

begun publication of a disarmament newsletter to help interested Canadians keep abreast of developments and activities in this field.

As Dr. Leddy knows, a consultative group of representatives of interested non-governmental organizations has met twice under the chairmanship of the Adviser on Disarmament and Arms Control Affairs. I hope the work of this group will lead to better mutual understanding of points of view and to practical measures of co-operation on education and research. The success of this consultative group leads me to think that the time may soon be ripe for the creation of an autonomous association for arms control and disarmament in Canada. Such an association could bring together experts and interested members of the public to analyze and evaluate the critical issues. We in government believe that it is important to raise the level of debate in Canada on these issues. Too often we have accepted without question the terms of the debate as it is conducted across the border or in Europe. In addition to focusing interest, such an association could also assist the government by providing reports and ideas on, for example, the negotiation of verifiable agreement — that is, realistic, practical and forceable agreements. Declaratory and vague proposals can lead to disillusionment and to the discrediting of the institutions which espouse them.

World federalists, I believe, have a special interest in pursuing measures which effectively strengthen the structure of international institutions, in particular the United Nations. As Secretary of State for External Affairs, I will follow this course of action and I look to non-governmental organizations to provide support. The recent decision of the government to appoint an Ambassador-at-Large for Disarmament testifies to our determination to encourage and seek arms control and disarmament agreements, as well as to our conviction that there will be continuing opportunities for constructive initiatives by Canada.

In summary, arms control and disarmament will be an important part of Canadian policy in the 1980s. We will continue to work with our allies and others to make negotiations successful; but we will also continue to reserve our right to speak out when we think that the pace is too slow or the agenda is too narrow. In this decade, even more than previously, arms control and disarmament is a security imperative. Canada is and will remain a member of NATO. Our security depends on co-operation within that alliance to prevent war. But at the same time, there is no doubt in my mind that the control and limitation of armaments, through negotiation, must be a vital ingredient of Western security policy.

In my view, not only is there no gulf between security and disarmament, but there is actually a continuity. I believe that we cannot have real security without having at the same time disarmament. Now I do not want to be misunderstood. What I'm speaking of is mutually-agreed disarmament. I believe that the arms race is better security — if we have to have an arms race — than unilateral disarmament. The powerlessness of the West in the Thirties led to war, just as surely and also with much worse consequences than the arms race did before 1914. But I think both of those are really second best choices. The best choice surely is mutually-agreed disarmament. I say that because of the cost of an armaments race, the expenditure of resources which is required in terms of the involvement of human lives, but most of all because of the

Mutually-
agreed
disarmament
best choice