

province of Quebec, with Montreal in the picture as well. The money that was paid to the Pan-Am games was paid as a result of an agreement between the federal government and the government of Manitoba, with the city of Winnipeg in it as well. I submit these are parallel propositions.

If we are trying to wind up our 1967 celebrations before 1970, instead of taking 100 years as they are doing in France, we have the right during these discussions to remind the government of some elements of this situation it seems to have overlooked. It is on that basis that I should like to make this case. If I have not persuaded you procedurally, I hope I can persuade you to be patient by saying I have not much more to say at this time. Perhaps that is more convincing to the Chair than my procedural argument. I gather from your gracious smile that it is.

May I just say that it was shortly after the Minister of Finance (Mr. Benson) gave us the budget on June 3, in which he announced the write-off of the Expo deficit, that I asked him—it was on June 10 as recorded in *Hansard* at page 9933—whether he would agree to the same kind of consideration for Winnipeg he had accorded to Montreal. I got an answer, the spirit of which I have already referred to. A couple of questions which I asked later on seemed to leave me in the same position. I had a private talk with the minister at one point toward the end of July during which he suggested I should write him. I wrote him on August 8 and gave him, in the best terms that I could, the facts of the matter. Not having received a reply by September 9, I wrote him again on that day and reminded him of my letter of August 8 and of our previous conversations. On September 15, I got an acknowledgement from Mr. T. K. Shoyama informing me that my letters were being considered and that I would receive a reply later.

By Wednesday, October 29, not having received that promised reply, I raised the matter during the oral question period and the minister replied in these terms, as reported in *Hansard* at page 242:

If I have not answered my hon. friend's letter yet, I apologize sincerely and will make sure that the answer goes out very shortly.

I still have not received an answer. I still do not intend to raise my voice or shout because I hope that the time being taken indicates that the point is being considered at cabinet level, that the argument I am making does have some merit, and now that we are

Dissolution of 1967 Expo Corporation

winding up our 1967 costs we will deal not only with this great big one with respect to Expo, but that we will deal with this one that has come to us from Winnipeg.

I will try to draw this to a conclusion. I said that a moment ago, and if I say it again I hope it will keep you, Mr. Speaker, from interrupting me. I should like to point out that there was an agreement between the federal government on the one hand and the provincial and local governments in Manitoba on the other, on April 8, 1965, under which the costs were to be divided: five-elevenths to Ottawa, four-elevenths to the province and two-elevenths to the city of Winnipeg. Later on certain amounts were added because the Pan-Am pool was built and so on. Through the piece there was a pretty good relationship. There was an awareness of the fact that costs would mount, but when the party was held and when all the bills came in there was much more spent than had been anticipated, not astronomical as in the case of Montreal, but enough that the amount now to be paid by the city of Winnipeg is just too much for a city of that size.

There is a deficit in both cases. We are prepared to write off \$120 million in respect of Expo '67. I do not object because, as I said before, this was a good party and Canada is better off for having had it as part of its 100th anniversary. But Winnipeg also made a major contribution to the celebrations of that year. It has a deficit of a little over \$1 million, and it is help in clearing off this amount that is being sought from the federal government. I hope that favorable consideration is being given to this matter.

I think this is a solid case. It is being pushed by Mayor Juba of Winnipeg and the Winnipeg city council. It is being pushed by all of us who are the Manitoba members of this House. I hope this matter will be dealt with favourably. After all, we are simply asking for fair play.

Let me say again that all of us are a little astounded at the total cost of Expo. It went far beyond what we anticipated. It is also true that our enjoyment was greater than we anticipated. What it amounts to is that we have to pay the bill now that the party is over. If I may allude again to the minister's reference to the situation in Paris, let us not leave out tag ends. If we are winding up the cost of celebrating 1967 in Canada, let us do the complete job. Let us not only do the fair thing for Quebec and Montreal, let us do the