

Thus, in response to suggestions from certain states whose constitutions imposed limitations on the employment of their armed forces, a condition was included that the units maintained by each member should be made available "in accordance with its constitutional processes". Other delegations doubted the need for a panel of military experts, provided for in the resolution, to assist member states in organizing and training their United Nations units, but on this point the sponsors would not yield, and the provision was retained.

The fourth section of the resolution (Part D) established ad hoc machinery in the form of a Collective Measures Committee<sup>1</sup> of fourteen members to study and report to the Security Council and the General Assembly before September 1, 1951, on methods by which collective measures against aggression might be organized. Early in the debate certain delegations, notably the Australian, expressed misgivings as to the scope of the investigatory powers of the proposed Committee, and it was in response to this that the sponsors made it clear that they were principally concerned with means which might be employed to implement the principles set forth in Part C of the resolution. In the course of his statement on this point, Mr. Pearson suggested that the Collective Measures Committee might "examine the pros and cons of a small, specially recruited international force". Canada was appointed to membership on the Committee.

The final section of the resolution, Part E, embodies the essence of a Chilean draft resolution urging intensified and universal respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms and calling for new efforts to achieve economic stability and social progress, particularly through the development of under-developed areas.

It is too early to predict to what extent the new provisions adopted by the General Assembly under the "Uniting for Peace" resolution will add to the peace-preserving resources of the United Nations. Whether or not the Assembly will make use of the authority with which it has been endowed will, of course, depend on the willingness of member states to act in accordance with the moral force of the Assembly's recommendations. The Charter contains no clause which could be interpreted as making recommendations of the General Assembly legally binding on member states. However, in the words of the Canadian statement on this point "recommendations, as we now know from the events of June, can have a force as strong and compelling as any mandate, when right and justice are behind them". In strict law, therefore, member states remain free, under the "Uniting for Peace" provisions, to act according to their own desire in response to requests for action by the Assembly, so long as their actions are in conformity with their general obligations under the Charter. At least, however, the new procedure should ensure that the ultimate responsibility of the United Nations as an instrument for the maintenance of international peace will not be abdicated because of the failure of the Security Council to agree on collective measures to resist aggression.

<sup>1</sup>The following fourteen member states were appointed to membership in the Collective Measures Committee: Australia, Belgium, Brazil, Burma, Canada, Egypt, France, Mexico, Philippines, Turkey, the United Kingdom, the United States, Venezuela and Yugoslavia.