

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA
2:30 p.m., Thursday, May 27, 1976

Opening Prayer by Mr. Speaker.

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

MR. SPEAKER: Before we proceed I should like to direct the attention of honourable members to the gallery where we have 36 students, Grade 9 standing, of the Jenpeg School. These students are under the direction of Mrs. Nancy Foster. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Thompson.

Also we have 25 students, Grade 6 standing, of the Columbus School. These students are under the direction of Mrs. Ruth Breckman. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Assiniboia.

We have 29 students Grades 5 and 6 standing of the Collicutt School. These students are under the direction of Mr. Robb. The school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Seven Oaks, Minister of Urban Affairs.

And 48 students, Grade 6 standing of the Madison School, Fargo, N.D., under the direction of Mr. R. Melarvie. On behalf of all the honourable members I welcome you all here today.

Presenting Petitions; Reading and Receiving Petitions; Presenting Reports by Standing and Special Committees; Ministerial Statements and Tabling of Reports; Notices of Motion; Introduction of Bills; Questions. The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

ORAL QUESTIONS

MR. DONALD W. CRAIK (Leader of the Official Opposition) (Riel): Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the House Leader can indicate at this time whether the government plans to bring in legislation still this session with regards to family law.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Mines.

HON. SIDNEY GREEN Q.C. (Minister of Mines, Resources and Environmental Management) (Inkster): Mr. Speaker, there will be a resolution before the House but there will not be a bill for first, second and third readings - to pass a bill. There will be a matter brought before the House but it will not be in the form of a statute.

MR. CRAIK: I wonder, Mr. Speaker, if the House Leader can further indicate whether the government intends to bring in amendments and changes in the form of The Labour Relations Act.

MR. GREEN: Well, Mr. Speaker, that's been indicated.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for River Heights.

MR. SIDNEY SPIVAK, Q.C. (River Heights): Mr. Speaker, my question I would assume would be to the Minister of Industry and Commerce in the absence of the Premier. I wonder if he can indicate whether the government has had any consultation with the Federal Government with respect to the closing of any of the military bases or closing down of a portion of any of the military bases in Manitoba.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Industry and Commerce.

HON. LEONARD S. EVANS (Minister of Industry and Commerce) (Brandon East): Mr. Speaker, not in recent months, no.

MR. SPIVAK: I wonder then if the Minister can indicate whether there has been any indication that the government would provide lead time in the event that there would be either a partial or a full closing of a military base in the province.

MR. EVANS: Well, as the honourable member knows, in years gone by we've had some considerable involvement with the communities involved, particularly the communities of Rivers and Gimli, with respect to the continuance of military bases in those areas. Unfortunately our ability to dissuade the Federal Government from closing those bases seems to be rather limited. We haven't any indication from the Federal Government, Mr. Speaker - at least there's been no formal indication and I haven't any indication personally from any Minister of the Federal Government, particularly the Minister of National Defence, whether we will be given any lead time. But again perhaps the honourable member is assuming a little too much here.

ORAL QUESTIONS

MR. SPIVAK: Recognizing that it is the prerogative of the Federal Government, all I'm concerned about is determining whether there have been any discussions with the Federal Government which would indicate that there would be at least an understanding that lead time would be provided because of dislocation and other factors that would be involved.

MR. EVANS: We've had no indication that there'll be any closure of bases. The suggestion is a good one, but in the past we've had no warning unfortunately, particularly with the CFB Gimli and I think that's very unfortunate.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, a question to the Minister of Health and Social Development. I wonder if he can indicate whether either next week or the week after there will be a meeting of Ministers - this is to the Minister of Health and Social Development - whether he can confirm that there will be a meeting of Ministers to deal with the proposed changes in the Canada Assistance Program. I wonder if he can indicate the timing of the meeting and as well what Manitoba's position will be with respect to the proposals that have been put forward by the Federal Government for changes in the scheme.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health.

HON. LAURENT L. DESJARDINS (Minister of Health and Social Development) (St. Boniface): Mr. Speaker, this certainly will be one of the main reasons to look at the Canada Pension and Quebec Pension, the income supplement and the proposed Social Services Act, but I don't think that at this time I can make the position of Manitoba known. There will be discussion there and we have to have certain flexibility and so on. We feel that - if I may in a word or two - we feel that the Federal Government should at least guarantee that they will pay the same percentage that they are paying now, not leave the provinces with a larger bill.

MR. SPIVAK: I wonder if the Minister can indicate whether he will be attending the meeting with information supplied from the experience of the Mincome program in Manitoba to be able to document and support the positions and requests of Manitoba.

MR. DESJARDINS: No, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Birtle-Russell.

MR. HARRY E. GRAHAM (Birtle-Russell): Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for River Heights.

MR. SPIVAK: I just would ask the Minister, how can you reconcile the continuation of the Mincome program?

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, the question if argumentative. The Honourable Member for Birtle-Russell.

MR. GRAHAM: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have a question for the Attorney-General. I would like to ask the Attorney-General if the Province of Manitoba is now relying entirely on the Federal Government and the activities of the External Affairs Department in attempts to bring Dr. Kasser back to Canada to stand trial.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

HON. HOWARD PAWLEY (Attorney-General) (Selkirk): Mr. Speaker, this has been for some time a concern not only of the Province of Manitoba but also of Canada insofar as the extradition of Dr. Kasser. For some time both Canada and Manitoba have worked together in respect to this question with the Austrian authorities and I wish to say that I am pleased, very pleased that the Minister of Foreign Affairs, the Honourable Mr. MacEachen did raise this matter in Vienna and I'm very satisfied with his efforts there.

MR. GRAHAM: A supplementary question then. Can the Minister indicate what additional activities the Province of Manitoba is carrying on on its own in respect to attempting to get Dr. Kasser back to Canada.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, I thought we went into that in some detail during Estimate review. Legal counsel in Austria, through various legal steps within the State of Tyrol are continuing to proceed through the legal channels and Mr. MacEachen has taken the opportunity when he was in Vienna to pursue it through the diplomatic route.

ORAL QUESTIONS

MR. GRAHAM: A further supplementary question. Is the firm of Gallagher and McGregor still retained by the province acting in this respect or have they obtained new legal advice?

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, I don't know why for a moment the Honourable Member for Birtle-Russell would assume that we had obtained new legal advice. Of course Gallagher and McGregor are still working on behalf of the Crown in the Province of Manitoba. It's a good firm, there is no reason that we would change firms at this stage.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie.

MR. GORDON E. JOHNSTON (Portage la Prairie): Mr. Speaker, I direct my question to the Honourable the Minister of Mines. Is Saunders Aircraft at Gimli in any form of receivership?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Mines.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, the Board of Directors of the MDC are taking steps to take the assets under their debenture security which will result in a receivership. That would be a normal step for them to take. I don't know whether it's been taken yet.

MR. G. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, another question. Could the Minister inform the House whether or not Saunders Aircraft Company owes any substantial amounts of moneys to suppliers that may be considered to be overdue.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, Saunders Aircraft Company has, for a large part, paid bills which would not be the responsibility of a company if it were not for the manner in which the government has chosen to deal with those bills. The MDC will be realizing on their security and I am satisfied that Saunders has done more for their creditors than would normally be the case with another company. There is good reason for that and we indicated that would be done in June when we indicated the termination of the program. I can't tell him whether every account has been paid but I can tell the honourable member that Saunders will exercise its rights under its debenture bond to realize its security, similar to what any other person holding a debenture bond would do.

MR. G. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, could the Minister tell us if the government, through MDC, is guaranteeing payment of any bills still outstanding?

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I believe that Saunders will be fair to its creditors in accordance with the statements I made. I'm not going to make a statement here that will be considered by some a blank cheque that they can get money from the Saunders Aircraft no matter what the state of their account is.

MR. G. JOHNSTON: Could the Minister inform the House as to approximately how much money would be involved in overdue amounts owing?

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, the amount that I projected would be payable in June was \$7 million. That would be the amount that would be necessary to deal with the program that was winding up the company. I believe that affairs of the company, up to the date of now dealing with the assets as they are, would be wound up within that amount.

I want to make it plain, Mr. Speaker, that I am not here saying that I am going to pay or that the government is going to pay or the people of Manitoba are going to pay everybody who says that Saunders Aircraft owes them money. We are going to deal with our accounts in a responsible manner.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health.

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, I am afraid that I might have been a little bit abrupt. I should have explained the question of the Honourable Member for River Heights.

We are not going to this conference with too much experience from Mincome because Mincome has just started and we will not have too much knowledge of how everything went for another couple of years. But if there's something that we learned from Mincome, some part of administration, of course we'll use it.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for River Heights.

MR. SPIVAK: I wonder then if the Minister can indicate whether in the discussions with the Federal Government they have more or less time-tabled the completion and introduction of the new proposals to commence at the beginning of next year, that is the new CAP program.

ORAL QUESTIONS

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, that depends on how soon we can come to arrangements or if the Federal Government, like they've been doing lately, act unilaterally it could come as early as a year from now.

MR. SPIVAK: Well then on the basis of that, I then ask the Minister what's the value of the Mincome Program? --(Interjection)-- On the basis of what he's just said, what is the value of the Mincome Program?

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, when this Mincome Program was started, at the request I think of the Federal Government, we couldn't foresee everything that was happening; we couldn't see the economic condition we'd have in Canada also. It could be that things could be changed or modified in a year or so, or two years. It's not going to destroy the whole plan. That is only part of it. The Social Services Act doesn't deal only with Mincome or guaranteed income.

MATTER OF PRIVILEGE

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Consumer, Corporate and Internal Services.

HON. IAN TURNBULL (Minister of Consumer, Corporate and Internal Services) (Osborne): I rise, Mr. Speaker, on a matter of privilege. In today's Free Press there was an article indicating that rent control in this province and stabilization in this province would cost \$11 per unit. That calculation of \$11.00 per unit, Sir, is based on a figure in the Free Press report of 50,000 rental units in the Province of Manitoba. I do not know where the reporter got the 50,000 unit figure. It may be based on the Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation's inadequate survey of rental units in the province. They estimate some 50,000 units, but that number excludes all apartments of six units or less and it excludes triplexes and duplexes and rooming houses and all that kind of rental accommodation. So that if you took all this accommodation that would normally be included in a survey of rental accommodation, the figure of rental units, the number of rental units in Manitoba would be approximately 100,000. That would mean, Sir, that the cost per unit for rent control would be in the neighborhood of \$5.00. That, Sir, would indicate a 100 percent margin of error in the Free Press report.

ORAL QUESTIONS cont'd

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day. The Honourable Member for Arthur.

MR. J. DOUGLAS WATT (Arthur): Mr. Speaker, I direct a question to the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources. I'm sorry I didn't give the Minister notice of this question but I wonder if the Minister could indicate if lands acquired by the government for wildlife management have been leased for grazing purposes in the last six months.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Mines.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I believe that that would fall either under the Minister of Renewable Resources or the Minister of Agriculture, but I will take the question as notice.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, I direct a question to the Attorney-General. I wonder in view of the shortage of Crown Prosecutors he's facing in his department if he might find a job there for the Member for Birtle-Russell.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General. Order please.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, if I didn't sense opposition from within our back bench I would gladly concur so that I can get him away from being my critic across the way.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health.

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I could have leave to table an Order for Return.

MR. SPEAKER: Could the Honourable Minister have leave? (Agreed)

REPLY TO AN ORDER FOR RETURN

MR. DESJARDINS: An Order for Return No. 55, dated Monday, May 3rd, on the motion of the Honourable Member for Ste. Rose.

ORAL QUESTIONS cont'd

MR. DESJARDINS: While I'm on my feet, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to answer a question asked of me by the Honourable Member from Rhineland. He was talking about the 1.3 million in the appropriation for Community Outreach Program. I think my honourable friend was referring to part of the department, financed by the department which was covered in my Estimates at the time.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Radisson.

COMMITTEE SUBSTITUTIONS

MR. HARRY SHAFRANSKY (Radisson): Mr. Speaker, by leave I wish to make a substitution. Substitute the name of the Honourable Minister of Urban Affairs for the name of the Honourable Member for Churchill on Economic Development Committee which is meeting tonight at 8 o'clock.

MR. SPEAKER: Agreed? (Agreed) The Honourable Minister of Mines, the House Leader.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

MR. GREEN: Yes, Mr. Speaker. Would you proceed to the Order Paper please.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you. Orders for Return. The Honourable Member for Wolseley is absent.

