

*Adjournment Debate*

One more point, Mr. Speaker. I know he has raised questions about the ILS on runway 06. Yet the regional municipality has accepted the decommissioning of the ILS. It should be noted that it does not degrade the available level of service as an ILS is available on the 8,000 foot runway.

I think that the member, in order to be fair, ought to concede that the minister has been giving due attention and we ought to let the airlines do some choosing as to which facilities they want to use.

## HARBOURFRONT CORPORATION

**Hon. Bob Kaplan (York Centre):** Mr. Speaker, like the previous speakers, I am very happy to have a chance to expand on some points that are really hard to make in the context of Question Period and the issue about which I am glad to have this extra time is the developments at Harbourfront in the city of Toronto.

Harbourfront had a somewhat controversial launching, but there is absolutely no doubt that it is a very valued asset in Toronto today, something appreciated by the people to the point where traffic jams on weekdays and weekends are more the issue than lack of use.

There have been problems with Harbourfront. Its policies have been criticized, but none of them have been criticized as much as the criticism of the federal government's proposed solution to the problems at Harbourfront.

We rose in December to ask some questions about the government solutions to the Harbourfront problem and we certainly did not receive satisfactory answers. The minister told us that the mayor of the city of Toronto was happy about the solution of Harbourfront. He failed to mention that of the 16-member council only one member, the mayor, was happy about it. All the other members of council had objected to the imposed solution of the federal government and, in fact, as I rise now we are awaiting one further study—maybe one study too many—of what the solution to the Harbourfront problem should be.

I do not have a whole solution fleshed out to put forward. It is not the function of the opposition to do so, but I want to draw attention to the serious problems with the government's so-called solution and I ask these questions in the spirit that three months later, almost four months later, that have elapsed since the question

was asked, the government may well have come to recognize the problems with its so-called solutions.

This is a solution by the way which will result in the federal government, which once owned at the beginning when Harbourfront was established, 100 acres of land. Now at the end of it, if this solution is implemented fully, the government, the Harbourfront non-profit corporation, will only own 10 acres of land.

• (1800 )

We are giving the park back to the people. We are going from a federal landholding of over 100 acres to a federal government landholding of 10 acres. We have complained that the cultural and recreational programming, which the government says it guarantees will continue, will in fact not be guaranteed.

There is not enough funding provided to ensure that these programs will continue. The government has made a commitment to maintain that programming, but the funding that they have provided will not do it.

It needs a better solution. It wants to pass the burden to the city of Toronto to sustain this programming, but the programming could be sustained by the use and development for commercial and other purposes of the rest of the land.

The second problem that I want to focus on is that instead of using the surrounding land to its full economic advantage for the programming at Harbourfront, the government is basically embarking on a program which gives it away.

Naturally, there is going to be some consideration paid for it by the private developers who are going to be acquiring some of this 100 acres of land. Coopers and Lybrand, an independent appraising firm which did an appraisal of it, found that the land that the corporation is disposing of to private developers in return for what we call the pipeline land is the land that is on the south side of Queen's Key and actually facing the water. It is actually worth \$36 million more than the federal government is going to be getting for the favours that it is giving in return.

In other words, \$36 million which might have been available for funding of the Harbourfront programming is instead being transferred to private developers. When I raised that question with the minister, you will not believe what he said in reply to me. He said: "We had to pay a premium to get that land back from the private