

a working body rather than a forum. It is believed that the Commission can do constructive work if it concentrates on its terms of reference but that the quickest way to thwart that purpose is to indulge in mere propaganda. It might therefore be preferable if the Commission could restrict its public sessions as much as possible and do its work in closed committee. While international covenants should be made public, they may often be better negotiated in confidence, provided the principles and purpose of the negotiations have been made clearly known.

Collective Measures

The study of collective measures to deter or resist aggression has its origin in the experience of the United Nations in Korea. In order to strengthen further United Nations collective security arrangements, the General Assembly at its fifth session had adopted Resolution 377 A (V) of November 3, 1950 (the "Uniting for Peace" resolution), providing means for the Assembly to act in the event of a veto in the Security Council and setting up a Collective Measures Committee of 14 members, including Canada.¹ This Committee was directed to study and report to the Security Council and the Assembly on "methods . . . which might be used to maintain and strengthen international peace and security in accordance with the purposes and principles of the Charter, taking account of collective self-defence and regional arrangements".

In the report which it submitted to the sixth session of the Assembly², the Collective Measures Committee recognized that it could not anticipate any specific situation which would lead the Security Council or the Assembly to decide upon or recommend particular measures in any given case, and emphasized that it had concentrated on the preparedness of states and on techniques, machinery and procedures relating to the co-ordination of national and international action.

To assist it in its work, the Committee had established four subordinate bodies to study respectively (a) the problems involved in the establishment of a Panel of Military Experts³, (b) possible political measures, (c) possible economic and financial measures, and (d) possible military measures, which might be undertaken by or through the United Nations in the event of aggression or a threat to the peace. In conclusion, the Committee recommended further study on the economic and financial and on the military aspects but omitted any specific recommendation on whether or not its own mandate should be extended.

The reports on both the Panel of Military Experts and on political measures were brief and non-controversial. The first

¹The members of the Collective Measures Committee were Australia, Belgium, Brazil, Burma, Canada, Egypt, France, Mexico, the Philippines, Turkey, the United Kingdom, the United States, Venezuela and Yugoslavia. The U.S.S.R. was not included at its own request.

²Document A/1891.

³General Assembly Resolution 377 A (V) requested the Secretary-General "to appoint . . . a Panel of Military Experts who could be made available upon the request of member states which wished to obtain technical advice regarding the organization, training and equipment for prompt service as United Nations units of the elements referred to in paragraph 8".