

the Government, he helped to establish, and through which he helped to fashion Canada's activities in the developing world, and to develop a Canadian expertise, and the expertise of other countries, in helping others with their problems scientifically. But perhaps most important, honourable senators, he found himself universally accepted as a man of wisdom. He was the friend of many statesmen; a valued adviser.

• (10.10)

There are not many of his stature who can take a true measure of the relative importance of contemporary problems, or who can assess the proper role of the individual human being in society. His self-effacement, gaiety, humanity—these were the elements of his character which enabled him to do so much good with such apparent ease.

On the domestic front Mike Pearson was determined to accomplish as much as he had accomplished in diplomacy. As Prime Minister, his qualities enabled him to weather trying times and to pilot the ship of state without serious mishap. His Prime Ministership was served in an exceedingly difficult period. The circumstances in Parliament and in the country, perhaps understandably, were often hostile to the performance of great acts of domestic statesmanship. It was not like the halcyon days of the fifties when Mike Pearson's talents received full rein in an international climate which was favourable to the exercise of his genius. The domestic problems of the sixties were such that as Prime Minister he had to strive with courage and, as those of us in this chamber who were with him know, with great determination in directing our affairs.

And yet, as the years pass, it is more apparent that he achieved great things—accomplishments which were all the more remarkable given the adverse circumstances under which he laboured. The Canada Pension Plan, his work to maintain national unity, and his flag were milestones in our history. As the years go by I am sure the importance of these steps will be appreciated more and more.

Mike Pearson's reading of our problems of national unity came at a time when there was need for the greatest understanding. The B and B policy, the B and B Commission, the flag—all were sensible measures, and yet they were difficult to achieve and they took courage, as we all recognize wherever we sit. The flag would never have been adopted but for his determination, almost his sole determination, and courage during one of the longest debates in the Commons' history.

He served Canada as Prime Minister at a crucial time in our history. He was frequently and bitterly criticized, as men in the avocation that we have chosen must expect to be. But his diplomatic sense, which so many had praised in the foreign minister and often damned in the Prime Minister, served him and his country well. He had practised diplomacy as the art of compromise, and he appreciated the value of that experience in carrying out his duties as Prime Minister.

History has yet to make a final judgment on Lester Pearson, the Prime Minister. But I am confident that the bench of that most exacting court will rule in his favour. Elsewhere, however, Mike Pearson, the diplomatist,

ambassador, Under-Secretary and Secretary of State for External Affairs, already has been judged by history, and history has awarded its laurels.

His life was devoted to the search for international co-operation and collective ways of seeking the resolution of international problems. And here is to be found, I believe, what could be his greatest achievement.

From 1930 on he advocated his belief in the obligation of Canada as a sovereign state to act on its commitment to collective security. This was inherent, he argued, in the signature we affixed to the Covenant of the League of Nations.

He was a senior adviser at the founding Conference of the United Nations in San Francisco in 1945 at which the Charter of the world organization was signed. Mike never lost faith, as I well know, in the capacity of the UN to provide for an effective application of collective security in due time.

His close association with NATO, as necessary in the interim, was but an alternate expression of this same deep-seated belief. He has written about these matters in the first volume of his memoirs which appeared only recently.

He had been disillusioned with the failure of Canadian governments in the twenties and thirties to give effect to the covenant of the League. Canada had been sought out as an original member of the League of Nations and he felt, rightly or wrongly, that we were not honouring our commitment. He resisted the reluctance of successive governments before the Second World War to accept responsibilities or share them with others in the League.

His commitment to collective ways of resolving conflict dominated his support for the work of the UN, as did his work in establishing the United Nations Works and Rehabilitation Agency, one of the great monuments and efforts of human beings in the field of international charity, and the Food and Agriculture Organization.

No wonder that at two different periods only the veto of one nation prevented his becoming Secretary-General of the United Nations. How well he would have filled that exacting post!

His unremitting zeal was highlighted in his work for peace around the world, his belief in NATO, his unswerving support for the Canadian position in 1955 which broke the five-year deadlock over the admission of new members to the UN and, above all, his role in resolving the Suez crisis and establishing the Emergency Force in the Middle East, which was to earn him, so deservedly, the Nobel Foundation's Peace Prize. It is fitting, perhaps, to recall at this time that Mike's honours also included First World War military service medals, the Order of Canada, and the rarely conferred Order of Merit, which was conferred on him about a year ago by Her Majesty the Queen personally.

Mike Pearson personified Canada's commitment to uphold the integrity of the international system. His idealism in this regard seemed to promote Canada's interests and those of the world community.

I fully share his commitment. His passing must not be seen as the end of our national involvement in the pursuit of this obligation.