Adjourned Debates on Second Reading. Bill No. 54 - the Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. L.R. (Bud) SHERMAN (Fort Garry): Stand, Mr. Speaker? (Agreed)

BILL NO. 56 - THE FOREIGN CULTURAL OBJECTS IMMUNITY FROM SEIZURE ACT

MR. SPEAKER: Bill No. 56 - the Honourable Member for La Verendrye. The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. HARRY J. ENNS (Lakeside): Mr. Speaker, I wonder by leave of the House if I have permission to speak on Bill 56, recognizing that the bill will remain standing in the name of the Member for La Verendrye.

Mr. Speaker, I feel compelled to speak partly prodded by members of the Fourth Estate who have given this bill some particular note and indeed have noted the fact that, will this bill ever carry on in the debate since the time of its initial introduction. I remind you, Mr. Speaker, that that introduction took place some time ago.

The introduction of the bill itself is worthy of some note, Mr. Speaker, in the sense that it was introduced without question as a government bill. Then a period of time was allowed to elapse and then, perhaps with it coming to a slow burn or a slow boil on the back burner of somebody's oven, the thought came to the government to take the Whips off on this occasion and make this a free vote on this bill. I just make that comment in passing because many things about this bill should be noted.

One of the other things, Mr. Speaker, of course that I noted about this bill is just the mere number, Bill 56. I need not remind any members of my caucus that that conjures up images of past battles lost that had to do with a matter of freedom of choice and basic and fundamental freedoms. But again, Mr. Speaker, I just put that into the record that it's with a touch of irony that the government chose to number this bill as being Bill 56. --(Interjection)-- We had thought perhaps, as the Member for Morris suggested, that that number would be worthy of retirement like No. 9 of Gordie Howe fame. But however I suppose ever since Gordie Howe came back to the World Hockey

BILL 56

(MR. ENNS cont'd) Association and never did retire the government has every right to continue with the use of Bill 56 as a numbered bill.

Mr. Speaker, let not the easy manner of my approach or opening to this bill lull the honourable members opposite to rest. I do want to speak with some sincerity and some feeling about the bill before us. I say, Mr. Speaker, that the bill is wrought with confusion, confusion of basic principles that are contained in the bill and it's just a very short bill. There are a lot of herrings, Mr. Speaker, and I won't even say red herrings put in our path - just simply herrings - that are confusing the issue before us. I choose to divide my remarks on this bill in two parts and I'll deal with the part that I am perhaps most concerned about first.

That is, Mr. Speaker, that I am being asked for the first time, Mr. Speaker, in my approaching eight or nine years of public office to knowingly, conscientiously pass a piece of legislation in this Chamber that will restrict, curtail and take away some pretty fundamental rights that my constituents presently enjoy, that my constituents presently enjoy. I've never been asked to do that before, Mr. Speaker. I doubt, Mr. Speaker, whether any other legislator in this building has ever been asked to do that before in the history of the Province of Manitoba. We are being asked to do that on this occasion. Mr. Speaker, I want to underline that point because it's a very, very major concern that I have with this bill.

Mr. Speaker, before I get on to the substance matter of my remarks on this bill, let me assure you, Mr. Speaker, that despite some of the advance publicity surrounding this bill and indeed my own interpretation of the bill, that it should be made abundantly clear to you and other members of this House that it is not a position that I take because I have not been able to come to grips with the real world or to realize that Russia exists and the Soviet Union exists and it's there. Mr. Speaker, I'm quite prepared to acknowledge the fact that when a Russian hockey team comes and plays in this country that I, along with hundreds of thousands of other Canadians and North Americans, recognize that we're probably seeing sport entertainment of the highest calibre that the international community can afford and I enjoy it and I support it, whether it's the ballet that comes to visit us from time to time - polite comments can be made; whether it's the Red Army Chorus that wants to sing to me and I have some affinity for male chorus singing. I usually buy a ticket and want to listen to them.

Mr. Speaker, I'll even go one step further and in a very personal way, you might say, to say that just this past weekend I've sent my wife and all my in-laws on what you might call a personal cultural exchange program to Russia and she's there right now. Well now, Mr. Chairman, I realize that less charitable persons may not consider that as a cultural exchange program but just as one hell of a way of getting rid of one's in-laws for awhile. I leave that to be judged by members in the Chamber. What I'm trying to say, Mr. Speaker, that there is not in me that kind of a stiff and unalterably opposed position with respect to all things that emanate out of the USSR.

But I do come back to the point that I started to make, that I am being asked by that particular government to take an action that to me is unusual, to me is unique and quite frankly, Mr. Speaker, to me is repugnant. Mr. Speaker, I am well aware that as the bill was introduced and undoubtedly as other speakers to follow will continue on, they will describe the nature of the subject matter before us as being a question of the acknowledgment of international art, world art. They will indicate to us that this art has no national boundaries; that all museums of stature, all art of stature, has questionable backgrounds as to its origins, as to its present possessors and how they came by it. Mr. Speaker, none of this is relevant to the bill before us. I take no quarrel with the excellence of the art that is being talked about in this particular instance; I take no quarrel with the fact that art of this nature over the period of time, over history, has come into the possession of people and governments as a result of wars, revolutions, plunder, what-have-you and that art is indeed, this kind of art, the only force of law really is perhaps the force of possession, possession being nine-tenths of the law. One really doesn't quarrel with that too much.

BILL 56

(MR. ENNS cont'd)

Mr. Speaker, it's in this context that I should remind honourable members opposite that to this day the people of India, the government of India, claims half the Crown jewels of the United Kingdom Government. But, Mr. Speaker, I also remind the members of this House that the British Government is not that insensitive; it is not that callous, has not that presumptuous gall that it would ask an Indian House of Parliament to pass a law of the type that we are being asked to pass. Furthermore they don't parade those particular treasures which are still open to claim or to suspect in the country of their origin.

Mr. Speaker, I'm told that from the heady times of the British Colonial Empire that they claim - and with lack of discretion - some of the priceless treasures taken out of Greece, now residing in London museums, and Egypt, still have claim laid to them by their respective home governments. But, Mr. Speaker, again, the British Government would not be that insensitive to ask the Egyptian or the Grecian government to pass this kind of legislation much less parade their own art in front of them and ask Greek Governments or Egyptian Governments to pass this kind of legislation which would say, now having stolen it from you some years ago, we now will add salt to the wound of injury and ask you to pass a law that will deny your citizens their rights to lay claim to any of those treasures. No, Mr. Speaker, that isn't being done in the international community of art by other governments. Mr. Speaker, for the very first time this kind of a request is being made of us.

I am well aware, Mr. Speaker, that members opposite aren't all that prone to hold up the United States as a model of decorum to follow. The United States Congress has passed an Act with respect to this particular exhibit, an Act word for word the same as the one that's being presented in this Chamber. But, Mr. Speaker, the United States, as is the USSR, the two super world powers in this world, in the grander design of things when big and important peoples in governments get together and arrangements are made, I want to indicate to you that it's my doubt - indeed I've done some checking with the Embassy in Washington and in Ottawa - that a debate of this nature never took place in the American Congress. It was part and parcel of an overall cultural exchange program that was agreed to at the very highest of levels at summit conferences where in a spirit of detente this kind of an arrangement was arrived at, both in recognition of the American Bi-Centennial celebrations and in fact the effort to be made by these two super powers to bring about a lessening of tensions between these two countries.

Well, Mr. Speaker, my main concern then is the question that I am being asked. Let me be very specific and very clear. I am being asked by the Secretary of the Communist Party of Russia, I believe that is a fair statement to make, because in that country of course the important position is not a position that one should forget. It is the Party and the Party is the Communist Party and it is he who runs the Communist Party of that country that runs the country. So, Mr. Speaker, it is the Secretary of the Communist Party of Russia that is asking me to deny my constituents a basic and fundamental right, namely the right to due process of law, due process through the courts.

Mr. Speaker, I am well aware that the request to view the exhibit was made by our country, it was made by our Art Gallery and it's understandable. It's a noteworthy international exhibit. But, Mr. Speaker, let's be very clear on this. It is the Russian Government; it is the Communist bosses of Moscow that are telling us to pass this piece of legislation and nobody else. Not the Art Gallery and nobody else. They are placing the demand; they are placing condition on it; they are asking for this legislation. Quite frankly, Mr. Speaker, I don't mind at all standing up and indicating to my constituents that I'm not prepared to click my heels and bow when Comrade Brezhnev asks me to pass legislation that inhibits my rights and inhibits the rights of my constituents, that inhibits the rights of all the citizens in Manitoba. If this government wishes to go on record as doing that, then of course they are welcome to do that.

I would appeal first and foremost to my own members in my own caucus, to my Acting Leader, to reconsider his position on this bill. I ask members of my caucus who have second thoughts about this bill, who have on other occasions expressed

BILL 56

(MR. ENNS cont'd) pretty concerned points of view on this matter whether or not they cannot accept my arguments as being clear and as being fundamentally correct as to the nature of the bill. Mr. Speaker, it is Mr. Brezhnev from Moscow that is asking us to pass this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I indicated to you that there has been two aspects of the bill. --(Interjection)-- Mr. Speaker, I detect a little nervousness on the parts of some of the members opposite, Mr. Speaker, I want to say that there is the other side of the bill and that is the emotional bill. Mr. Speaker, my friend and colleague, the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources, has on occasion, I think publicly and certainly privately, indicated to me that we do all too often and in most instances allow our emotional or our heartfelt feelings to govern us in our basic and kind of fundamental approach to matters of principle that we are asked to deal with from time to time in this Chamber. I accept that position as being fundamentally correct.

We are being told, Mr. Speaker, that there is no room in this kind of an argument for the kind of political feelings or the kind of re-fighting of past revolutions or the introduction of ideology in politics into this kind of a debate. It's art for art's sake. We should not be denying Manitobans this once in a lifetime opportunity to view this outstanding art exhibit and we should be looking at it from that point of view. Well, Mr. Speaker, I can accept that as I accept Russian hockey, as I accept Russian ballet, as I accept Russian music or whatever. But that's not the question.

I am being asked to do something different in this instance. I am being asked to stand up here, knowingly and conscientiously to deny my constituents certain rights. That makes it a different ball game, Mr. Speaker. Unless you think, Mr. Speaker, that emotions do not colour the picture - I would ask for instance of the Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie, if history had taken a different course and if in fact we were now dealing with a regime, repugnant as it would be to us, headed by the former Nazi government of Germany and if, knowing as I know, that the Member from Portage la Prairie along with many other men and women, better men and women than I, I might say, that fought for certain freedoms of his generation for us and who subsequently languished years in German imprisonment camps, would he be that quick to support a bill if the request came from Herman Goering or Mr. Goebbels. I think not, Mr. Speaker, I think not.

Mr. Speaker, is there anybody in this Chamber or anybody in the members of the Fourth Estate that can tell me honestly that if the present military rulers of Chili felt for obvious reasons - they have reason to feel - that their public relations could do with a little bit of dusting up and were considering the sending of an exhibit of their national art treasures to our museum, would the Attorney-General of this government be putting forward a bill on behalf of the Chilean Government, present Chilean Government of this nature? Would they do it? Well now, Mr. Chairman, I know the honourable members opposite better than they know themselves if they chirp to me and they suggest that they would do it. And do you know why I know that?

Mr. Speaker, on much less momentous occasions we have been asked, we have been asked by members of this government not to drink South African wine. Why? Because we disagree. We disagree with the kind of domestic policy that they have on racial matters in that country and we put it off the shelves of our Liquor Commission. Not that South Africa has ever done something fundamentally and basically wrong to us. We haven't been at war with South Africa. As a matter of fact South Africa was our last ally in the last war. But, Mr. Speaker, correctly we are affronted. We are affronted by the actions of the South African Government and so we take a particular way to choose to demonstrate that affrontation. And we do that.

Mr. Speaker, it wasn't so long ago that I could recognize individual ministers of the government leading parades, telling us to boycott the eating of California grapes because we believed that there was unfair labour practice taking place with respect to the harvesting of that.

Mr. Speaker, I believe continuing to this day, supported by the New Democratic Party of this province, we are told to boycott Kraft cheese because we think that the economic policies of Kraft cheese, their buying policies, their manner of dealing with

BILL 56

(MR. ENNS cont'd) dairy farmers in Ontario is repugnant to the government.

Mr. Speaker, all I point out is that this government has shown - and I don't single out this government - we have shown on different occasions for different reasons, different ways of demonstrating a feeling of opposition to what is happening in other countries, in other lands. So before you are too quick to suggest to me, Mr. Speaker, that this bill would be coming forward at the request of General Comolosa Mondeos of Chile, I would suggest that that is whispering in the wind. That is whispering in the wind, Mr. Speaker, because that bill would not be before us if it came from that direction.

