

also considered to be well-placed to influence the existing "system" of international relations as it was largely outside ideological U.S.-Soviet confrontation. Canada's ongoing role in promoting multilateralism was therefore stressed.

On the question of the Disarmament and Development relationship, the point was made that, whilst arms were not the cause of war, they do represent a vast waste of public money. Therefore, while the Disarmament and Development linkage was seen as a "sensible" one, it was clear that the sources of conflict lay elsewhere -- on the political level, not on the level of defence procurement and expenditure.

In discussing the Disarmament and Development relationship as it concerns developing countries, it was noted that military expenditure as a percentage of GNP had declined in the developed world, this was not however the case in developing countries. It was suggested that the level of military expenditure might be used as a criterion for ODA. Canada should not contribute to those governments which spend on the military.

In looking at Canada's continuing role and influence in global politics, it was suggested that Canada should form a new set of alliances -- eg. with New Zealand and Japan -- which would remove Canada from the East-West confrontation, enhance renewed economic strength and broaden our international influence.

In this regard, the Green Paper was seen as promoting too many "sacred cows" which were not up for discussion -- i.e. NATO and NORAD.

In light of U.S. actions in Libya, many people expressed the view that such reprisals were inappropriate, and that a constructive response to the problem of terrorism should be the subject of discussion and action in the U.N.