

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