

Mr. Muir: I just wish to know his understanding of what the agreement involves.

Mr. Henderson: As you can see from the note here, we have had some difficulties in understanding what this agreement contemplated. As is explained, ever since 1964 I have been asking the corporation to clarify certain of the paragraphs in that agreement, recognizing that they would present problems to me at this time, as I finalize the accounts, which is the process in which I am engaged at the moment.

Mr. Muir: The original agreement was that the federal government would put up \$20 million and that this would be matched equally by the Province of Quebec and the City of Montreal.

Mr. Henderson: That is the agreement that is referred to here. It is known as the Tripartite Agreement, and under that the money was to be put up three ways. That applied to the original \$40 million of grants. Since then the money has been advanced by the federal government on the basis of securities issued by Expo Corporation in favour of the Receiver General. Those advances have been appearing in loans and advances in the estimates to Parliament each year, and they end up in the investments here.

The Chairman: I have two questioners on my list, Mr. Southam and Mr. McLean.

Mr. Southam: Mr. Chairman, the suggestion has just been made by one of the members that to expedite the work of the Committee we should move on to the 1967 report rather than work back and forth between the 1966 and the 1967 reports.

In your opinion, Mr. Henderson if we took this step would we be overlooking consideration of some pertinent details or matters in the 1966 report? We are all interested in making some progress, but I would like to have his advice on this first.

Mr. Henderson: Mr. Southam, I appreciate what actuates the suggestion, but the fact of the matter is that we have two reports here. I am completely in your hands.

In accordance with your last decision we have prepared a list of all the 1966 comments which are not carried forward into 1967. They concern a host of matters which, in the normal course, you would examine. If however, you should decide that you want to pass up examining . . .

Mr. Southam: Let me hasten to say that I am not suggesting that we do that. If in your opinion, there are important matters that should be examined I am all for doing so. It was surely to expedite the work of the Committee that I raised that suggestion again.

Mr. Henderson: There are some quite important matters, Mr. Southam, if I may be so bold as to say so. For example, there is the very first one, Governor General special warrants. That is the kind of thing with which we have been wrestling for ten years, on which you have been making recommendations, in respect of which nothing has been done and which will pop up again in the event of another election.

There is also the item of the recording of commitments. They are all important points.

Mr. Winch: And they are not repeated in 1967?

Mr. Henderson: They are not repeated in 1967. We have a fresh bunch in 1967.

Mr. Southam: Can we, then, follow the procedure of concentrating directly on 1966 and completing that part?

Mr. Henderson: That is what we were hoping to accomplish by giving you a listing.

The Chairman: And that is what I have been trying to do, but we are going off on many tangents. I will rule with an iron hand, if you like, and I will say, "That is out. That is in 1967".

Mr. Henderson: The tangents are very helpful to us, Mr. Chairman. I appreciate very much the attention that is being given, but . . .

The Chairman: I seem to be rather in between.

Mr. Muir: Would anything be gained by taking the 1967 items first and then reverting to those of 1966?

The Chairman: Gentlemen, we will proceed on this basis this morning.

Mr. Tucker: If I may I will ask one more question on Expo's ultimate deficit of \$211 million.

Would Mr. Henderson advise us what proportion of that debt, if it is correct, would be borne by the federal government, the provincial government and the City of Montreal.