

convinced, however, that the remedy lies in further restrictive measures. In Canada we believe that it lies instead in having the courage to permit our people and those engaged in the press, radio and television, to develop within themselves a sense of public responsibility, with which they can best serve the interest and welfare of the community as a whole. To us this is a vital element in the heritage of democracy.

I listened with great interest to the comments of the distinguished representative of Chile when he spoke on this subject on Friday last. He made a number of most useful suggestions. I was also impressed by the statement made by the distinguished representative of Pakistan, and with her comment that some of the amendments which have been proposed relate more appropriately to Article 26 than they do to Article 19.

I have endeavoured, Sir, to outline the point of view on this article of my Delegation, and I shall not take up the time of the Committee to indicate our position on each of the amendments before us. Where we think such amendments will improve the text, or result in an acceptable compromise, we will support them, provided they do not in our opinion prejudice in any way the intention of those who drafted the article, to ensure the basic freedoms set forth in the first two paragraphs. We should not, Sir, lose sight of our basic objective in our endeavours, however worthy, to prohibit licence.

The Canadian Prime Minister, the Rt. Hon. John G. Diefenbaker, had this to say in the House of Commons when the Bill of Rights was given its third reading. "The principles of freedom are never final. Freedom is not static. It cannot be fixed for all time. It either grows or it dies. It grows when the people of a country have it in their hearts and demand that it shall be preserved. I would be the last to