

make a significant contribution by elaborating the concept of a new regime of mutual security based on mutual interests, mutual benefits and mutual confidence.

The threat to North America is likely to remain what it has been for some time; that is, intercontinental ballistic missiles (ICBMs) and submarine-launched ballistic missiles (SLBMs)--but long-range cruise missiles may well loom more important and the eventual deployment of land-based or space-based ballistic missile defence (BMD) systems is not to be excluded. Such developments could have direct implications for Canada and for Canada-US defence cooperation, and could force some awkward choices on the government. On the one hand, there are serious differences between Canada and the United States on such matters as the Strategic Defence Initiative (SDI); on the other, Canada will find it difficult to influence US policies if it goes it alone. These problems will not be made any easier if they are dealt with in a purely North American context, where the disparity of power between Canada and the United States is bound to weigh. We should therefore do what we can to promote the strategic unity of NATO by ensuring the alignment of US strategy and NATO strategy.

Beyond the NATO area, there are trouble spots in Central America, in the Caribbean, in the Middle East and the Persian Gulf, in Southern Africa and around the Pacific Rim, some of which are of concern because they carry the seeds of wider destabilization and conflict, and some of which could lead to Canadian involvement in a peacekeeping role or otherwise. Particularly disturbing is the trend toward state-supported terrorism and the dangers that flow from the availability of ever more lethal weaponry. It would obviously not be practical for Canada to involve itself in all these situations; priorities must be set in terms of our special skills and