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 UN'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 knowledge about the possible effects on climate of a nuclear war.

I have come back to Canada from this fall's activity at the UN with a heightened sense of concern and yet with a feeling of hope for the future.

The UN is an imperfect institution, to be sure. But it reflects the "atmospherics" of our time. These atmospherics are dominated by the sense of antagonism and mistrust between East and West, which spill over into the various sets of multilateral relationships. There is too much confrontation in the UN debates, not enough co-operation. The process of consensus, as I learned, is an easy victim. And it is the people of the world who are the losers.

I am not daunted by the consensus and communication breakdown at the UN, holding as I do to the belief that peace in the world requires much more than UN resolutions. But the UN is, nonetheless, a vital instrument in producing strategies for security and stability.

What the UN needs most of all is to be infused with the political will of the major countries, determined to implement the program of action which all countries agreed to at the tenth Special Session of the General Assembly in 1978, the first special session devoted to disarmament.

What now of 1985?

The new year will start auspiciously with talks in Geneva between Secretary of State Schultz and Foreign Minister Gromyko. We must hope that this event will open a new door to genuine negotiations on the reduction of all nuclear weapons and on the prevention of the weaponization of space.

The third Review Conference of the Non-Proliferation Treaty will be held in September. This conference cannot be allowed to fail if we are to ensure that the spread of nuclear weapons does not extend horizontally to other nations. In recognition of the importance of non-proliferation and the upcoming Review Conference, the United States and the Soviet Union have just announced that they will hold regular semi-annual talks on nuclear non-proliferation. This agreement formalizes what has been an informal practice since 1982. Canada recently had bilateral consultations with the Soviet Union