

The security of everyone will be strengthened by both disarmament and development.⁷⁵

Clark clearly expressed an understanding of security that not only recognized non-military threats (hunger, poverty, inequality) but also sees armament itself as a threat to everyone's security. Canada, he claimed wants nuclear and conventional arms reductions and looks to all nations to take such actions.

This view of security was not shared by then Defence Minister Perrin Beatty. Two months before Clark's speech in New York, Beatty told Canadians that the way to understand security and the best way to preserve it is military strength. The government's 1987 White Paper on Defence said, "...the West has no choice but to rely for its security on the maintenance of a rough balance of forces, backed up by nuclear deterrence..." to prevent Western Europe from being "subverted, overrun or destroyed."⁷⁶

Two weeks after Canada signed the international Conference Final Document, agreeing that "non-military threats to security have moved to the forefront of global concern",⁷⁷ the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of National defence, Bud Bradley, MP, told the House of Commons that the Defence White Paper is "visionary" policy and that,

the reality is that each nation will judge its own security in its own terms.

The notion, therefore, that Canadian defence expenditures should be reduced for the purpose of transferring funds for developing in the Third World ignores the fact that the level of such expenditures is decided in accordance with overall security considerations.⁷⁸

⁷⁵ Statement by the Secretary of State for External Affairs, New York, 24 August 1987, Press Release No. 17, Permanent Mission of Canada to the United Nations.

⁷⁶ Challenge and Commitment, A Defence Policy for Canada, Department of National Defence, June 1987, pp.5-6.

⁷⁷ ICRDD Final Document, para 18.

⁷⁸ House of Commons Debates, 25 September 1987.