

collective security in military terms, in face of the opposition of one of the great powers, as dangerous to the interests of the United Nations and to world peace. Some of the Latin American states regarded the existing regional arrangements of the Organization of American States as having priority over any United Nations arrangements.

The opposition of the Soviet bloc was apparently directed not so much against the resolution itself as against its origin in the "Uniting for Peace" resolution of the previous session of the Assembly and against the United Nations collective action in Korea. The Soviet Delegation submitted an opposing resolution which proposed the abolition of the Collective Measures Committee and the calling of a meeting of the Security Council "without delay" under Article 28 of the Charter to consider measures to remove international tension and examine, in the first place, what could be done to bring the Korean armistice negotiations to a successful conclusion. In spite of the reply of the Western powers that there was no useful purpose in referring the Korean question to the Security Council, because it would complicate and might even suspend the existing negotiations at Panmunjom and would only provide Soviet spokesmen with a new propaganda platform, this proposal for a Security Council meeting had sufficient appeal to warrant adoption of a further resolution. The Soviet resolution was, however, amended by deleting the phrase "without delay" and the references to Korea; a meeting of the Security Council was to be called "whenever such a meeting would usefully serve to remove such tension and establish such friendly relations in furtherance of the purposes and principles of the Charter".

As a member of the Collective Measures Committee, Canada agreed to the contents of the report to the Assembly and was one of the sponsors of the joint resolution based on that report. The Canadian position assumed that the United Nations could not remain passive in the event of a major war and still retain its moral validity. Canada therefore supported the principle of collective measures taken under the auspices of the United Nations and agreed that the United Nations could usefully review all possible measures which might contribute to this purpose, provided it did not attempt to anticipate specific situations. At the same time, it was the Canadian view that the United Nations was not the appropriate body actually to direct military operations. Canada therefore supported the approach of the Collective Measures Committee, which recognized that, while the United Nations would have to maintain some degree of supervision over any collective measures decided upon, the question of specific methods to be used and their application was one to be decided by individual governments. Moreover, it was the Canadian policy to regard collective security through regional organizations as complementary to United Nations collective measures and to recognize that such regional arrangements, if they were to be successful, must be such as to command the general support of the United Nations.

The Collective Measures Committee reconvened in New York on April 15 of this year and has since then adopted a programme of future studies. It has been agreed that only two sub-committees