prodigious research effort, dwarfing the Apollo project in cost and technical complexity. Its technological spin-offs could be very important for both military and civilian sectors. We will have to reach a consensus on whether strategic defence is likely to enhance or diminish our security, and we will have to consider to what extent our economic and technological interests are at stake.

Strategic defence raises a host of questions, on which Canadians may need to take decisions in due course.

In summary, what priorities do Canadians wish to ascribe to national defence, to making a substantive and cost-effective contribution to collective security, and to enhancing Canada's international influence?

Arms Control and Disarmament

There is a widespread consensus in Canada that defence and deterrence are only one dimension of international security and that effective arms control and disarmament agreements are a necessary complement. Questions which Canadians need to ask themselves relate to the balance to be struck between these two dimensions and to how we can use our influence — as a country serious about peace, skilled at mediation and negotiation and technically proficient — in the quest for international security.

The challenge is to translate our desire for progress into action that leads to practical agreements. To be effective, we need to recognize the dynamic and often deleterious connection between East/West political relations and the