

this little-Europe nostalgia for the pre-war era struck no favourable chord in Canadian minds. The differences between the League and the U.N. did not seem to most Canadians to discredit the latter. If the Asian and African countries were lacking in diplomatic experience, all the more important to give them some! We too were non-Europeans, fairly new on the international stage, and not perhaps overly-reverent.

It is I think no coincidence, in view of Canada's long-standing attitudes to international affairs, that it was the Canadian delegation, led by Paul Martin, now our Secretary of State for External Affairs, which took the lead in pushing through, in 1955, arrangements which broke the log-jam on membership. The new members thereby admitted were mainly non-European, non-white, ex-colonial and economically underdeveloped. This has changed the character of the U.N. all right. It has eliminated the former almost automatic voting majority at the disposal of the West. That has complicated life for Canada too. But the enlarged UN seems to us essentially healthier. The United Nations today is much more a reflection of the real world in which we live. Some day we must face up to a difficult constitutional problem about responsible voting. But dis-franchisement seems no satisfactory cure, or preventive, for unbalanced or badly weighted voting.

Some 23 centuries ago Aristotle observed that once a society adopts a democratic form of constitution, it becomes inevitable that sooner or later the majority, who are poor, will use their voting strength to get economic benefits from the few, who are rich. The societies of which he was speaking were cities, but his observation was profound, and applies also on our present global scale.

Nationally, the political law which Aristotle pointed out has led to the development of the welfare state in the democracies of the