Mr. Speaker, it leads me to at least unburden myself of a brief history lesson to honourable members opposite because you know, the example that I choose about Chile happens to be very apt in mind concept and I believe not all that inconsistent with the facts of history. The fact of the matter is that the present government that is asking us to pass this legislation and the present Government of Chile have one thing in common. They both are responsible for the snuffing out of a democratic government.

Mr. Speaker, history distorts the facts. One is led to believe that the present rulers of Russia were instrumental with the downfall of the autocratic Czarist regime which is of course garbage. The Czar abdicated in late February. There then was, for a brief period of time, an opportunity for the great country of Russia to be led by a social democratic government under Kerensky. My father was a social democrat and I'm proud of that and supported that cause. Under the most difficult circumstances, under the most difficult circumstances at a time the country was at war, not unlike the situation that, for instance, you found in Chile where you had a foreign country sending in agents to subvert this government - in this case I suppose it would be the CIA in Chili - but in this instance, the 1917, 1918 it was the German Government who was after all at war with Russia that sent in, paid for, Lenin and his group of Bolsheviks to subvert the struggling, fledgling social democratic government that attempted to bring democracy to Russia after the fall of the Czar.

Winston Churchill described it thus, Mr. Speaker. "The German leaders," said Winston Churchill, "turned upon Russia the most gristly of all records. They transported Lenin in a sealed truck like a plague of . . . from Switzerland into Russia." Mr. Speaker, yes, I speak with a great deal of emotion about the regime that was foisted upon Russia at that time, a regime that made Adolf Hitler's camps look like a Sunday School. Where 20 millions of peoples, conservatively estimated, died, among them my own immediate family put to the wall and shot. The most oppressive regime this world has ever seen. Ironically, Mr. Speaker, a regime - particularly if we're dealing with the cultural matters - a regime that hasn't got the dignity to allow in matters of literature, matters of culture, when individuals surface through that oppressive regime and win world acclaim such as Nobel prizes, this government can't allow their own citizens the dignity of achieving that and receiving that world acclaim.

This government, Mr. Speaker, this government has the presumptuous gall, the audacity to ask me to stand up in this House and ask my constituents to waive, to lay aside a fundamental right, the right of due process of law. Mr. Speaker, to use a phrase that was introduced during this session by the House Leader, I say, it isn't fair. I say it's not fighting fair to ask anyone of us to pass this kind of legislation. It's not fair on the part of the Art Gallery to put us in this kind of a position. I say it's presumptuous gall on the part of the Soviet Union to demand it and I ask the Honourable the Attorney-General not to force any of us to vote for or against this bill but I ask him to withdraw it. I ask him to withdraw it.

Because, Mr. Speaker, you know six months after the exhibit has come and gone, Political Science students will correctly ask us: what is this piece of legislation doing on our books? Five years from now it's going to be on our books; ten years from now it's going to be on our books.

Mr. Speaker, it's bad legislation, it's a bad precedent.

Speaking to precedents, let's imagine, Mr. Speaker, for a moment - and we're looking forward to the next visit by the International Russian Hockey Team, this September I understand - now let's assume for a moment that they felt a little ruffled

BILL 56

(MR. ENNS cont'd) by some of the bad press they received the last visit they were here. After all we found out that it isn't only Gordie Howe that's got elbows, the Russians do a pretty good job at spearing and winging their elbows about. Indeed if they don't like the way the refs call the game they go into a snit and they go right off the ice for a little while and pout about it for a while. Now this may have upset my Russian colleagues, I don't know. But let's assume that as a condition for their coming back to play us this September they put the condition down that they're after all not used to the freedom of the press that we have in this country, that they would ask as a precondition that all press reports had to be cleared through a Russian press officer. Can you imagine for one moment that any one of those honourable gentlemen . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Would the honourable gentleman face the microphone so we can transcribe what he is saying.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, much of what I'm saying I'm not particularly worried whether it's being transcribed for posterity. I'm speaking to my colleagues with whom I'm in a desperate battle for their emotions, for their votes and pleading for them to vote in a particular way on a bill. Now whether Hansard records me or doesn't, it is really of little consequence.

I was saying - to the Honourable Member for Morris - that I doubt very much whether any members of the Fourth Estate would that willingly give up their long held, long cherished freedom of the press for a matter of expediency simply if it were conditional about whether or not the Russians could come and play hockey here or not. I doubt it very much. I've tested this question out on a few individual members. The response was negative. But yet, Sir, we as lawmakers of this province are being asked, being lobbied by another group who are saying, "Look, just for a little while waive your principles - they're not that important after all - and pass this bill."

What is the effect of the bill, Mr. Speaker, in conclusion if I may? What we are really doing in this instance, we are transferring fundamental rights over to the Cabinet as I read the bill. They will decide from time to time when it is a fundamental right that citizens of Manitoba have due process of law accorded to them. That I understand is the nature of the bill.

If an exhibit, cultural exhibit of some kind comes to this country, the Cabinet will gather I suppose in our new MIA surroundings, dining room and so on to decide, well is this a matter where we withdraw or withhold or grant to the citizens of Manitoba their fundamental rights. Mr. Speaker, it's bad legislation; it's repugnant legislation and I ask the Attorney-General to consider most seriously the withdrawal of this legislation.

I'm not at all satisfied, Mr. Speaker, that all attempts have been made to bring the art exhibit under question to us under a different means. I think, Mr. Speaker, it's an affront to us to be asked to pass this legislation. I know of not a single person that would lay claim to any of the art treasures named. I don't believe, Mr. Speaker, that any seizure would take place.

Secondly, knowing the liberalness of our course I know for certain not a court in the country of Canada would uphold such a claim. Mr. Speaker, surely we can't be serious that somebody's going to walk through the art exhibit and say, "You know, I think my uncle had that picture some time back so I'm going to lay claim to that \$1 million Rembrandt." That's just not going to happen, Mr. Speaker. So again, Mr. Speaker, I say it's an affront to our whole system of justice.

Mr. Speaker, it's quite understandable from where the request comes. That government that is asking us doesn't have an understanding for the kind of rights, for the kind of fundamental things that I'm speaking about. They have managed to snuff that out over the past 50 years.

So, Mr. Speaker, I appeal to you, Sir, who after all also have a role as a lawmaker of this province. I appeal to all other 56 members who are here by the grace of our constituents to do what, Mr. Speaker? To curtail, to rescind, to cut back on our rights? Or to preserve and to protect them. Indeed, Mr. Speaker, if I want to turn my attention again more directly on my own party, certainly that of the

BILL 56

(MR. ENNS cont'd). . . . Conservatives, the Progressive Conservative Party, it's a position that we enunciate on every occasion we can, to expand the individual rights of our citizens, not to curtail them. I address myself briefly to the Liberal members of this party who have, with some degree of significance during this session, talked a great deal about expanding the rights of the individuals in our society whether it's involving information or other pieces of legislation. Yet, Mr. Speaker, we are so easily set about to bandy away a very fundamental right. Mr. Speaker, it's repugnant to me and, Mr. Speaker, I for one at least will not click my heels and bow to attention when Comrade Brezhnev asked me to do so.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Public Works.

HON. RUSSELL DOERN (Minister of Public Works)(Elmwood): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I don't want to spend my time rebutting the speech of the Honourable Member for Lakeside other than to say I find it very difficult to fathom his objections for a man who is so engrossed in the Conservative ideology and in the ideology of democracy and one who feels that any association of any kind with the Soviet Union is harmful to suddenly admit that his entire family is visiting the Soviet Union and pouring thousands of dollars into the coffers of the State and into the hands of the very same Secretary of the Communist Party that he so despises. I find it very difficult to fathom. He also did admit that he did not believe that there was a single individual that will come forward and attempt to lay a claim to one of these paintings in his exhibition. He repeatedly spoke about his constituents and their rights and their attitudes, etc., and how these were being denied the passage of this legislation.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I may make one or two passing references but I intend to put the case in favour of the bill. I do so as an individual member of this House and I think perhaps for the first time in my career in the Legislature I can honestly and openly appeal to members of the opposite side, because I speak to them as one of their colleagues as well as the Member for Lakeside, since this is not a party vote. I have the same rights as he has in appealing to each and every member of this House to consider the merits of this particular bill and I think that they are overwhelming in favour of the legislation.

The purpose of the bill is not to permit the Soviet Union and the Soviet Union alone to exhibit art objects in our province but it is to enable any foreign government, depending on certain conditions as laid out, to exhibit cultural objects in our province. I believe that each and every MLA should support the legislation to enable the people of Manitoba the opportunity of seeing these valuable, rare, priceless foreign cultural objects in Winnipeg and Manitoba both now and in the future.

You know some people are fortunate, Mr. Speaker. Those who have the financial ability to travel abroad to visit the countries of Western Europe and Asia and other places on the globe, they have the financial means to be able to see firsthand the cultural objects, the cultural treasures, the inheritance of the civilization firsthand. They can go to the great museums of Paris and London, Rome, Vienna and they can spend hours and hours and weeks and months looking at the heritage mainly of Western civilization but in some cases of Eastern and African as well.

I am one of those who has a particular interest in the cultural area and I know that many of my counterparts across the way have similar interests and also support with some enthusiasm the endeavours of the community and Winnipeg and Manitoba that attempts to bring to our province some of the finest cultural objects in the world. In 1972 for example, Mr. Speaker, I spent I guess about four or five days in Vienna, and if anybody wanted to see some of the finest cultural objects in the world they could not do better than to go to that particular city. If you want to see a painting by Rembrandt, which I think most of us would be most impressed if the Winnipeg Art Gallery had one Rembrandt, if you wanted to see Rembrandts in Vienna you can be shown through a room full of Rembrandts. If you are interested in the painting of Rubens, who painted in gigantic size and with all sorts of interesting romantic themes, if you want to see Rubens you can go to the Rubens room and look at maybe 10, 15, or 20, 30 paintings by him. If you are interested in glass, they have rooms full of glass. If you are interested in wood sculpture going back to the middle ages and beyond you can spend you time there.

(MR. DOERN cont'd)

I found one particular exhibit very interesting where they had a place called the Treasury or something like that, where they had the costumes of heralds from medieval times, the robes of Charlemagne and all sorts of crowns that dated back many centuries. That is what is available to people who live in those centres of Western Europe steeped in culture and people who are tourists, who can afford to go there and spend some time.

I also, Mr. Speaker, in 1967 paid a visit to Paris and spent a day at the palace at Versailles. One of the most interesting things there was that the French tour guide who led a particular group that I was involved in, pointed out that much of the furniture in Versailles had been sold after the Revolution by the succeeding governments - I guess I would have to defer to some of my colleagues who are more steeped in history than I - but the succeeding governments after the Revolution of 1789, I suppose there was the Napoleonic regime and the re-establishments and so on but somewhere in between the furniture had been sold off for cash or because they didn't want a reminder of the previous royalty. And where was that furniture today? Where was the furniture that had once filled the rooms and ballrooms in the Palace of Versailles? Much of it was in England and some of it, as a matter of fact, was in the possession of the British Royal family. I think it would be extremely unlikely that the French Government would either demand that that furniture be returned or that they would ask that it be sent around on exhibit for their own people to examine. I'm sure that they perhaps had attempted to buy it but that in most cases it simply wasn't for sale and wasn't for examination.

One of the most interesting historic cases was the Elgin marbles and I think this was already referred to by the Honourable Member for Lakeside, where an Englishman, Lord Elgin, somewhere - I guess in the early 1800s - secured permission from the Turks to remove Greek antiquities. Between 1803 - I'm now reading from the Encyclopedia Britannica - between 1803 and 1812 his great collection of sculptures taken chiefly from the Parthenon at Athens was brought to England and became the subject of violent controversy. Elgin was denounced as dishonest and a rapacious vandal notably by Lord Byron while the quality of his acquisitions, later regarded as exceptional, was questioned. In 1810 he published a memorandum defending his actions and judgment on the recommendation of a Parliamentary Committee which also vindicated Elgin's conduct. The marbles were bought by the nation in 1816 for 35,000 pounds, considerably below their value according to Elgin, and deposited in the British Museum where they remain on view.

Of course all of us know that most museums have in their possession fine collections of Egyptian sculpture and art, Greek, Roman, etc., and do these exhibitions travel, Mr. Speaker? Are they put on display throughout the world? Are they shipped and trucked and displayed for all to see? No way. They stay put. These treasures are kept in these museums and they are never moved because I suppose of the danger of challenge and also I suppose because of the danger of inflaming the passions of some of the citizens and nationals in those particular countries.

