

Some compromise must be found between the theoretical equality of states and the practical necessity of limiting representation on international bodies to a workable number. That compromise can be discovered...by the adoption of the functional principle of representation. That principle, in turn, is likely to find many new expressions in the gigantic task of liberation, restoration and reconstruction."

There are remarkably few changes which I would like to make in that statement after almost four not uneventful years, because I believe profoundly in the principle which the Prime Minister of my country announced. Nevertheless, the experience of the United Nations has proved to be discouraging in regard to its acceptance. National prides, national sensitiveness, and other influences have been preponderant and representation on practically every United Nations agency, where a few had to be chosen from all, has been determined by other than functional consideration. I venture to make the rather pessimistic prediction that if the United Nations Assembly had to choose a committee for planting flowers in the grounds of Lake Success, the Big Powers would claim automatic representation and the others would be chosen on the basis, as they call it, of "equitable geographic representation", with two or three from Latin America. If the greatest botanist in the world were a delegate, he might have to be omitted because he came from the wrong country.

This difficulty, which I have put before you in a somewhat exaggerated form, springs from the legal equality of states and their actual inequality. One effort to overcome this difficulty is found in the developing tendency to classify states, not only as members of geographic blocs, but as great, middle or small. I must confess that I have never been much impressed with the "three-decker" international structure which is so loosely talked about today. Canada has, from time to time, been included in this structure as a middle power. I do not know, however, just what this means. In these international fields in which the Canadian people have functions to perform and the capacity to perform them, they should be, and we must find out how they can be, recognized in terms of their ability to deliver the goods. Those goods may be as tangible as wheat or uranium or military manpower, as intangible as a capacity for conciliation and compromise, or as influential as discoveries in the fields of science. You will note that most of the attributes I have mentioned do not come within the sphere of sheer physical power. I hope, therefore, I won't be accused of weighing influence in terms only of great natural resources or great populations, though I would be the last to deny that material factors ought to weigh very heavily indeed. What I am suggesting here is that we must find the relationship between the realities of moral and physical power and the principles governing representation in the world order we are talking about. That we have not made too much progress in this respect within the framework of the United Nations is not to be wondered at. The fact is, however, that no yard-stick has yet been developed which can even roughly equate the potential contribution of peoples with the representation of states in the world order. The social scientist of the University can do much in helping to find such a yard-stick.

This, and much else, remains to be done before all nations - or even a sufficient number of nations - will accept limitations on their sovereignty, within a framework of law, as a better guarantee of their interests and their security than insistence on the dubious advantages of full and individual autonomy in a world of international anarchy.

It seems to me at times that in our present form of international organization we are subsidizing relatively low forms of political development at the expense of relatively high ones. It seems