

of Freedom. On the contrary, the investigation extends to "any problem related thereto". I suggest that it would not be possible or practical to restrict the investigation. The country is entitled to a study of the problem in its entirety and within its complete context. We know, for example, that there has been a considerable degree of assimilation in so far as the majority of Doukhobors are concerned. We should have the fullest information about this assimilation, particularly with respect to the factors which have aided or fostered the events which have enabled thousands of Doukhobors to live at peace both with their neighbours and with constituted authority. Perhaps there are lessons to be learned, and perhaps not. We should know whether there are or are not.

Through an historical approach we could discover whether the overall problem may be expected ultimately to resolve itself or, at any rate, what sort of approach would be most calculated to expedite such a resolution. We have to ask ourselves quite honestly and firmly: have we approached the problem with intelligence and understanding? Have we dealt harshly or unfairly with the Doukhobors? Have we been treating symptoms or have we searched, as good diagnosticians should, for the root cause of the ailment, if such it be? Or, in a lawyer's phrase, have we sought out the mischief before applying the remedy?

The committee would, I should think, have to seek out the philosophical, spiritual and religious bases for the continued refusal of the more radical Doukhobors to obey the law or, as they might put it, to "accede to the demands of the secular authority". There might have to be a massive reappraisal of what is really meant by "freedom of religion" or "freedom of worship".

In making this motion, I would hope that its adoption would be welcomed by all those immediately concerned: by the federal and provincial authorities who are faced with the problem from day to day, by the thousands of Doukhobors who have found safe and happy havens in Canada, and by those who have not.

The investigation would indeed be abortive if it were regarded by the Sons of Freedom themselves as just another attempt by constituted authority to beat them down. The object should be, and I am sure it would be, to acquire a real understanding of their problems with a view to helping them to find a solution.

Honourable senators, it has been well said that the deeper the cut the longer it takes to heal. The problems with which the committee must deal go back a long way in

Canadian history, and beyond that into the Caucasus, and beyond that again into the Crimea, back to Peter Veregin, the Elder, and to Tolstoy himself.

It is interesting to note that the novel *Resurrection* was written by Tolstoy in defence of the Doukhobors. He assigned part of the royalties to the Doukhobors, and some of that money was used to bring them to this country. There cannot be any glib or sudden panacea or cure-all for something so deep-rooted, nor should the Senate committee be expected to provide one. If it is necessary for the committee to continue its work beyond the present session, so be it.

It may be that some honourable senators will feel that we should have a joint committee with the other place. I would welcome that. Perhaps some arrangements could be made to have provincial representatives, as well as Freedomites and orthodox Doukhobors, as observers and consultants. I welcome your views on this very perplexing problem. I hope this resolution will be thoroughly debated and, in the end, accepted.

In the face of all that has happened in the past sixty years, we are in honour bound to try our hand at finding a solution. The problem involves directly only a small portion of the Canadian people, but we are all involved because the question of liberty is at stake.

The district of Kent passed an emergency bylaw that prevents the Freedomites from entering their area, and the police have put up a roadblock. I for one do not intend to put any roadblocks in their way. I am not going to say any more about that, although I had some harsh things to say about the bylaw. The matter is now before the courts, and I think it would be improper for me to make any further comment.

Honourable senators, I think the Senate is well suited to conduct such an inquiry as is proposed. I say this despite my brief experience in the Senate but knowing something of its long history. There could be no question of the independence or fairmindedness of such a committee. It would have no axe to grind. It would not be a committee of the Government seeking ways and means of thwarting the legitimate aspirations of a group of Canadian citizens.

The Senate has a distinguished history in the field of human rights and fundamental freedoms. Here I bow to the honourable senator from Toronto-Trinity (Hon. Mr. Roebuck) who was responsible for conducting investigations in other years before we had our Bill of Rights. If this motion passes, the Senate will have a further opportunity to add distinction to its long record in this regard.