

**Security the key
to disarmament**

But let us recognize that arguments about first use do not really go to the heart of the matter. The real problem before us is how to break the arms spiral. We will not do that in circumstances where any of the parties feels deficient in its security. We arm out of fear for our security and we will disarm only if we are convinced that the threat to our security has abated. Arms control, to be viable, must increase security, not reduce it.

Security, unfortunately, is an elusive concept. It is not only a matter of weaponry. It is also a matter of perception. When each side acts in ways which the other perceives to be threatening, the gulf of suspicion widens between East and West.

But the shadow that overhangs all arms-control negotiations and has led to the unravelling of some, comes mainly from the fact that we are dealing with an array of very different weapons systems in circumstances where technological innovation tends to overtake a negotiation even while it is in progress.

I believe that we must reconcile ourselves to the notion that total security is not achievable for any country in today's world. An attempt to achieve it can only result in everyone else feeling insecure. In a world where nations are interdependent in so many of their dimensions, security cannot be argued as a purely national proposition.

It has always been a useful precept of diplomatic negotiation that the outcome must take account of the legitimate interests of both sides. Arms-control negotiations are no exception. An attempt by one side to make strategic gains at the expense of the other will not, in the end, work. Only measures that increase mutual security are likely to offer a way out of the present paralysis. In particular, the two super-powers must start with the recognition that each has strategic interests and the strength to protect those interests.

Nuclear issues

Those then, are the premises from which my discourse on disarmament will flow. I am going to use the time available to talk primarily about nuclear issues, not because Canada does not attach great importance to the negotiation of agreements on chemical weapons and conventional armaments — it does — but because the preoccupation of our publics today justifiably centres on nuclear weapons.

The nuclear arms build-up is causing anguish to many people in many parts of the world. They are disturbed by the rehearsal of nuclear scenarios in a deteriorating political climate. They are posing their own questions about reasonable definitions of security. They are reminding political leaders that what is at stake is the crucial matter of the life or death of mankind.

As prime minister of a country that, from the outset, renounced a nuclear weapons capability of its own, I understand full well the people's anguish and confusion. The nuclear debate is difficult and seems to pursue an inverse logic. It deals with power