Recently, there was a major exhibition which was announced to the world as a major archeological find and that was in China. There was an exhibition, I guess everyone was aware of it but some of us followed it. This was with some very interesting and ancient sculpture, with some jade suits and other priceless possessions which had just been unearthed, I suppose, in the last decade by the Chinese Government. Typically this exhibition was brought to North America, sent to Toronto and then exhibited in a number of cities in the United States including San Francisco. Were they offered to Winnipeg or did they come to Winnipeg under any conditions? No. Typically they were offered and presented in the major museums of North America. Although we have a very fine Art Gallery and we have a very excellent museum we cannot at this point rival, we cannot compete with the well established and well endowed and older museums of North America. It is extremely difficult for us to be able to be considered even, when it comes to major exhibitions.

Now the Hermitage in Leningrad was first made known to me I guess some 15 years ago, I recall some series of articles in Life Magazine showing the possessions of the Hermitage which maybe were more or less photographed for the first time or widely displayed in North American coloured photographs, etc. A lot of this art was acquired

BILL 56

(MR. DOERN cont'd). . . . many centuries ago. Apparently the museum was started by Peter the Great and most of the acquisitions, some several thousand paintings, were purchased by Catherine the Great. Then of course there would undoubtedly have been acquisitions with the Revolution which we are all familiar with when I guess the government seized the personal possessions, particularly in terms of painting and jewels, etc., of people throughout the country. Sixty years ago that was done. Perhaps some more was acquired in World War II. But that was not unique, Mr. Speaker.

It may be regrettable and it certainly is unfortunate for any individual involved but the whole history of art is full of forgeries, it's replete with theft, and it is very common that paintings and art works are looted at wartime and that has gone on in our century as it has in previous centuries.

I'm sure that if someone can come forward and make a claim to a painting, a claim to an Old Master for example, someone else can come forward and show that that painting was stolen from a monastery 100 years before. So to claim ownership, to put an imprint that that is my family painting and we have had it in our family for 100 years, the painting is 300 or 400 years old, it may be very difficult indeed to establish that particular ownership.

The Director of the Art Gallery, Mr. Selby, injected one of the rare notes of humour in this debate, because I think most of us take it seriously. I think my honourable friend the Member for Lakeside does take this seriously and I certainly do. --(Interjection)-- Right.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Order please.

MR. DOERN: The Director of the Art Gallery said that it would be very beneficial if the exhibition came so that we could have a look at it and see whether that particular painting might have come from the old family collection. I know that if this exhibition comes I'm certainly going to go and carefully scrutinize some of the art work to see if there's any resemblance, for instance, between the Member for Lakeside and the "Laughing Cavalier" by Franz Hals. Or look for little stamps on the pictures that say "Property of the Enns Family" or somebody else that we might know. There might be some give-aways as to ultimate ownership.

So the obvious result of the fact that much of this art has been acquired either in wartime or in dispute or, as I say, many forgeries have been evident for centuries, I think that it is clear that the tendency of nations is not to exhibit their arts, not to take their collections out of their countries and send them on display. Certainly no nation will exhibit where there is a danger of challenge either to tie up a collection or to tie up one particular portion of it. It's absolutely out of the question.

Now the Honourable Member for Lakeside repeatedly said that the Soviet Government was demanding certain legislation and the Soviet Government was demanding this and demanding that, and he wasn't going to bow to the Secretary-General of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union. Very dramatic stuff, Mr. Speaker, very dramatic. But I would like to tell him, I would like to point out that the exhibition was asked, it was a request of the Federal Government in Ottawa to the Soviet Union --(Interjection)--

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. DOERN: We heard your speech, Mr. Speaker, if I could have the floor. It was a request of the Federal Government because the exhibition has been in the United States for the past year. Now I don't know all the cities. I've heard which cities, I don't know if I can recall them, but apparently the exhibition was about a month in the National Gallery in Chicago, in Houston, in San Francisco, etc., there were about half a dozen cities. It was because of legislation passed in 1965 on cultural exchanges and other matters that this was under that particular umbrella. Well, we have our cultural exchanges, and so on. Why this wasn't included or why it isn't included, I don't know. But we have had similar exchanges with the Soviet Union, maybe not in this particular area, all consistent with previous legislation and previous actions.

So, as I say, the exhibition has spent about a year in a country which is not particularly noted for kneeling to the Soviet Union, the United States. Then it is now in Mexico City, one city in Mexico, Mexico City the capital, and apparently the Mexican

BILL 56

(MR. DOERN cont'd). . . . Government passed similar legislation so that the exhibition will be there. From Mexico City and all these major American centres the exhibition may come to Winnipeg. Then after that it may go to Toronto or to Montreal.

Mr. Speaker, one of the points about art that has always concerned me and perplexed me was this question of what do you do in a city of this size and a province this size in attempting to acquire a collection of art. This is something that I've thought a great deal about, namely, do you attempt to get several million dollars and buy yourself one Rembrandt for example. Or if you had half a million dollars, would you buy a French Impressionist? You know, if we took that approach I think over a period of time like between now and the year 2,000 we'd probably have about six pictures in the Winnipeg Art Gallery that would be of this international calibre.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I think that the resolution of that is very simple. Forget it. I think that the money that we can give to the Art Gallery should be spent primarily on Canadian art and in particular on Manitoba art. Just as the great paintings that you see in all these museums and centres, they weren't purchased for \$2 and \$3 million apiece as Rembrandts are today, they were bought for a few hundred or a few thousand dollars in their time, many of them from local artists or national artists. But nowadays of course the prices are so staggering: first of all, they're not for sale; you can't go out and buy a Rembrandt tomorrow; there are very few; nobody wants to sell them; and on rare occasion when one comes on the market the pricing is just sky-high. I think the British Museum bought one a number of years ago, one of Rembrandt's paintings Aristotle looking at or examining or adoring a bust of Aristotle. Something like that. Or Aristotle examining a bust of Socrates, some Greek photograph like that. That I think cost \$6 million. There's no way --(Interjection)-- I can't be as risqué as some members of the frontbench.

Mr. Speaker, I think that our government has done a fair amount to further the arts in this province. I think that some of the programs of the Department of Cultural Affairs, of Public Works with a one percent of construction costs going for the commissioning of murals and art work and sculpture, the Federal Government's Canada Council and Art Bank, etc., and the efforts of individuals to do something to further the cultural consciousness of people in our province.

But for most Manitobans, Mr. Speaker, for the overwhelming majority of Manitobans, their familiarization with art is very limited. They don't have the opportunities. They can get books from the library. If they belong to the Art Gallery they can borrow art books or they can get from the public library, art books. They can see the occasional black and white photograph in a newspaper. They can see the occasional television program on art. But when the opportunity arises for Manitobans to see a major exhibition, they flock to it by the thousands. I'll give you two examples from the past decade, and I think there have only been two. In 1961 some of you may recall the Van Gogh exhibition which was brought to Winnipeg - and I can't remember whether it was shown at the Art Gallery or where, but it was the first major exhibition in a long long time in Winnipeg. Maybe it was the first one. Fifteen years ago. Fifty-one thousand Manitobans went to that exhibition, 51,000.

In 1965 four years later the King Tutankhamen exhibition came from Egypt --(Interjection)-- King Tut; 42,000 Manitobans flocked to see that exhibition. --(Interjection)-- I saw them both. I recall them both as being outstanding. And in between, from 1961 to now or from 1965 to now there's been a lack of opportunity to see something like this in Manitoba.

Well, Mr. Speaker, rather than talking about art, some of the members are talking about the politics of art and that raises another question. I don't want to get into that very deep other than to say that we trade extensively with nations that we don't agree with in terms of their regimes, that my honourable friend who's so worried, he's so worried, he won't be able to sleep at night, he has nobody to talk to, he's turning over in his mind the fact that the Secretary of the Communist Party is demanding that the Member for Lakeside bow down to the regime in the Soviet Union.

But I wonder whether he worries when his farmers in his riding sell wheat to the Soviet Union. Doesn't he know, doesn't he realize that that money is pouring into the Soviet Union, into the hands of the Secretary of the Communist Party? Doesn't that bother him? Can he sleep at night with that on his mind? --(Interjection)-- Oh, that's different.

BILL 56

(MR. DOERN cont'd). . . . Oh, no, no, no, that's different, Mr. Speaker. It's quite different. When your family travels there, it's quite different. When you smoke a Cuban cigar, that's different. When you drink Russian Vodka, that's different. When you watch them playing hockey on television or see them playing, that's not quite the same. When you see their musicians at the Concert Hall, that isn't the same thing.

A MEMBER: You're right.

MR. DOERN: When you go to these space exhibitions, that's completely different. It's all different. It's unrelated according to the Member for Lakeside.

You know, Mr. Speaker, I have a lot of sympathy for politicians because I am a politician like all of us. But I also have a lot of sympathy for artists. I have always found it disturbing when artists are hassled on a political level. My view is as follows: If you want to boo somebody, if you want to attack somebody, attack the political representatives of that nation. Don't attack their athletes. Don't attack their dancers. Don't attack their musicians. Don't attack their art. Attack their politicians and attack their politics.

So Mr. Speaker, I say that all members of the Legislature should weigh the factors, that they should not unduly weigh the possibility of a claim which we have heard about - there's going to be some kind of a claim that's coming. Detective Birtle-Russell, who has a badge from Dick Tracy as a junior detective, he undoubtedly is going to uncover one million of the population who will have a claim. If anybody can do it, he can. If Baretta can't handle it, he can handle it. --(Interjection)-- The Member for Wolseley he probably could, but he won't. He'll defer to his senior colleague the Investigator from Birtle-Russell.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Birtle-Russell state his matter of privilege.

MR. GRAHAM: On a matter of privilege. The Minister of Public Works is anticipating.

MR. SPEAKER: That's not a matter of privilege. The Honourable Minister of Public Works.

MR. DOERN: Well from one who sees flying saucers, Mr. Speaker, namely him, since I don't believe in them, I can expect anything. I say this, Mr. Speaker, in short the vote has to be decided in this way. This is the way I see it, honourable members may see it differently. I say you have to weight the possibility of a claim by a person in this province against the certainty of 50,000 to 75,000, maybe up to 100,000, people flocking to this exhibition to see and enjoy some of the world's greatest art works.

Mr. Speaker, the Attorney-General has mentioned some of the work that is in this exhibition. I would simply say that there is no question that some of the world's finest Old Masters are in the exhibition, including work by Rembrandt and Rubens. There are some of the best French impressionists of all time in the exhibition, Cezanne, Gauguin . . .

A MEMBER: Some Spanish ones too, are they good?

MR. DOERN: We have work by Picasso in the exhibition, and so on. There are basically three groups as I understand it, Old Masters, French impressionists and some Russian artists, and there are probably some who don't fit into any of those particular categories.

In passing this legislation we will enable thousands of Manitobans to have the opportunity of seeing this and other nations' exhibitions. So I urge members within the Assembly, particularly on the other side, since I understand there is some resistance and some mental blockage, and I urge them to support this particular bill because as I say thousands of Manitobans will flock to this exhibition - there is no question of that - and many more will be made aware of it through the media, through the press and through television and radio.

I would just say again that six galleries in Canada wanted this exhibition, six bid for it, and it was decided that Winnipeg and Toronto would have the opportunity. There are some 43 paintings worth some \$35 million. I think all of us know that there is a community in the province and in the City of Winnipeg of enthusiastic volunteers who belong to the Art Gallery, and so on, who desperately want this exhibition, including the professional staff.

So, Mr. Speaker, that concludes my comments. I think that if members in the House consider both sides of the issue they will see that the evidence is in favour of supporting the bill.

BILL 56

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Mines.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I think that the House should be indebted to the Attorney-General for bringing forward this legislation because I think that probably there has been sort of a speech brewing up in the Member for Lakeside for many many years, and there were no items on the Order Paper which he could fit this speech into until this bill was presented. The bill having been presented we had an opportunity to observe the rather indifferent attitude that the Member for Lakeside has towards the Soviet Union and to the Soviet regime. I'm sure that all of the members who observed him in his eloquence came to the conclusion that butter couldn't melt in his mouth insofar as the Soviet regime was concerned. His sister is there, his parents are there, he recognizes them and what have you, and that none of the remarks that he made had anything to do with the nature of the Soviet regime. Well we heard about Kerensky, we heard about the Russian Revolution, we heard about the Hitler and Goebbels, who happen to have, and, you know, I guess there's lots of argument about this but I suppose the citizens of the Soviet Union had some role in the destruction of the Hitler regime which is something.

