

not to commit itself, and we shall abstain, therefore, on the resolutions involving Vietnam. I have not argued the case for abstention as a general principle for other delegations but merely as one which seems best for us. It is not quite the same position as those adopted by our colleagues from India or from Poland, but I imply no censure on them. The positions they have adopted seem to us equally compatible with our mutual responsibilities. I have made this clear because in our view the tripartite international commissions have had a remarkable degree of success in securing the peace throughout Indochina and we are most anxious not to disturb our collaboration within the Commission. We have had our differences and we have had our frustrations, but we have proved that the transition from war to peace can be achieved if countries with much to divide them have the will to work together in international bodies of this kind. We trust that our work in Indochina will soon be ended, but we think that what has been done there might have charted courses which the United Nations could well study for future reference.

There is one aspect of the Canadian position on applications for membership which I should like to clarify. At the Tenth Assembly we were authors of a resolution proposing admission of a large number of countries. From this number we excluded those countries about which a problem of unification arises: This formula, it will be recalled, was used solely as a means of defining the applicants which, under the circumstances existing at that time, we proposed to sponsor. Everyone knows the reasons which then existed for drawing up such a restricted list. We had no intention of creating a principle of permanent validity. The division of a country is and always will be an important factor in the consideration of applications for membership. We do not, however, subscribe to a theory that countries which are divided, or parts thereof, should never under any circumstances be admitted to membership.

There is one other point I should like to make. It seems to my Delegation that the arbitrary linking together of Korea and Vietnam in one resolution is, to say the least, unfortunate. I agree with the distinguished representative of Pakistan on his objection to the use of the word "simultaneous". There is no reason why action of any kind on one of these countries should wait upon appropriate action on the other. Whatever similarities there are between these two unhappily divided countries, there are many differences also. It would serve no useful purpose to attempt to describe their differences, but I might merely point out that members of the United Nations have very special reasons for viewing with scepticism the credentials of the Government of North Korea for membership in this organization.

It has been suggested that those of us who promoted the admission of so many new members last year have committed ourselves to a doctrine of universality and that this doctrine means that every applicant should be admitted. I can assure you that Canada has never accepted such an argument. We have argued for making the United Nations as universal as possible and representative of many points of view and forms of government, whether we like those forms of government or not. To suggest, however, that we should admit every authority which asks to come in, without assuring ourselves that this authority has some substantial basis for legitimate existence is to carry things much too far. I doubt very much if any member of the United Nations could face with equanimity the consequences of such a policy - or lack of policy.