

Questions

if so, what is the amount of the estimated deficit and, of this estimated deficit, how much is the responsibility of the federal government?

Hon. Robert Winters (Minister of Trade and Commerce): Expo brought large financial net benefits to Canada. Therefore, on a national basis, it was a good investment of funds although as an isolated project, there was a substantial deficit. The termination of contracts, disposal of assets and final financial statements of Expo '67 will be completed only about June 30, 1968. Therefore, the exact amount of the net cost within the gates of Expo is not yet known. It is estimated that the total net cost in the books of the exhibition corporation will amount to approximately \$295,000,000. of which 50 per cent, or approximately \$147,500,000. will be paid by the federal government, 37½ per cent by the province of Quebec and 12½ per cent by the city of Montreal, under the tripartite agreement. Not reflected in the deficit of the corporation are the following:

1. Assets transferred to the three governments were recorded in the books of the exhibition corporation at a value of \$74 million.

2. The estimated increase in the tax revenues of all governments generated by expenditures on Expo was \$238 million.

3. Foreign participants invested an estimated \$200 million in their participation of Expo '67.

4. Tourist revenue increased in Canada in 1967 by approximately \$490 million, most of which was due to Expo '67.

5. Over 50 per cent of Expo visitors were non-Canadian tourists. Approximately one million Expo admissions were by people from outside continental United States and Canada. The foreign pavilions were operated by the trade, commerce and industry departments of the 72 foreign governments and the three international organizations represented. All of this will result in benefit to Canada's foreign trade and general reputation abroad.

Expo '67 was universally acclaimed as the greatest world exhibition in history. It has generated greater understanding of Canada at home and abroad, and has produced substantial intangible benefits which cannot be reduced to a sum of money in assessing the overall value of Expo.

[Mr. Coates.]

* C.B.C. USE OF U.P.P. PROGRAMS

Question No. 933—Mr. Ormiston:

1. Has the C.B.C. at any time delivered U.P.P. programs, purchased by the C.B.C. to its affiliates that purchased these U.P.P. programs?

2. In respect to Part 1 above, does the C.B.C. make the normal program charge on a per hour range for these U.P.P. programs?

3. In respect to Parts 1 and 2 above, to how much has the subsidy to the affiliates amounted, to date?

Mr. Albert Béchard (Parliamentary Secretary to Secretary of State): The answer to this question is as follows:

Some of the United Program Purchase organization's programs purchased by C.B.C. owned stations for local use are transmitted via microwave at a common time period. C.B.C. affiliated stations purchasing the same programs independent of the C.B.C. are permitted, upon request, to "lift off" these programs during the time of the C.B.C.'s line feed. This practice is usually employed to complement regular network colour programming where affiliated stations not able to originate colour film programs can transmit network colour programs. In addition, sponsors of specific programs common to both C.B.C. owned stations and some affiliated stations have requested that such programs be "lifted off" by the affiliated stations during the period they are being fed to C.B.C. stations. The affiliated stations U.P.P. membership is not a requisite to receive this service.

The answer to Nos. 2 and 3 is that there is no charge to affiliated stations, whether or not they are members of the U.P.P., nor is there any additional cost to the C.B.C.

LANGUAGE REQUIREMENTS FOR POSTMEN

Question No. 934—Mr. Valade:

1. What are the requirements of the Postmaster General concerning a knowledge of the English language for French-speaking Canadians and of the French language for English-speaking Canadians who apply for the position of mailman?

2. How many applicants have been turned down between January 1, 1967, and January 1, 1968 (a) in the case of applicants residing in Quebec who did not have an adequate knowledge of English (b) in the case of English-speaking applicants who did not have an adequate knowledge of French, in each of the provinces?

3. Are applicants for the position of mailman required to undergo an examination on their knowledge of the French language in provinces other than Quebec?

4. What type of examination applies to applicants for the position of mailman as concerns (a) the English language (b) the French language?