

The eight non-aligned members of the ENDC were also active on the item dealing with the urgent need for suspension of nuclear and thermonuclear tests. They sponsored a draft resolution urging universal adherence to the partial test-ban treaty, an end to further testing, an international exchange of seismic data and the elaboration by the ENDC of a treaty banning underground nuclear-weapon tests. Canada supported this proposal, which met with general approval and was passed in plenary with 100 in favour, one opposed (Albania) and two abstentions (France and Cuba).

An Ethiopian proposal for an international conference to sign a convention prohibiting the use of nuclear and thermonuclear weapons passed in plenary by a vote of 80 in favour, with 23 abstentions and none opposed. Canada abstained, as it has long been its view that verifiable arms-control measures make a better contribution to the cause of disarmament.

An item on the elimination of foreign bases in both the independent and dependent countries of Asia, Africa and Latin America led to heated debate. Introduced by the Soviet Union, it was a thinly-veiled attempt to paint the Western alliance systems in neo-colonialist terms and to seek unilateral military advantage. Amendments were introduced by African states broadening the terms of the resolution to include foreign bases in all regions, and to make clear that states with foreign bases could retain them if they so wished. In the view of the West, the original resolution violated the principles of collective self-defence and non-interference in internal affairs. After some days of vigorous debate, the United Arab Republic put forward a procedural resolution to refer the matter to the ENDC. This resolution was adopted by the Committee, as was a motion not to vote on the Soviet draft and amendments.

### ***Peace-keeping***

While the United Nations continued to fulfill its *current* peacekeeping commitments<sup>1</sup>, the Special Committee on Peacekeeping Operations, ("Committee of 33"), appointed in February 1965, was unable in 1966 to resolve the differences which had divided the membership over the authorization, financing and control of *future* peacekeeping operations. The U.S.S.R. and France continued to insist that all aspects of peace-keeping were the sole prerogative of the Security Council; most Western countries and many developing countries maintained their view that the General Assembly had the power to mount peacekeeping operations when the Security Council was

---

<sup>1</sup> See Pages 57, 60.