

Closing Expo 1967 Corporation

seemed to have any control—spend, spend and draw on the government of Canada, or at least with the tacit approval of the government of Canada. I repeat that there was never any suggestion anywhere, any place or at any time that this kind of thing would be tolerated.

The minister has the habit of making statements accompanied with a happy face.

Mr. Pepin: I learned that from you.

Mr. Diefenbaker: He is a congenial fellow. Nobody I know in the House of Commons can be more congenial when he is in greater difficulty. That is an attribute I give to him. He smiles.

Mr. Prud'homme: He is not going to cry.

Mr. Diefenbaker: He exudes congeniality, but I am not going to tell the hon. member that he also imitates the minister or that the minister imitates him. They are both happy individuals, and always when there is difficulty the minister adopts that attitude.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Diefenbaker: What about the total amount that was to be spent? Did anybody ever contemplate the expenditure of \$270 million? Did anybody ever begin to realize that we were going to be asked to cover up \$122 million by the subterfuge of the bill now before the House instead of following the constitutional system? There was nothing of that kind.

What did Mr. Pearson say? On August 13, 1963, within a period of a few months after he resumed office, he announced an immediate summit conference to guarantee safe sailing for the world's fair. Then, he announced that the federal contribution would be something over \$50 million toward the exhibition. There had been no ratification or acceptance by Parliament, but even Prime Minister Pearson, in his most effusive declaration regarding the exhibition, never went beyond something over \$50 million.

• (3:50 p.m.)

The Prime Minister went on to say that federal government support for the fair had already been decided and an allocation of \$20 million had been made toward direct costs. Added to this amount, he said, would be the cost of an exhibit "worthy of this country", and a "substantial extra amount" would be required to protect the site. He said the total expenditure of the federal government would be something over \$50 million. That included

the cost of Canada's pavilion. Let that be clear. The whole cost would be the original \$20 million plus some \$30 million to cover Canada's exhibition and certain additional costs. Then he said that improvements to bridges, access roads and other ancillary needs would have to be met by either the Province of Quebec or the City of Montreal. And he added these words: "There must be a clear understanding of who will do what." Mr. Speaker, that is exactly what we are saying now. The hon. member for Regina East (Mr. Burton) who spoke, and who moved an amendment, had this in mind. Well, nobody ever decided that question. The government simply allowed those people in charge to spend whatever they wished to spend, without any control whatsoever.

Let me go on. Mr. Pearson said:

We must anticipate events. Each government must assess the full meaning of what it must do. Time is all too short for what must be done.

The report continued:

The three government leaders, with other dignitaries, sat under 16-foot high blue, green and red letters reading EXPO '67 on one side of the main barge—From then on, the folk dancing took place.

Today, the folk who are dancing are the people of Canada who have to pay the taxes from which to meet these unjustified expenditures, outlays which constitutionally ought not to have been permitted. I see the minister says my figures are a myth, and while I had suggested in the House in April, '64 that net costs were to be held to that amount, I had not been so certain of that possibility in December, 1963.

I never altered my view, Mr. Speaker. Parliament approved the amount which was required and requisite on the part of the federal government. What happened was this: the Government of Canada under Prime Minister Pearson and those associated with him simply permitted expenditures to be made beyond reason, completely without any authority and in the absence of any information giving details. Nor are we going to find out, because if this bill is passed in its present form what we shall be doing is something along the lines of the old adage "forgive and forget". But in this case the people of Canada will have to pay.

The government I had the honour to lead brought EXPO about. I was in Vancouver in February, 1963 and I had before me six or seven different areas, one of which, it was suggested, should be the site of EXPO. Having examined them at greater length than ever