

unite to state clearly that the security of everyone will be strengthened by both disarmament and development. Neither process can be held hostage to the other, but progress in one can facilitate progress in the other.

It is not surprising that world attention is focussed on global military expenditures. It now amounts to \$1 trillion per year, or nearly 6 per cent of gross world output. Rather than disarmament, arsenals of conventional weapons have proliferated. Efforts to reduce stocks of nuclear weapons have seen very little success. There is documented evidence of the repeated use of chemical weapons, in breach of the Geneva Protocol of 1925. The armaments industry and trade in arms absorb vast quantities of resources, which would be better devoted to civilian use. Even allowing the preoccupation of governments with the security of their citizens, the level of arms expenditure frequently exceeds reasonable security requirements.

There is, of course, the promise of a significant reduction in nuclear arms as a result of the initiatives of the United States and the Soviet Union and the negotiations at Geneva. Obviously, arms control is everybody's business. But the two superpowers have the power to make the changes we can only recommend, and we should welcome the seriousness with which both those nations appear to be approaching the Geneva negotiations.

Concerning development, all of us are aware of the world's enormous economic problems - slow growth, trade disputes, contraction of financial flows to developing countries, increased debt burdens, and the almost impossible plight of the poorest nations. These problems are made worse by looming scarcities of raw materials, declining prospects for economic growth, and the long-term price we pay for degrading our environment. In human terms, that means hunger, illiteracy, high unemployment and inadequate housing and social services.

Genuine progress in development is occurring, involving some countries more than others, but nowhere is it enough. Nonetheless, as we make our assessments, it is worth noting which of the countries with stronger economies contribute most to international economic development, and which contribute least. I am speaking, of course, of development assistance, not military aid.

Of course, some of the most important progress in international development has come as the result of multilateral actions, including through the agencies and