--(Interjection)--

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. GREEN: Well, Mr. Chairman, perhaps the honourable members who wish to shout back and forth at each other should do so, and do so possibly on their own time. I'm trying to deal with the remarks that were made; the honourable member has indicated that his view on this subject has nothing to do with the Soviet regime, it has to do with the rights of his constituents, the civil rights that are being taken away. Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to say that I am not as indifferent--and I guess one has the danger of protesting too much - I'm not as indifferent about the Soviet regime as the Honourable Member for Lakeside.

I believe that the Soviet Union involvement, particularly now in the middle east, is what has caused the impossibility, or the present impossibility of a resolution of that conflict which happens to affect me personally and emotionally, and I am not able to deal with this question with any indifference towards the Soviet regime, and I cannot deal with it on that basis. I have to deal with the bill as to what it does. The Honourable Member for Lakeside is telling me and telling the members in this House that the Secretary of the Soviet Union, Mr. Brezhnev is asking me to pass this bill. I understood, and if in that understanding I am incorrect, then I want to be corrected. I am of the understanding that this bill has been asked for by Canadians, by people in this province, by people in Canada, by virtue of an exchange agreement that was entered into by our government requesting this material to be brought to this country. Now the Member for Elmwood made a very strong point. Countries generally do not let their treasured arts travel from nation to nation.

The Honourable Member for Lakeside said Britain would never demand that India who claims the Crown Jewels should pass a law saying that there will be exemption from seizure of the Crown Jewels. The likelihood is that England would not send the Crown Jewels to India. The Member for Lakeside says that England would not ask Greece to pass a law saying that some Grecian art should be exempt from seizure in Greece. The likelihood is that England would not send this art to Greece. And I am frankly surprised, Mr. Speaker, I am frankly astonished that the Soviet Government is willing to send these treasures around the world. I think that is a very unusual step for them to have taken. I doubt, Mr. Speaker, that I would be as trustworthy no matter what bills were passed, because I don't have control of citizens; I don't have control of people whose antagonism to the Soviet union may be just as strong as the honourable members, or stronger, who might do things to try to destroy, and other things that I cannot imagine of even if this legislation is passed.

I am frankly amazed that the Soviet Union is willing to say, for the purpose of facilitating this exchange we are willing to have these works - and I am not the art lover that the Member for Elmwood is, and frankly that is not a factor in the remarks that I am making. It wouldn't matter if it was art or anything else, but there, Mr. Speaker, there evidently has been some type of breakthrough, there has been some type of breakthrough, when treasured arts, which the Soviet Union covets and has in their possession,

BILL 56

(MR. GREEN cont'd)are permitted to be sent to what could be normally considered hostile countries. I don't think that Canada and United States are listed in the friendship group with the Soviet Union - as a matter of fact I think they have the Warsaw Pact, we have the Nato Alliance, set up to watch each other - and the Soviet Union has agreed that this art could go. They have stipulated that we want to be assured that there will not be any seizure taking place.

Now, Mr. Speaker, this is not a very unusual procedure. The Member for Lakeside makes it appear as though this is the greatest change in human events since the Bolshevik Revolution. Now I want to assure the honourable member that in the law business this kind of thing happens all the time. If a person is not in your jurisdiction and you want to sue him, you either go to his jurisdiction, or you sue him in your jurisdiction, in which case he has the choice of doing one of the following things: ignoring you and fighting it out when it winds up in his jurisdiction; or submitting to the jurisdiction, which is another choice, or submitting to the jurisdiction only on the question of jurisdiction but not to the question as to whether you will be tried. And what the Russians are saying is that we don't wish to change the jurisdictional control over these assets, and we have a right to say that if there is a suit over these assets it will be in our jurisdiction.

Now no rights are taken away. The Honourable Member for Lakeside says that his constituents' rights are being taken away. Mr. Speaker, I'm going to throw a test to the honourable member. His constituents have had the right to sue for their property in the Soviet Union for the last 55 years. They've had that right, why have they not done so? --(Interjection)-- Mr. Speaker, the honourable member says that there is no legitimate suit to be made. I will suggest to you that in many cases indeed that may not be correct, but that may not be correct. That some people may think that they have a legitimate suit, and the reason that they will not go to the Soviet Union--(Interjection)-- Well, Sir, the honourable member has just indicated, Mr. Speaker, the honourable member has just fallen for the trap that the Member for Lakeside would not fall for. You see what they will say is, how could we trust a Soviet court? That's what they would say. What justice will we get in a Soviet court. The place where the possession of the instruments of our art. Now, Mr. Speaker, if the Member for Lakesides' constituents say that they will not exercise their rights because they cannot get justice in a Soviet court, then how do you expect the Soviet Government to say that they are going to transfer the art to our jurisdiction and hope for justice in a Canadian court. The member for Lakeside, the Member for Lakeside has said - and you know I happen to agree with him, and really that is going to be my reason, that is going to be reason for affirming this bill, I happen to agree with him.

He says that there is no suit, that one thing that he recognizes, and everybody in this House should recognize, is that we recognize the right of a sovereign government to pass laws respecting matters within their jurisdiction. Much as we hate it, or the Member for Lakeside may hate it, he would say that a Soviet Government duly constituted has the right to pass a law saying what land and belongings in their jurisdiction, who it belongs to. And they also have the right to expect that another sovereign jurisdiction would respect their laws, and that if we pass a law in Manitoba as to who property belongs to, we have a right to think that that law will be valid and that other people will respect their laws.

And the honourable member says that is the case, and that is all that I am voting for. I am voting that Manitoba pass a law which says that we respect jurisdiction of the Sovereign Government of the Soviet Union to say what property in the Soviet Union, who it belongs to, and we're not going to let the laws get mixed up by a whole bunch of suits in Canada, which will then be decided, not perhaps by some judge who wants to look at the thing in its broad base, but will be decided as if the Member for Lakeside was the judge. Mr. Speaker, the fact is that we cannot separate our emotions from our judgments, and I have mentioned that in this House on many occasions, and those people who say that, you know, our courts are great and their courts are bad, what they are really saying is, our courts are ours and their courts are theirs, because history has indicated - and I'm going to get even a little closer than history - that after the Soviet Revolution, after the revolution in the Soviet Union, after the overthrow of Czarism - and the honourable member says

(MR. GREEN cont'd)that the overthrow of Czarism wasn't by the present regime. It sure wasn't, but I'll tell you something, the Kerensky Revolution would never have affected the revolution either, because Kerensky was willing and committed to keep the Soviet soldiers on the Western front in aid of an imperialistic war indefinitely. So that they would die for nothing, and that's why Kerensky could not be sustained and subsequently . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Order please.

MR. GREEN: Oh, now, Mr. Speaker, now we see the emotion coming out. Now we see what, now we see, now we really see . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I'm going to suggest to those members who cannot - order please - to those members who cannot contain their emotions that there is no necessity or no force holding them in their seat, they should remove themselves; otherwise they will have to abide by the rules and not interrupt. The Honourable Minister of Mines.

MR. GREEN: We are going to see what the issue is, Mr. Speaker, you see. Really the issue goes back, and I repeat, the honourable member's been waiting maybe 35 or 40 years to make this speech to deal with what to him was an injustice, and to many other people was an injustice, and I can't deal with it on that basis. The member wishes me to deal with it on that basis. He says I have the audacity, or the government has the audacity to ask him to vote for this bill. I'm not asking you to vote for this bill. Vote against the bill. Vote against the bill. I'm asking people who are able to look at the matter with a little bit more objectivity to vote for the bill, because I don't expect the honourable member to vote for the bill.

If the honourable member was able to hit me in an emotional . . .with regard to somebody who was coming here, I might not be able to do anything about the bill. I might picket. I might do something else. I might boycott. Those things are all legitimate. The question is whether the Government of Manitoba is willing to recognize that there is a problem of law here, that that problem of law came up after 1918 in numerous jurisdictions in England, in France, in this country, with respect to suits regarding assets of either Soviet citizens or Soviet assets, with regard to jewels, with regard to property, with regard to bonds, with regard to bank accounts, and Mr. Speaker, the courts in the western jurisdiction did not apply the laws to the Soviet Union, in the same way as they would have applied them to other countries. And isn't that expected? Is that so is that so unusual? The courts in the West looked upon the Soviet revolution as a theft of property. That's what they looked upon it as and they decided their cases accordingly. And the same thing happened in Cuba in 1956. And to get closer to home, Mr. Speaker, the last refuge of people in this province against legislation that has been acted by this government, is to say if we can't win there, let's go to court and maybe we can find a court who will do our trouble for us. They said that with Autopac.

And, Mr. Speaker, that really is the issue here. We have a very simple problem: We want something, not the Soviet Union, we want the Russians to have their Art Exhibit here in this country. The price we are asked to pay - and if there was a price that I had to pay which interfered with the rights of one Manitoba citizen I wouldn't vote in that way, I wouldn't pass it - is to declare that we recognize that that property is theirs, and the circumstances is theirs, and the circumstances under which it is coming we will see to it that that property is not seized. We are making declaratory law, and we are not doing much different than that, and we are saying that it is not going to be the subject of a seizure. I don't even know, Mr. Speaker, if it prevents a suit. No proceeding or action shall be taken. It does prevent a suit and a seizure. And in effect, Mr. Speaker, all we are doing is declaring this law.

Now the honourable member says, would people do this? I say that people have always looked at the price they have to pay and what they are asking to get. The honourable member took a perfect example, he pointed up to the press and said, "Would you write a story on the basis that it would have to be read by them and agreed to before it was printed in your newspaper?" He said, "You would never do it." Mr. Speaker, Richard Purser did exactly that. He wanted a story from Alex Kasser, or the Winnipeg Free Press. It was the Winnipeg Free Press. The Winnipeg Free Press or one of the

BILL 56

(MR. GREEN cont'd) papers, and I don't want to be unfair to either one of them, but I remember specifically, they went to Kasser, he gave them an interview, on the understanding that he would read it and agree with it before it was printed in their paper, and they said that in order to get this interview, they would do this, that this interview was so important to them, and they published, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I'm not compelling anybody to do anything. I am not compelling anybody to do anything. I am suggesting to you that there are a group of Canadians, not Russians, not Brezhnev, as a matter of fact probably if we had this list of Canadians Johnny MacAulay may be one of them because he is a patron of the Art Gallery. I do not know --(Interjection)-- It was Reiser, not Kasser, I'm sorry. Mr. Speaker, if in order to make his argument, if in order to make his argument, the Member for Lakeside has to say that the Member for Portage la Prairie and the Member for Riel are clicking their heels to do Brezhnev's bidding, I say he's got a very bad argument, because the Member for Portage la Prairie would not click his heels to Mr. Brezhnev or to anybody else. The Member for Riel would not click his heels to Mr. Brezhnev or to anybody else. So at least, Mr. Speaker, at least the honourable member --(Interjection)-- Oh well, Mr. Speaker, you see . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. GREEN: I assure the honourable member that --(Interjection)--

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. GREEN: I really do not know how to deal with that question, Mr. Speaker. I do not know when I have clicked for anybody. I do not know what Mr. Brezhnev could do to make me click for him, but certainly I'm not clicking for him with this bill. I am suggesting that our Art Gallery follow through with a proposal that they want to follow through with. Now what will be the end result of the following through of this proposal? There will be an exhibit of art in the City of Winnipeg. The Member for Lakeside has really taken this thing a great deal out of perspective. There will be an exhibit of art; it will not be seized; it will return to the place from whence it came. The people who want to sue for it can still sue for it in the jurisdiction in which it exists and we will have contributed something to the international free flow of things which actually is the free flow of things between citizens, between people, not between regimes, between the people of the Soviet Union and the people of Canada. What will be the result if we do not pass the bill? Now here's where the honourable member contributes to his opponent's case.

The people in the Soviet Union are decent human beings. They are just like the Honourable Member for Lakeside and myself. They can be stirred to hate, they can be moved to charity. The honourable member leaves this with the people of the Soviet Union: that their government will say that it was willing to take the Leningrad Hermitage Art Exhibit, it was willing to have it seen by Canadian comrades or comrades all over the world, but there was a Legislature in the Province of Manitoba which contains a million people and it's situated in the middle of Canada and they said that they are not willing to have that come here unless people have a right to sue for those treasures. We, the Soviet Government, are not going to send our treasures to the Province of Manitoba with the danger of them being sued for.

