



no reason to believe — that governments are likely to disarm, at the expense of what they consider their security, in order to divert funds to development. If we are serious, the reality we must recognize is that the level of a nation's security is the main criterion against which efforts for disarmament must be measured, not the level of economic gain. Security is the touchstone, and again, the reality is that each nation will judge its own security on its own terms.

I mean security in its broadest sense — not just military strength. The sense of economic and social well-being is an important factor in a nation's overall security. Seen in this light, development can make a major contribution to overcoming non-military threats. It can contribute to the establishment of a stable international system that will, in its turn, reduce the relative importance of military strength as an instrument of security.

It is fitting that, at the request of the General Assembly, this conference is being held under UN auspices. It was, of course, the United Nations that pioneered the study of the linkage between disarmament and development. The three-year study by 27 experts, headed by Inga Thorsson, inspired this conference. The Canadian Government commissioned a popular version of that study, entitled *Safe and Sound: Disarmament and Development in the Eighties*.

From the time of its establishment in the devastating wake of the Second World War, the United Nations has been dedicated to four key principles:

- freedom from the scourge of war;
- faith in fundamental human rights and in the dignity and worth of the human person;
- respect for international obligations; and
- the promotion of social progress and better living standards.

Our success in upholding these principles depends in large measure on the

degree of commitment of individual member states to the disarmament and development processes. Indeed, our success in pursuing these objectives can mean the difference between a decent quality of life and deprivation, poverty or even death.

Canadians hope that this conference will rekindle the flagging political will upon which real progress depends.

Our goal should be to issue a consensus statement at the end. It will be a lost opportunity if we do not 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 focused 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 efforts of the United Nations. That has been especially true when UN efforts have focused on practical, constructive and clearly defined activities.

Through its child survival strategy, UNICEF has reduced infant mortality worldwide. The UN commissioner for refugees has provided legal protection and material assistance to millions of people fleeing war and persecution. The United Nations Development Programme has helped nations build viable economies by supporting 8 500 projects in 150 countries. Smallpox has been eliminated through the work of the World Health Organization. The UN has also provided an essential forum for debate on global development issues, most recently at the successful Special Session on Africa.

Those achievements were the result of careful planning, the setting of realistic goals and reliance on practical measures. The lesson for this conference is clear when we turn to disarmament, where the record of the United Nations — and of its member states — has been less impressive. Twenty years ago, the UN's performance in this field