

studies. When the spokesmen for this draft advised that it was not open for amendment, Canada introduced a similar resolution.

Canada's resolution was not intended to undermine the Neutral Non-Aligned (NNA) resolution; we proceeded with our draft because we believed the scope of the resolution should be broader and should also include the climatic effects of nuclear war, including nuclear winter. We also believed that the resolution should not attempt to prejudge the studies that countries might be asked to submit to the U.N. The western cosponsors of the Canadian resolution, the Federal Republic of Germany, Japan and Belgium, authorized the Canadian delegation to negotiate to find the basis for a consensus draft. Our delegation succeeded in negotiating a text with NNA sponsors and believed it had reached agreement. This however, turned out not to be the case, and a small but significant element of the Non-Aligned leadership objected to confining the compilation of the Secretariat's report "within existing resources."

Due to our serious interest in maintaining the scientific integrity of the U.N.'s approach to this important question and bearing in mind the financial implications of the resolution we put forward a number of amendments designed to improve and strengthen the resolution in order to achieve consensus. Unfortunately the NNA did not agree, and on this point, negotiations floundered.

Though the possibility of achieving consensus was lost, Canada voted for the non-aligned resolution, even in its weakened state, so great is our concern about spreading