And what does that tell to the opponent of the honourable member? Does it tell them that their government is wrong, that their government has acted badly, that their government has confiscated or has prevented the comradeship as between different people in the world? Or does it say that there are some people over there that have adopted an entirely intolerable position to us and we cannot accept that position. We thought that it were otherwise but we cannot accept that position. And when it comes out, Mr. Speaker, that that is what's happened it won't come out with the sort of nuances that could be presented from the Member from Sturgeon Creek or the Member for Lakeside because the bottom line will come out. And the bottom line is really that simple, that the Soviet Government is willing to share its treasure with people all over the world. But the Government of Manitoba is unwilling to make this possible by merely indicating that they won't be seized when they are here. And to the Soviet citizen it will say, that's not

BILL 56

(MR. GREEN cont'd)protecting the right of a citizen of the Province of Manitoba, that really means that when they get there somebody's going to want to seize them..

The Honourable Member for Lakeside says there will be no suit. There is no claim. Isn't that what he is saying? That there is no claim. That's what I'm voting for. I'm voting for what he said. There is no claim. The whole question is not whether or not the bill is right, but one of trust. And the honourable member will have to recognize it's really one of trust. He has said it. He said the Soviets could send it here and our courts would recognize no claim. All they have to do is trust our court. Isn't that right? All they have to do is trust our courts.

The Honourable Member for Lakeside will have to realize that there are many people here who do not trust them. There are many people there who do not trust us. Mr. Speaker, the honourable member says he knows the difference and I am telling you, I am telling you, Mr. Speaker, that the people in the Soviet Union who do not trust us - and this is what the honourable member fails to realize - that the people there who do not trust us are every bit as sincere as the people here who do not trust them. That's the problem. If, Mr. Speaker, he can recognize that there is mutual distrust - and we'll not pass a law which has no other effective result but to dispel, and that's all it does, dispel mutual distrust - then what the honourable member really wants because he is afraid, because he is afraid, he wants to perpetuate mutual distrust. He is afraid that if that mutual distrust were not perpetuated it would endanger some of his ideological hang-ups and that's the problem, Mr. Speaker. That's all that's involved in this bill, there's nothing else.

I am not voting to eliminate anybody's rights. I am not voting for the Soviet Union. I am not clicking heels to Mr. Brezhnev. Mr. Speaker, I cannot do anything but to try to indicate to the Honourable Member for Lakeside that I do not have the same views about the Bolshevik Revolution that he does. I happen to think that the Bolshevik Revolution, and may I say it for the record, for the Russian people at that time was a positive step forward. I think that what happened since then has been a great disaster for that revolution. I cannot convince the honourable member, because he will not be convinced, that my feeling about the Russian Revolution which I have read a great deal about too can in no way take away from my present, my existing, complete antipathy to the Russian regime. I'll tell you that it applies to many things but it specifically applies to what they are doing in the Middle East.

Now if I have to sort of certify my hatred to you I will certify it. But it doesn't change the effective position on this bill. This bill is asked for not by Brezhnev, it's asked for by Canadians. It is a positive step, it is not a negative step and I intend to vote for the bill, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The bill stays adjourned by the Honourable Member for La Verendrye. The Honourable Member for Morris wish to speak on the bill?

MR. WARNER H. JORGENSON (Morris): Mr. Speaker, perhaps in my somewhat inadequate way, after listening to the Member for Lakeside and the House Leader, I want to make what may be termed a much milder contribution to the debate. I listened to the very eloquent argument of the Minister of Mines and Resources and it seemed to me that the burden of his argument seemed to be that what the Member for Lakeside was suffering from was an ideological hang-up that he does not possess and that his entire argument was based on the belief that he does not have any ideological hang-ups and for very practical and pragmatic reasons he's going to support the bill. Well, Sir, I can only take the House Leader at his word.

But there are a few questions that come as a result of that argument that are raised in my mind. I am no great student of history but I do recall a few incidents in history that I perhaps can draw a few parallels. They may be imperfect parallels in the particular case now before us. Lest I create the impression, because I am the third one that has spoken on this side, that members on this side are united in their opposition to this bill, I want to remind you, Sir, that the Leader of our Party has already spoken in this debate and has indicated support for it. I have no way of knowing just how many members on this side of the House are going to support the bill.

BILL 56

(MR. JORGENSEN cont'd)

But it is another one of those measures - and I recall several of them in the years that I have been in parliament of one kind or another - that strikes at the very deep emotions of individuals. I recall the flag debate in Ottawa. It was one of those measures that, regardless of party affiliation, people had very strong feeling about that particular subject and voiced those feelings very fervently and very sincerely. I think the question of abolition of capital punishment is another one of those issues that crosses party lines and the question of abortion I think is another one that would cross party lines.

I'm not so sure that I would be all that prepared to place this particular piece of legislation in that category although it does carry with it some of the earmarks of an emotional issue. One wonders the purpose of debate if a person has decided in his own mind that, for ideological or other reasons, a certain measure is bad and who is to say what motivates the thinking of certain individuals on particular issues. They have a - if I may use a mundane term - "a gut feeling" about many things that they express. I suppose there are people who are going to speak on this issue who are possessed with that "gut feeling." I must confess that I was somewhat less impressed with the argument of the Minister of Public Works and perhaps the comment made by the Member for Radisson was an appropriate one at the time that he rose to speak.

The Minister of Public Works simply based his entire argument on the basis that there was an art exhibit coming to this country, it was a good thing, which I will not deny, and that everybody should be given the opportunity of seeing it. Those are arguments that are very basic and arguments that no one attempts to refute. But I think there is something a little bit more to it than just that and the Member for Lakeside put his finger on it. It's not a question of whether the art exhibit is a good thing for the people of this province, and that people are going to flock by the thousands there. He mentioned that 42,000 or so came to watch a certain exhibition that came here. Well I might point out to him double that number go to watch the Morris Stampede.

--(Interjection)-- My colleague, the Member for Brandon West, wanted to know the dates of that particular Exhibition.

Perhaps I should take advantage of this opportunity to tell the House that it's as usual beginning the third week in July. Now this is a cultural matter of sorts, depending on how you view culture. Maybe, Sir, some will argue now that that was my only purpose in rising, to give some free publicity to that event in Morris. But that is really not my purpose in rising. I merely mentioned that as an aside. --(Interjection)-- Well the First Minister said that the dates clash and I am willing to bet right now, Mr. Speaker, that whether or not this bill passes and the art exhibit comes to Winnipeg, it's not going to interfere with that group of people who would choose to go to the Stampede.

Well, Mr. Speaker, the somewhat pragmatic arguments that were advanced by the Minister of Mines and Resources seemed to indicate that there is only one issue here and that is the question of a pragmatic examination of the legislation that is before us as to whether or not the people of this province are going to be given an opportunity to watch the exhibit. I recall other pragmatic examinations and decisions made in other matters that have turned out to be something less than what they were first intended to be. I, Sir, do not - and I want to make sure that I emphasize this point - I do not place this particular piece of legislation in the same category. I simply want to make reference to them as an illustration of how readily and how quickly a free people can barter away their rights without recognizing what they are bartering and giving away.

I make one reference, to the rule changes in the House of Commons in Ottawa. That particular decision was based on what they thought was a pragmatic examination of the role of parliament and how it could more efficiently and that was the word that was constantly used, more efficiently deal with the matters that were brought before parliament. What has happened? There is no parliament left in Ottawa. No parliament left because the members of that House willingly, voluntarily, gave away their rights for the sake of efficiency. Well if it's efficiency we want then of course the Russian system is the most efficient of all. There is no recourse to anybody or to any court. They make the decisions. Sir, that kind of a bartering of rights I don't think we should engage in in this Legislature or in this country.

BILL 56

(MR. JORGENSEN cont'd)

Another reference that I can make to a parliament that decided to deal with a particular problem at a particular time with great dispatch and great efficiency and I have mentioned it in this House before, Sir, and I know some of my friends opposite are going to moan when I mention it. That was at the time when Hitler came to power. How quickly, how quickly did the German Parliament destroy their own rights? Why? Because of the bringing in of the enabling Act, an Act to eliminate the distress of the Reich and its people. All that Act was asking for was the right of the German Government to deal with the very serious problems that they were confronted with at that time and oddly enough, primarily, inflation was one of those problems.

Well, Sir, when the German Parliament voted to accept that bill that was the last time it met. Now I don't say that if we pass this legislation that this parliament or freedom in Canada is going to be destroyed. I don't try to make that kind of a comparison.

A MEMBER: I may never come back, Warner.

MR. JORGENSEN: All I'm attempting to do, Sir, is to point out that there are times when we forget how easily we can destroy the rights of the individuals and the people of this country. Our job in this Parliament is to preserve their rights. That's particularly true of the role of the opposition.

There were a couple of other instances, Sir, whereby an Act of Parliament or an Act of Cabinet - not Parliament, but the Cabinet - where rights of individuals were taken away. In 1942 the Cabinet decided to take away the rights of Japanese Canadians. In 1970 the Cabinet decided to take away the rights of French Canadians living in the Province of Quebec. Now I'm not going to argue again that the circumstances surrounding the introduction of this legislation into this Chamber are parallel with the circumstances that existed at the time of the introduction of that Cabinet Order. But I do think, Sir, that in retrospect, in looking at the decisions that were made at that time they would never be made again under the same circumstances because I think the people of this country and the oppositions have recognized what a dastardly move that was in denying people of Japanese origin, simply because they were of Japanese origin, the rights that are the rights of Canadians in this country. I don't think there is a civil rights group in this country or anybody else that would stand for any government doing that sort of thing again.

I think that it's a recognition on the part of Canadians that there is a danger that carelessly or otherwise we can lose rights that are ours by tradition although they are not enshrined in legislation. That is one of the great differences between a parliament such as we know it here in Canada and the American Congressional system where the rights are enshrined in their Constitution. We don't have any such enshrining of rights in this country.

You, Sir, as I pointed out, upon your nomination to the high office, that you now hold, in the session of 1974, are the custodian of our rights. I believe if I had to make a choice as between the American Congressional system where the rights are enshrined in a Constitution and the manner in which we preserve rights in this country, I would much prefer the Canadian system. Because the rights are matters that can be defended not just by reference to a court but by reference to the highest court, the people of this country.

I, Sir, want to again assure my honourable friends opposite that the purpose in rising at this stage is not to repeat the arguments that were presented by the Member for Lakeside, because he presented them very eloquently, but perhaps to deal with this one particular matter of the protection of human rights. The thing that really disturbed me about the brochure or the thing that was sent around by the Winnipeg Art Gallery, there's one sentence in that particular brochure, and how glibly and lightly they treated this question of rights. They said: "To suspend the right to initiate legal action for six weeks out of a lifetime is not much to ask in the name of the interests of the majority of citizens."

I say, Sir, that more than anything I believe it was that sentence that prompted me to rise at this time and to make these comments. Because I don't treat my rights or

(MR. JORGENSEN cont'd)the rights of the people I represent or the rights of the people of this province as lightly as the Winnipeg Art Gallery would have us believe that they should be treated.

I want to, in my closing remarks, make a couple of references to a statement that the Minister of Mines and Resources said when he referred to Mr. Purser in his trip to Austria, I believe it was.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Mines.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, just on the point of personal privilege, I don't want to identify the wrong person. I don't think it was Purser. It was the Free Press.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. JORGENSEN: Then I don't want to make the same mistake. But I read the article and I may be wrong, but I assume that it was Richard Purser who had been to Austria and interviewed Mr. Kasser. A condition upon the writing of that article was that Mr. Kasser was able to read the article before it was submitted. There is a difference, Sir, which the Minister of Mines and Resources did not point out. That was a mutual agreement between Mr. Reiser and Mr. Purser and nobody's rights were interfered with. Nobody's rights were interfered with. --(Interjection)--

Well, you know, he makes a distinction between a mutual agreement between two individuals and government law that compel people to do certain things. To me there is a world of difference. The Minister of Mines and Resources has repeatedly used the argument that governments are people and I've refuted that. I've refuted that on a couple of occasions and I won't go into that argument again because governments are not people. Governments are made up of that group of individuals who at the present time are given the responsibility of administering the laws of our country and enacting new laws, spending money and raising taxes. Governments have a tendency, have been known throughout history to arrogate to themselves powers much greater, much greater, than they were ever intended to assume. It is only in legislative bodies such as this where they can be subjected to constant examination that the people can control their governments. Once a law is passed, Sir - we've seen it - there were a large number of people in this province who were not in favour of the Autopac legislation. But the law compelled them to abide by those rules as the law will compel these people to abide by the legislation that is now before us.

I simply want to point out that in my opinion there's a world of difference between that kind of legislation and a mutual agreement that is arrived at between two or more individuals. I want to make that distinction, Sir.

