

It should be noted however, that the majority of NATO countries and all Canada's major economic summit partners voted against the freeze resolution. Canada will continue to think about this issue and it will obviously be considered within the context of the upcoming foreign policy review.

(2) *Prevention of nuclear war:* Preventing nuclear war would seem an objective universally shared, and one which it would be easy to reach consensus in the United Nations. This did not prove to be so. The reasons are varied and serve as an object lesson on what is — and is not — possible at the United Nations. A draft resolution co-sponsored by Canada and our European allies sought to put prevention of nuclear war within the context of preventing all wars, and within the framework of the United Nations Charter. Some of the more radical non-aligned states sought to turn the issue of preventing nuclear war into a critique of Western security policies and alliance relationships and, regrettably, efforts to reach a consensus had to be abandoned. A substantive and balanced discussion of an issue of central concern to the international community was thus put aside as the result of ideological conflict (as well as posturing) at the UN.

(3) *Nuclear winter:* Canada's role in the "nuclear winter" debate provides an object lesson in the difficulties of obtaining consensus at the UN.

A year ago, more than 100 scientists endorsed a study headed by Professors Carl Sagan and Paul Ehrlich, projecting that a nuclear outbreak between East and West, in addition to the human casualties, the total of which might approach half the population of the world, would so damage the environment as to produce a "nuclear winter". The scientists said that a damaged ozone layer would leave a global wasteland where survivors would starve and freeze on a planet without sunlight, the air filled with toxic chemicals and penetrated by dangerous ultraviolet radiation. Under this hypothesis, a small drop in over-all temperature on the Canadian prairie would virtually end any viable farming. The Canadian government commissioned the Royal Society of Canada to examine the nuclear winter theory; a report is expected this month.

It should be remembered that the Sagan-Ehrlich study has not met the unanimous support of scientists. Some are not convinced of the gravity of nuclear winter. In an effort to have all pertinent studies on this important subject brought into the UN for further dissemination, the Canadian delegation attempted to develop a consensus vote, which would give added weight to the nuclear winter material.

A draft resolution, introduced by Mexico, Sweden, India, Yugoslavia, Pakistan and Uruguay, accepted nuclear winter as a foregone conclusion and called on the secretariat to compile a document consisting of excerpts from national 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 UN. The western co-sponsors of the Canadian resolution, the Federal Republic of Germany, Japan and