

*Dissolution of Expo 1967 Corporation*

for nothing. Rather it is they who gave something to the rest of the country in their great kindness, a present so to speak, but I shall not stress that word unduly. At least they proved their willingness to do their share.

The same holds true for the breakdown of Expo costs: they said that Canada would finance 50 per cent of the cost, Quebec 37½ per cent and Montreal 12 per cent. However, with respect to the 50 per cent contributed by the federal government, we must recognize that about 16 per cent thereof comes from taxes collected in the province of Quebec. Therefore, Quebec did its share.

I have quoted those figures for the benefit of those who might worry and who think that on this occasion there was a lack of distributive justice in Canada; I would like to show them that, on the contrary, Quebecers and mostly Montrealers are willing to co-operate with the rest of the country, when Canada's welfare is at stake.

In the course of this debate, Mr Speaker, it has also been said to my amazement that Expo cost considerably more than had been anticipated originally. I have here the official report of the House of Commons debates recording the words of the right hon. member for Prince Albert (Mr. Diefenbaker) in this matter. Indeed on December 20, 1963, as is recorded at page 6213, the latter spoke in the following terms and I quote:

*[English]*

In 1959 the Montreal chamber of commerce prepared a brief. In 1960, on February 10, I announced that Canada would apply to I.B.E. for the fair; that Ottawa would guarantee \$20 million, Quebec \$15 million and the city of Montreal \$5 million.

• (3:30 p.m.)

*[Translation]*

That is what had been anticipated in 1960.

Mr. Speaker, I feel almost tempted to be nasty to my friends opposite and remind them that the then responsible authorities for Expo, the Commissioner at that time, were of the same political stripe as they are. I have the feeling that those people—his associates and himself—lacked vision, did not imagine that Canada had to meet a greater challenge than what they pictured.

Those figures, moreover, were much too conservative. They did not show enough vision to anticipate the great support from people all over the world who would come to Canada on that occasion, to anticipate the number of countries which would wish to take part in Expo, as well as the number of

[Mr. Mongrain.]

statesmen who would come here with impressive retinues to visit what Canada and all the other participating countries had to show to the modern world.

I forgive them for making wrong predictions, but the government should not now be blamed for shortsightedness because the people who made wrong predictions had been appointed by our friends on the other side.

Mr. Speaker, I readily admit that nobody in the world could have forecast in 1960, 1961, 1962 or 1963 the tremendous success of the exhibition. Planning was as sound as could be but, considering the unprecedented number of countries anxious to take part in Expo and the millions of people who were then planning to visit us, the Expo site had to be enlarged, facilities and staff had to be increased. They were recruited within the private sector and, since it was for temporary employment, they obviously had to be paid more than had been expected.

Mr. Speaker, it is no cause for surprise that the exhibition should have left us with a deficit of \$143 million, at least as far as the federal government is concerned. No matter what the Auditor General says, I maintain that the exhibition has left us with assets worth more than that deficit. The Auditor General of Canada has overlooked them. They are most valuable and more than compensate the deficit for Canada.

These are moral assets, Mr. Speaker: invaluable prestige, such as Canada never enjoyed before and acquired through the exhibition which brought citizens of many other countries to visit us. They now know the true image of Canada, a giant emerging from sleep in 1969, thanks, first of all, to Expo, then to "Man and His World."

Mr. Speaker, such things are bought and are paid for, even with money, nowadays. The research and the experiments that were carried out will bear fruit in many sectors of our economy and of our industry. What nobody would have dared undertake before because the necessary money could not be found in the usual budgets, was done with the Expo budget. Such things will profit our scientists, manufacturers and businessmen for centuries. All year round, funds are being spent for research and our friends opposite are the first to blame the government for not investing enough in that field. Now, we had a unique opportunity for research which resulted some new techniques.

Mr. Speaker, the federal government's share in the deficit have contributed to the