Also, Sir, an argument was made by the Minister of Public Works that the paintings that were to come to this country were masterpieces painted by famous artists and the people of this country should have an opportunity to view those masterpieces. I find that in conflict I might say with an attitude of a government that deliberately boycotts a product that is imported into this country simply because they disagree with the actions of a certain government. It, to me, is also in conflict with the view of a government that does not believe that the individual efforts of a person are as good as the combined efforts of a group of people. As if, Sir, one could paint the Mona Lisa by assigning a dab to each of a thousand artists. It can't be done.

I am happy to have the Hermitage exhibition come to Winnipeg. I believe it will be a good thing for the art community, a good thing for this country. But I do not believe that legislation should be passed by this House denying the exercising of individual rights.

Sir, I would even be less opposed to this legislation if it contained a final clause in it that suggested that when the exhibition has come and gone that the legislation then will cease. The fact is, Sir, that contained within the legislation is a clause that enables the Cabinet, the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council, to exercise that same right at any time it chooses. Sir, if the government would add an additional clause following the one that says that the Act comes into force on the day it receives Royal Assent, saying that the Act becomes invalid the day that the Russian exhibition leaves Manitoba, I would be more inclined to want to support it.

BILL 56

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for St. Matthews.

MR. WALLY JOHANNSON (St. Matthews): Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Member for Morris anticipated a suggestion that I was going to make and that was that I certainly would be amenable to an amendment in the Act which would provide that the Act was null and void following the end of the exhibition. To me that makes sense. To my understanding the bill was mainly intended to permit the exhibition of the art collection from the Hermitage and it would achieve that objective and it could cease as far as I'm concerned. The bill could be null and void as far as I'm concerned at the end of the exhibition. So I certainly would agree with the Honourable Member for Morris in that proposal.

However, I can't find myself in agreement with much else that he said. I must say this: the honourable member did give a reasonably rational series of arguments on this question as opposed to the display which his colleague from Lakeside put on earlier this afternoon. But his principal argument, Mr. Speaker, was enforced with a series of parallel examples or a series of analogies which I don't think really are valid.

He stated that free people can barter away their rights and he is saying that the people of Manitoba are bartering away their rights in this legislation. --(Interjection)--

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The Honourable Member for Morris on a . . .

MR. JORGENSEN: . . .because I think I emphasized on at least two if not three occasions that I do not draw that parallel. I simply point them out.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for St. Matthews.

MR. JOHANNSON: Well, Mr. Speaker, if the honourable member does not draw the parallel but simply points them out then I ask why point them out? Because then they're irrelevant and I think they are.

The parallels he drew were interesting. He talked about the enabling legislation passed by the German Parliament which enabled Hitler to take absolute power in Germany. What he didn't mention, Mr. Speaker, was that the one party in the German Parliament to vote against that enabling Act was the Social Democratic Party. The Conservative Parties in the German Parliament voted for the enabling legislation and in fact the Conservative Parties in Germany were involved in bringing Hitler to power. There is no question about that when one reads anything about German history.

The honourable member also mentioned the abuse of the rights of Japanese Canadians which occurred in 1942. Again, Mr. Speaker, the one party that upheld, that spoke out for the rights of the Japanese Canadians was the CCF Party. Mr. Speaker, that took a great deal of courage because the CCF Party by speaking out for the rights of Japanese Canadians did not win popular support in British Columbia or in Canada. In fact it brought a great deal of hatred upon the party. But it did the right thing. I, as a socialist, am proud of my party. Conservatives and Liberals can be less proud of their parties when one considers their behaviour at that time.

The third example the honourable member brought out was the 1970 War Measures Act. And again, Mr. Speaker, the one party that solidly opposed that was the NDP. --(Interjection)-- One Tory had some integrity. The Tory Party supported The War Measures Act in Parliament; the NDP opposed it. Now who in this whole sequence of events, who stood up for the rights of the people? The socialist parties continually did. Not the Conservative Parties. --(Interjection)-- I hope we do get some votes in favour of this bill on that side. Frankly I hope for the sake of the opposition that some of you vote for this bill because it is a free vote and as far as I'm concerned if the opposition voted solidly against this bill, I would be happy politically because I think you'll bring discredit upon your own party if you vote against this bill. I think it would be a political benefit to our party if you vote against this bill. I mentioned the fact that the Honourable Member for Morris conducted the debate on this bill on a far more rational level than his colleague from Lakeside, and really the performance of the Member for Lakeside I don't think brings great credit upon himself. It was a great job of acting. It was a great job of acting. The honourable member is a good speaker. He's a very able speaker, and he can give very emotional speeches, which is something that I cannot do, and I give him credit for being a very good speaker. But the problem is that the honourable member sometimes gets carried away with himself. And I think on this occasion he did.

BILL 56

(MR. JOHANNSON cont'd).. In the beginning of his speech the honourable member mentioned red herrings, and then proceeded to drag a whole series of red herrings through the debate, a whole school of red herrings - I would prefer to call them rotten herrings, but he used the term red herring, so I'll use it.

The honourable member talked about the denial of the due process of law. And really I find that difficult to accept. This bill by the way is almost identical to the wording of the Act passed by Congress in 1965. In fact it's modelled on that Act. The Act has a very practical and a very simple purpose. As the honourable member pointed out it has been requested by the Russian Government as a preliminary to the bringing of the Art Exhibition to Canada, and I think it's a reasonable request. The Russian Government as far as I understand, is not worried that the art collection would actually be confiscated, but they are worried about the collection being tied up in the courts by frivolous or mischievous suits. I think that is a reasonable request on their part that their art collection not be tied up in the courts for a great length of time.

The honourable member also made some parallels. He talked about the parallel between our government and that of Chile. He stated that the Government of Chile snuffed out the liberties of the people just as this government is snuffing out the liberties of the people. Mr. Speaker, that is the most outrageous use of examples that I have ever heard in my life. The present regime in Chile came to power by murdering, by murdering the president of Chile, who had been legally elected, by killing a great many of the elected members of the Chilean Government and the Chilean Legislature, by killing thousands of people in Chile, by torturing many, many people in Chile, by placing people, thousands upon thousands of people in concentration camps, and he draws this as a parallel to the behaviour of the Government of Manitoba. We came to power by defeating that group in an election, by due process of law, by the ordinary functioning of the parliamentary system, and we have continued to operate within the parliamentary system.

Mr. Speaker, I think that the Russian Government is being extraordinarily generous in this matter. For one thing they are subsidizing part of the cost of putting on this exhibition. The entire cost of organizing the collection--(Interjection)-- Mr. Speaker, I don't know how much. But the people in the Hermitage and the Russian State Museum are doing the work of organizing the collection and they bear that cost, so they are in effect, subsidizing the showing of one of the great collections of art, one of the greatest collections of art in the world for the people of Manitoba. And for this generosity, Mr. Speaker, we have the Honourable Member for Lakeside replying by reciting a whole series of crimes against humanity by the Russians. This is his reply to the Russian generosity in this particular case.

I'd like to contrast, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to contrast the behaviour of the Honourable Member for Lakeside with the behaviour of the Americans. The Honourable Member for Lakeside has often said that I hate Americans, that I have no use for Americans, but I would like to contrast, Mr. Speaker, his behaviour with the behaviour of the Americans, and we'll see who is the civilized, who are the civilized people. Mr. Speaker, this is an art book put out in the United States. It's called "Master Paintings from the Hermitage and the State Russian Museum." It is a collection of the paintings, an illustrated collection of the paintings that will be shown in this exhibition. This was published, not in the Kremlin, Mr. Speaker, not by some Moscow publishing house, Mr. Speaker, it was published jointly by the National Gallery of Art, Washington, D.C., M. Knoedler and Company Inc., New York, New York; the Detroit Institutes of Arts, Detroit, Michigan; Los Angeles County Museum of Art, Los Angeles, that hot bed of radicalism, Los Angeles; and the Museum of Fine Arts, Houston, Texas. Mr. Speaker, this event, the exhibition from the Hermitage has been designated as an official event by the American Revolution Bi-Centennial Administration. This --(Interjection)-- yes they must be a bunch of Reds as the Honourable Member for Portage points out. They have designated this exhibition as an official event of the American Bi-Centenary, and here we have --(Interjection)-- Yes. The other day we passed a resolution voting to celebrate the American Bi-Centenary. Now one of the other events of the American Bi-Centenary is being opposed, being opposed by the members of the Tory Party.

BILL 56

(MR. JOHANNSSON cont'd)

It's interesting, as I say, Mr. Speaker, it's interesting to contrast the behaviour of the Americans with the behaviour of the Honourable Member for Lakeside. What do they say about this exhibition? In the National Gallery of Art where this exhibition opens under the honorary patronage of Mrs. Gerald Ford, "The people of the United States may delight in masterpieces from two of the Soviet Unions greatest museums." So this is opened under the honorary patronage of Mrs. Gerald Ford. She must be a dangerous radical or a Red, Mr. Speaker. "From the Hermitage comes an outstanding collection of paintings by renowned European artists. All of these paintings are being seen in the United States for the first time, thus enabling the people of America to enjoy these treasures, just as the people of Russia visiting a future reciprocal exhibition will be able to view great works of art from our museums." Mr. Speaker, to me that is a civilized response to an act of generosity, unlike the behaviour of the Honourable Member for Lakeside. "We extend our gratitude to the Director of the Hermitage and their staffs and to the other people in the Soviet Union who were involved in bringing this collection together. On behalf of M. Knoedler and Company, Inc. I would like to express my gratitude to the directors and Curatorial staff of the State Hermitage and State Russian Museums for their generosity in lending us some of their greatest treasures, and for their friendly co-operation throughout the exhibition, throughout the organization of this exhibition." This is the response of the United States, of the people of the United States to an act of generosity. Yes they must be dangerous socialists, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, the Russians not only are being dangerous but they are assuming a real risk. There could be a possibility of damage or loss of some of these paintings, either during transportation or during the exhibition. Mr. Speaker, not only have the Russians spent money in subsidizing this exhibition, not only have they been co-operative in helping to organize it, they are assuming a very large risk, and for that they get the reaction of the Honourable Member for Lakeside.

I won't read it all, but I want to read some more, because, Mr. Speaker, I want to express my admiration for the United States, and the civilized behaviour of the people of the United States. Mr. Speaker, I want to contrast their civilized behaviours, their acknowledgements with the behaviour of the Honourable Member for Lakeside. Now let me read also from the introduction to this book. "In the present exhibition the State Hermitage Museum presents the American public with selected treasures of Western European paintings from its collection for the second time. Masterpieces by Poussin, Picasso, Caravaggio and Tiepolo, Rubens, and Velázquez, Rembrandt, and Hals, and many other great painters are included. Never before has such a representative exhibition left the walls of Hermitage to be shown abroad. This collection ranks among the first in the world, not only by virtue of the number of paintings but also because of their high quality."

Mr. Speaker, the Russians are not merely taking representative art from their collection and showing it to us, they are taking the greatest masterpieces in the world, in this history of world art, and they are allowing us to see these masterpieces.

The Honourable Member for Lakeside made a statement that - and I'll try to repeat his argument as closely as I can because I don't want to be unfair to him. He contrasted what the Russians were doing in this case with the case of a country having stolen art from people some years before and then parading it before them later, and then denying their legal right to reclaim or to recover that art. The implication of that argument is that the Russians stole these paintings, specifically that they stole them from Canadians somehow, that they are now parading these paintings before the people of Manitoba and denying them the right to reclaim the paintings they stole from them. And what's the case, what are the facts? The fact is that most of these paintings that are being shown were purchased in the reign of Catherine the Great, during the Romanoff period. The great mass of the collection, or a very large part of that collection was assembled by Catherine the Great, by the good free enterprise method of buying art from people who had it for sale. --(Interjection)-- What is the problem? The problem that I pointed out was that the Russians are not, as I understand it the Russians are not

BILL 56

(MR. JOHANNSON cont'd)so much worried about the pictures actually being confiscated through court proceedings but being tied up by court proceedings for a lengthy period of time. Now it is interesting, there are some paintings that were stolen, but they weren't stolen by the Russians. Alexander the First purchased from Josephine, the Empress of France, Napoleon's wife, the Russian Czar purchased from Josephine a very fine collection of paintings. The Russians didn't steal those paintings, Napoleon stole them. Napoleon stole these paintings which were given to his wife Josephine, from the Landgrave Hesse-Cassel. So if there was theft, it was by the French and not by the Russians.

Let me again, let me again read a short excerpt from this Art Book. "I again want to express my great admiration for the sentiment and the genuine feelings of the American people."

