

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

\* \* \*

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

The U.N. 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 U.N. debates, not enough cooperation. 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 U.N., holding as I do to the belief that peace in the world requires much more than U.N. resolutions. But the U.N. is nonetheless a vital instrument in producing strategies for security and stability.

What the U.N. 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 10th 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