

connected therewith. The explanatory note states clearly that the purposes of this bill is:

(a) to provide for the dissolution of the Canadian Corporation for the 1967 World Exhibition;

Nobody can object to that, I think, because it is in order.

The second purpose of this bill is, and I quote:

(b) to authorize the disposition of the remaining assets and liabilities of the Corporation;

There might be differences of opinion as to the manner of disposing of the assets and liabilities, but the government proposes a solution which will be discussed at the meetings of the appropriate committee. The third purpose of this bill is:

(c) to stop interest accruing on the outstanding notes of the Corporation payable to the Government of Canada and thus prevent the accumulation of additional liability in respect of those notes and to write-off one hundred and twenty-five million dollars representing Canada's share of the deficit of the Corporation;

It must be admitted that this is an economy measure which can be easily accounted for and it will be possible to put questions to the minister in the committee.

Here is the fourth purpose of the bill:

(d) to authorize the deferral to 1972 of payment by Quebec of not more than five million five hundred thousand dollars due in 1969-70 in connection with the operations of the Corporation.

As we know, the government has taken such action in order to take advantage of the request made by the city of Montreal to cope with unemployment there. It is therefore a rather fictitious expenditure, since the equivalent would have been spent on unemployment insurance and welfare allowances.

The minister explained in greater detail the reasons for every provision of the bill.

After the minister's statement, the bill seemed quite clear and simple to me, and even the opposition praised it no end. Therefore, I thought the debate would only take a few hours, just long enough perhaps to hear the few usual speeches from members of the opposition, so that the measure could be referred to the appropriate parliamentary committee, where questions and explanations could be asked, concern expressed and answers obtained from the minister and his experts.

I would not have dared intervene in the debate if all members had agreed that it might save time. But since the whole day yesterday was spent in bringing all kinds of

#### *Dissolution of Expo 1967 Corporation*

charges against the government and distorting the facts, I feel duty bound today to answer at least briefly.

While I felt the debate was unnecessary, I listened to all the interventions of the opposition, including statements that were petty and at times disquieting.

I hope that I am mistaken, because I do not pride myself on being infallible. However, I thought I perceived in certain members an intention to express, indirectly and discreetly, while heaping praises on the minister, some feelings of jealousy toward the city of Montreal and the province of Quebec because of Expo. Some also took the opportunity to attack the government.

Mr. Speaker, in my view this is uncalled for, since we are dealing with an exceptional measure. In fact "Man and his World" has been the finest monument ever erected to the Canadian way of life, for all the world to see, thanks to the co-operation of all—whoever they may be: the Progressive Conservative party, other parties or all citizens, even those who are not interested in politics.

This achievement was the result of co-operation from the beginning. At least this time we managed to agree on a tremendous achievement for the sake of Canada's prestige. I think we should not give the rest of the world the impression we are mice trying to nibble away at this monument's base, but that we can work together and complete this wonderful undertaking that was launched so successfully.

Of course, some people always worry and we must try to reassure them.

First of all, I wish to deny that this was a gift to the city of Montreal, and I can prove it. On the contrary, I believe, as I already said, that it was a co-operative effort from all Canadians toward the development of this country, and that Montrealers and Quebecers did more than their share, or at least their share, shall we say, not to exaggerate.

We are told that Expo cost every Canadian \$7, but it is perhaps not known that it also cost Quebecers more than \$7. They have indeed paid \$18, Montrealers have paid \$75, not taking into account the sharing of the deficit that we shall pay as Canadians, Quebecers and Montrealers. The contribution of each Montrealer, Mr. Speaker, will amount to some \$75.

This is to say that Quebecers, mostly Montrealers, have done more than their share and have not really got anything free, gratis and