

- negotiation of a freeze would "detract from efforts to achieve real reductions;
- mutual agreement on establishing rules for verification must be reached to provide assurances; and
- no provision was made for the "potentially destabilizing" problem of peaceful nuclear explosions.

Speaking in the Commons November 21, NDP leader Ed Broadbent questioned the External Affairs Minister Joe Clark as to why Canada had cast a negative vote on such a vital issue. Mr. Clark responded that, in the government's opinion, progress toward arms reductions could only be made through a search for "effective actions which persuade the superpowers." The cause of reduction, he added, would not have been advanced by the freeze declaration. Mr. Clark further stated that adding Canada's endorsement to the resolution might have had the effect of "causing tensions within the alliance," and been "counterproductive" in bringing NATO influence to bear on the US. A negative vote, said Mr. Clark, maintained the strength of the alliance. Outside the Commons, Mr. Broadbent was not satisfied with Mr. Clark's explanation, telling a CBC reporter that an affirmative vote would have indicated "a minimum amount of leadership . . . I don't think there's been any matter that has disappointed me [more] than the answers I got from Mr. Clark today" in the Commons (External Affairs transcript, November 21).

Ambassador Douglas Roche defended the UN vote on CBC television November 22. Mr. Roche reiterated much that had been said in his UN address, repeating the government's contention that more effective than a relatively symbolic freeze declaration would be further negotiations toward a "comprehensive test ban resolution." A freeze would not, in Mr. Roche's estimation, "make the level of safety in the world that we aspire to." Those advocating a freeze, he said, do not examine the long-range problems created by frozen high levels of nuclear armaments (External Affairs transcript, November 26).

Criticism of the negative vote continued from various sources, disarmament groups among them. Operation Dismantle spokesperson Jim Stark characterized the vote as a gesture of subservience to US policy. He added that "the government is saying we're for a freeze but we'll vote no because the United States doesn't agree" (*The Citizen*, November 23). He said such a vote raised serious questions about Canadian "sovereignty and foreign policy." Mr. Stark said the Canadian vote ran against opinion polls which had indicated a large percentage of Canadians supported a freeze. The Canadian Labour Congress (CLC) also levelled criticism at the vote in a press release of November 22, expressing its "dismay" at the negative vote. Sending a telegram to External Affairs Minister Joe Clark, the CLC reminded him of Canada's stated commitment to a "more active role" in nuclear disarmament, and offered CLC support for a new Canadian initiative. The CLC called for practical steps toward disarmament rather than rhetoric. Another group sent a message to Prime Minister Mulroney November 26, members of a planning session for the 1985 Women's International Peace Conference, also expressing their "dismay." Their message questioned

the advisability of voting against the UN resolution for a bilateral, verifiable, negotiated nuclear freeze. The telegram from the Women's Group concluded by stating that "withholding Canada's compliance with the continued nuclear buildup as other NATO middle powers have done, would be more influential in pursuing our stated peace policy" (WIPC press release, November 26).

### **Nuclear Winter Resolution**

The First Committee of the UN General Assembly voted on and adopted a Neutral and Non-aligned (NNA) resolution on nuclear winter November 27, despite last minute efforts by Canada to introduce amendments to the resolution as it was introduced. Two resolutions had been submitted, one from Mexico and the Non-aligned countries, the other from Canada and three others. Both expressed the need for additional study on the subject, which should, when completed, be submitted for examination by the UN. While the NNA resolution called for a compilation and distribution of extracts and used more "alarmist language" in its description of the possible effects of nuclear confrontation, the Canadian resolution called for the availability of a complete listing of studies and attempted to moderate the language surrounding nuclear winter. According to a House of Commons Briefing Note of November 28, Canada's resolution did not attempt to "prejudice the validity of the nuclear winter hypothesis." (The NNA resolution regarded nuclear winter as certain in the event of nuclear confrontation, while Canada presented it as a "worst case" scenario.) Unable to negotiate a consensus text with Mexico, Canada attempted to amend the resolution "to ensure that it did not prejudge the effects of nuclear winter and that costs for the UN report would be found within existing resources." Unable to secure the amendments, Canada withdrew its own resolution (lacking sufficient support) and voted for the Mexican resolution (External Affairs transcript, November 28).

The government defended its attempts at amendment by stating that rather than trying to "undermine" the Mexican resolution, it was more an effort to "broaden" its scope (including climatic effects) and prevent a prejudgment of studies to be submitted to the UN by member nations. After negotiating with the NNA "in good faith" and being unable to achieve a consensus, Canada had then put forward the amendment proposals. These were intended both to maintain the "scientific integrity" of the UN's approach to nuclear winter and to maintain an awareness of the financial implications. Canada agreed with the "general thrust" of the NNA resolution, while retaining reservations with regard to some of its language (External Affairs transcript, November 28). However, the media noted an unusually harsh tone to the language used by the two groups in their efforts to achieve consensus, with a CBC radio report November 29 recalling that "the Mexican representative denounced the amendments as insulting [and] for his part, Canadian Ambassador Douglas Roche . . . accused some of the rival sponsors of bad faith in negotiating" (External Affairs transcript, November 29, *The Citizen*, November 28).