

Dewitt addressed the challenge of bringing commitments in line with capabilities. He said that "even recognising that while all of these issues in some way are security challenges, not all of them draw on the military as the first line of action; nor are other aspects of the Canadian state well equipped to handle some of these concerns." He suggested that for the Canadian Armed Forces, the challenge will likely continue to be how best to adapt to the asymmetrical equation of excessive demands with inadequate supplies. At the same time Canada, along with other countries facing a similar situation, believes that its privileged position comes with an obligation to act responsibly in support of efforts for global peace and security. While this may be so, Canada may be in the unique position of not requiring a substantial military force to ensure its own national survival, making the issue of scarce resources allocation to a complex and demanding set of global security challenges that much more significant and a more political issue. Dewitt suggested that these considerations should be a focus of some serious and sustained domestic debate. The debate should be reflective of values and interests that may change in response to external factors and to the realities of a changing Canadian society.

Dewitt said that the issues outlined above challenge the values embedded in our political and social identities and should be responded to through a material commitment given our privileged position. Yet, we continue to struggle with the realities of transforming those value-laden beliefs and preferential interests into effective and sustainable international commitments and action. In this context, he offered three points:

1. Defence policy, as one of a number of instruments of security policy, must be based on a clear statement of Canada's national interests and global obligations.
2. If we presume that Canada has a global vision, does that mean we also have a global mission, and if yes, how does that square with our lack of a global reach?
3. If we agree that Canada is committed to be a responsible actor in areas of national, regional, international and global peace and security, and we acknowledge that we continue to face significant resource limitations, then on what basis do we make judgements about those areas of active Canadian engagement ?

#### Recommendations :

- A statement by the Minister of Foreign Affairs is necessary to 1) articulate a Canadian view of both national and international peace and security, 2) identify Canadian priorities, and 3) indicate a preparedness to allocate resources to ensure responsible action in those areas.
- DND needs to be more transparently willing to consider the hard choices emanating from such an international security statement.
- Canada may make a difference when bringing leadership and expertise to multilateral