
Canada can be proud of these achievements, and others as well. At the October pledging conference of the World Disarmament Campaign Canada's contribution of \$100 000 constituted one third of the amount pledged by all countries; so great is our commitment to education on peace and disarmament issues. At this session of the First Committee, of a total of 64 resolutions that came to a vote, Canada co-sponsored 13, voted in favour of 36, voted against 14 and abstained on 14. Each resolution was considered on its own merits, bearing in mind our desire to seek consensus. However, we should perhaps look at the areas and issues where consensus — or near-consensus — was not possible, or where controversy or the complexity of the issue raised deeply troubling questions.

(1) *Nuclear freeze*: No consensus was possible on the concept of a nuclear freeze, which expresses the desire of mankind to be free from the fear of nuclear war. The idea of capping the nuclear arms race and reducing the enormous number of nuclear weapons in current arsenals is, of course, attractive.

Three freeze resolutions were introduced. A Soviet proposal called on all nuclear states to freeze their nuclear arsenals. A Swedish-Mexican draft urged the Soviet Union and the United States to proclaim an immediate nuclear arms freeze as a first step towards comprehensive disarmament. An Indian draft called on all nuclear-weapon states to agree to a freeze on nuclear weapons and stoppage of any further production of nuclear weapons and a complete cut-off in the production of fissionable material for weapons purposes.

The Soviet proposal passed with 95 yes votes, and 18 no and 13 abstentions. The Swedish-Mexican proposal passed 111 yes, 12 no, and 7 abstentions. The Indian draft passed 110 yes, 12 no and 9 abstentions.

Canada voted no on all three, the government stating that mere declarations of a freeze are not a meaningful response to the nuclear danger. Rather, as the government has said many times, Canada wants the immediate, unconditional resumption of negotiations on reductions. A return without preconditions to meaningful, bilateral negotiations between the United States and the Soviet Union, which take into account the legitimate security interests of both sides and with adequate verification measures, constitutes the most realistic means of reducing nuclear arms.

Thus, Canada's vote reflected the genuine doubt about the practicality of the concept of the freeze as it is currently being advocated. Declaring a freeze rather than negotiating one would inevitably raise numerous and likely intractable problems about definitions, exclusions and inclusions. The negotiation of a freeze would be as intricate and as prolonged as would the negotiation of reductions.

Nonetheless, the voting patterns this year indicated that further study is needed to find a resolution which would have the effect of stopping the nuclear arms race without locking in unacceptable superior positions at different levels of armaments. The diverse votes of the Western countries reveal that a debate is under way to find the correct course leading to collective security at lower nuclear levels. In the Swedish-Mexican proposal, two North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) countries Denmark and Greece, and Australia voted yes; four NATO countries, Iceland, the Netherlands, Norway and Spain were among the seven abstentions.