And I'll just read one paragraph from Page 17 of this book. "The splendor and variety of the Hermitage and the State Russian Museums bears witness to the fact that a love of art is endemic to the Russian character and that Russian art collecting and patronage have consistently been of the highest standard." That is the tribute that the Americans pay to a Russian act of generosity. And what do we get from the Honourable Member from Lakeside?

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to refer briefly to some of the paintings that are contained in this exhibition and that are contained in this book. And the first one is on Page 21, it's by Lucas Cranack the Elder. It is called "The Madonna of the Apple Tree." Now, Mr. Speaker, I am sure that is going to corrupt the youth and the people of this province. The Madonna of the Apple Tree. This is a painting of religious character done by a great German painter of the 16th century. The second one I would refer to is called the Dead Christ with the Virgin Mary and an Angel, called the "Lamentation," done by Veronese. Mr. Speaker, the first painting by Cranack was purchased by Nicholas the First in 1851 for the Hermitage; the second one by Veronese, purchased from a French person in 1775; another painting, Mr. Speaker, by Caravaggio, again this was purchased in 1808 for the Hermitage. Mr. Speaker, I'd just like to refer to a few other of these paintings that some of the Conservative members do not want shown in the Province of Manitoba. Mr. Speaker, if the honourable members want these paintings displayed in Manitoba, they will have to pass this Act. The Act must be passed.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. ORDER.

MR. JOHANNSON: Mr. Speaker, the exhibition will not be shown unless this Act is passed. Any member who votes against this Act being passed, any member who votes against this Act being passed is voting against the showing of this exhibition in Manitoba. There is no question about that. The fact is that if this bill is not passed the exhibition does not come to Manitoba.

A MEMBER: Why?

MR. JOHANNSON: I have explained why. The Russians do not want this exhibition tied up in court fights, and that I think is a reasonable request. The honourable members, by voting against this bill, are voting against the showing of this exhibition in Manitoba. There is no question about that. That is what the Honourable Member for Lakeside is doing. He is voting against the showing of this exhibition of Art in Manitoba; the Honourable Member for Morris is voting against the showing of this exhibition of art in Manitoba.

Let's look at a few more pictures, Mr. Speaker. The pictures that the honourable members opposite do not want displayed in Manitoba and the pictures they do not want the people of Manitoba to see. This is one by Velázquez, the great Spanish painter called "The Repast," purchased in 1774. There are some Russian masters here too. There are a number of paintings by Rembrandt which the Honourable Public Works Minister referred to on Page 73, "David and Uriah" purchased by Catherine the Great, one of the great paintings of the world. There are a number of Rembrandts in this collection. There are some 19th and 20th century French paintings by Cézanne, Gauguin, Matisse - you'll have to pardon my French pronunciation, it's not very good. Some of these by the way were not purchased by the Russians. In the case of some of

BILL 56

(MR. JOHANNSON cont'd) the French paintings these were confiscated from nationalized palaces of aristocrats or merchants, all under the Russian Revolution. But these were confiscated within Russia. --(Interjection)-- As far as I know there are none from the collection of Herman Goering which was stolen from all over Europe. There is none in this collection that were confiscated from Herman Goering. There is a great painting by one of the Russian masters, a painting of Tolstoi which I'm sure the Honourable Member for Lakeside would regard as a dangerous piece of Communist propaganda. I'm sure he would regard this as dangerous and therefore he does not want it shown to the children and the people of Manitoba.

The fact is, Mr. Speaker, that of these 40 paintings not one was stolen from the people of Manitoba, not one was stolen from the people of Western Europe. Some were confiscated from collections of noblemen or merchants in Russia. So I think really the essential point is, Mr. Speaker, that the members who are voting against this bill are voting against the showing of this exhibition. They are denying our rights. They are voting against the showing of this exhibition.

It's most interesting, Mr. Speaker. I can recall having a conversation with the former Leader of the Conservative Party in Brandon at the 75th Anniversary of the University of Brandon. We had a rather friendly exchange during which the Member for River Heights claimed that there was an anti-intellectual element in our government and in our party. We were anti-intellectual. I maintained that his group was far more anti-intellectual than ours and I really think, Mr. Speaker, that this bill will be a measure of how anti-intellectual the Tory party is and the NDP party is. I think that this bill will be a good measure of who is anti-cultural, the Tory party or the NDP. I really think that the members of the Tory party who vote against this bill are violating some of the best traditions of Conservatism and there are elements of Conservatism that I admire a great deal. One of the elements of Conservatism - when I say I admire elements of Conservatism I am not expressing admiration for the group across from us. One of the very admirable characteristics of Conservatism is the great veneration, the great admiration for the works of the past, for the best works of the past.

A very fine Conservative historian was Jakob Burckhardt, a Swiss historian, who had a great great respect for art, for the artistic tradition of Western Europe. This may be something that is not very congenial to the members opposite but I have a great deal of respect for his opinions in this area. I'd like to just read one little excerpt. Burckhardt never closed his mind to new possibilities, unlike members opposite. But he insisted - and this was the driving force of his study and teaching of history - to preserve European culture one must first be aware of it. It is awareness that distinguishes the civilized man from the savage and one must be aware of it in its wholeness, in its magnificent continuum which includes of course its origins its antiquity and which includes of course its great art.

You people who vote against this bill will be denying to the children and the people of this province an opportunity to be far more aware of the culture from which we come. You who vote against this bill will be denying some people in this province of a chance to be aware of the great traditions of art in Western Europe. People who vote against this bill are denying my daughter the chance to see those great works of art. You are denying the people of Manitoba, the people of Winnipeg, a chance to look at some of the greatest art that has ever been done in the history of Western Europe. That is what you are doing if you vote against this bill. I welcome the challenge. I want to see who is going to vote against this bill, who is going to vote against it, who is going to deny a far far more fundamental right than you say we are violating in this bill. That is the right of the people of Manitoba to see this great collection of art. I will be very interested in seeing which members opposite vote against this bill.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek.

MR. J. FRANK JOHNSTON (Sturgeon Creek): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I'm going to put the honourable member's mind at rest right now. I'm voting against the bill. I wouldn't want him to have to stay up this evening worrying about it or for a couple of days worrying about it. I would also tell the honourable member that I will vote against this bill even if there is an amendment for it to self

BILL 56

(MR. J. FRANK JOHNSTON cont'd) . . . destruct after the exhibit leaves Manitoba because I'm a little bit like the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources. If I say yes, I will have the Russian exhibition here, and then I say that I will not maybe have one from France or from some other place, then I would have to say to myself what kind of favouritism am I showing and what would they think of me in that country. So I'm afraid that I couldn't vote for the bill even if it does self destruct.

Mr. Chairman, really the Member from St. Matthews was trying his hardest to put the blame upon the Conservative Party or the members in this Legislature that vote against this bill that we will not be able to see the culture that he speaks of, that we're denying the right to his daughter. Well I must say that he's got a pretty good argument but he and I don't see it the same way. The rights to his daughter or the people of Manitoba, at what cost? At the cost of taking a democratic right away from the people of Manitoba right now.

Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Mines and Resources brings up it's a point of law, it's done all the time. I don't compare the law in Russia and Canada. I don't compare the law in Canada and the United States or the law in Canada and France. I'm not really interested in all that paraphernalia. If you say it's not the Russians who have asked for this legislation - and I wouldn't blame the French Government if they asked for it, I wouldn't blame the United States if they asked for it. But you to say that it's the people of Manitoba that are asking for it, fine. Write them back and say, we want the exhibit but we will not take a right away from the people of Manitoba. Then see if you get it. What are you trying to put the blame on us for? What do we have to be the good guys all the time for? Why the devil don't they send it here? Why don't they send it here? Why don't they just pack it up, send it here, nobody's worried about it.

You keep talking about the age of the pictures and the Minister of Public Works with his travelogue that he gave me I'm not really that impressed that he's been around Europe and quite frankly I am not probably as connoisseur of art as he is but I enjoy it. I would go and see the exhibition if it comes and I would probably go home and say that it's marvelous and I'm very glad I've seen it. I would say that the book that the Honourable Member from St. Matthews read, and I'm sorry he's gone because I'm sure the public relations man of the Art Gallery will do a better job, do a better job than some of the Americans did because that's a promotional book to get people at it and he'll do a good job on it too. I don't blame him, he'll want the people flocking there if it comes.

But don't ask me to turn around and vote to say that I take a democratic right from the people I represent. The Minister of Mines and Natural Resources says that this is emotional and has something to do with countries. Not with me it doesn't. It doesn't have any relationship to me whatsoever in that form. All I say is the guy that I'll click my heel for is the constituents who elect me. They may want to see it and I will have to say to them, as your elected member I had to choose whether you saw that art at expense of losing some democracy that we have in Manitoba and I tell you this, if they want to kick me out on that basis go ahead. I'll run it that way. Won't bother me one bit. I'd be very happy to take it up on that basis. Mr. Speaker, I don't want to take this debate into the ridiculous but I'm going to . . . --(Interjection)-- The Member from Morris would be very annoyed when I use that word when I want to mention the Morris Stampede. But there are some men who watch a guy ride a bucking bronco and watch the horse and the guy working together and think that that is a demonstration, an exhibition of art that they have never seen before. They would far prefer many people, to go and watch the guy. They'll go down there and they will watch that Morris Stampede and all of a sudden the champion bronco is out there in the corral and some guy from Morris comes along and says, "That horse that was brought up from the United States was stolen from me." And they call the Member from Morris up and they say, "Warner, will you please get hold of the Cabinet and stop the seizure of that animal and make it immune, make it immune from seizure because there's 5,000 people sitting in the stands here waiting to see Joe Blow ride that bronco." Now that's exactly what you're doing. --(Interjection)-- Yes that is the attitude, you know,

BILL 56

(MR. F. JOHNSTON cont'd)that's the usual stupid sarcasm of the Minister of Health but that's the attitude he takes. But anyway that is exactly what you are doing. You're talking here all the time about paintings that are 50 or 1,000 or 500 years old - 200 years old. I don't know the dates you have in your book but, Mr. Speaker, this bill says that a guy can come up from the United States, book what he likes as far as art is concerned or an exhibition is concerned, go back down to the United States, maybe it's seized by their government but it can be shown in Canada, in Manitoba, and no Manitoban can claim it if it's his.

You're talking about passing a bill that says that any art, not that was stolen before - and I am beginning to think and I believe now that unless a picture is stolen five or six times it isn't worth a damn but that's probably right - but I'm telling you right now that you are not talking about pictures stolen then, you're talking about things that could be stolen now. And five years from now, or next year the Manitoba Government can say, bring it here guys, here's the haven for all the stolen culture in the world, and nobody can seize it whether it was stolen from a Manitoban or not.

Mr. Speaker, I hear somebody talking about the States. The Federal Government in the United States obviously has the right to do it. In Canada we have a BNA Act which gives the provinces the right, it gives the government of the province the right to protect the people, and it gives the man who represents them to speak for them and try to protect. And I prefer that system to the United States.

Mr. Speaker, I don't care what happened way back when as far as theft is concerned but the bill you're passing is not just then, it's now and future. And you're taking a democratic right from Manitobans. And, you know, whether you like it or not, that's what you're doing. Anybody in Manitoba can walk down the street and claim what is his and go to court for it.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for St. Matthews.

MR. JOHANNSON: Could the honourable member tell us whether the people of Manitoba right now have a right to claim the art that is contained in the Hermitage.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: We're going back to what I just said. He wants to go back and he wants to isolate this bill because he happens to like art or he wants to like this particular art, he wants to say --(Interjection)-- I don't know whether there is or not. I don't know that. I don't have to know that. I don't have to know that when I vote on a bill which is going to take a democratic right away from a Manitoban. Have you gone out and asked the million people in Manitoba? Have you gone out and found out whether they feel they have or they haven't?

A MEMBER: Do a poll.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: The member says do a poll. Don't walk in here and assume. And as I say, I have no worries at all about what the Member from St. Matthews tries to put on my shoulders when he says, if I vote against it I am voting against the people of Manitoba seeing it. I want them to see it. Send it. Send it.

And as the Member for Lakeside said, or the Minister of Public Works said, he talked about hockey, he talked about wheat, he talked about everything else. Send it. But don't ask me to pass a bill. Don't ask me to turn around and if there's a man who played hockey here last year, if he stole something while he's here and he comes back the team comes back and they say, this man's wanted in Canada for theft, that we won't send the team for those people to see unless you pass a bill making him immune from your loss. Why should we at any time make people immune from our laws?

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The hour being 5:30, I am now leaving the Chair and the House will reconvene at 8:00 p.m. The honourable member will have an opportunity to debate for another 30 minutes. Thank you.