

standards should be made to apply to a destabilizing new weapons system.

The SDI program would mean little economic benefit, either, for Canada. If the Canadian government were serious about job creation, wouldn't it be better advised to contribute to a more labor-intensive industry than the aerospace sector?

Rejection would have wide ramifications

C.R. Nixon (former Deputy Minister of National Defence) supported participation in the research linked to the SDI program. Canada should move from the concept, Mr. Nixon said, to being prepared to participate in and provide funding for Canadian universities and firms to participate in such research.

To reject Canada's participation would likely affect not only Canadian high technology, but the total environment for negotiation and discussion of Canada-U.S. relationships.

Mr. Nixon suggested Canada should also urge its NATO partners to launch discussions about possible changes in Alliance strategy should the SDI research program demonstrate merit for comprehensive ballistic missile defence systems.

Would encourage the other side

Peace Research Institute (Allan Newcombe) suggested any deployment of an SDI system would merely encourage the other side to launch a campaign aimed at eliminating a threat to its own offensive capability. Moreover, the SDI "defence" system might try to destroy missiles and warheads while they are rising from the ground. But the system offered no defence against cruise missiles, bombers, suitcase bombs or submarine-launched ballistic missiles.