

That is beautiful rhetoric. These are the three commitments that the minister made in point (5) of his presentation. I urge you, Madam Speaker, to try to find them in the bill. You cannot find them, because all it says in Clause 40 is that the Minister of Public Works, once this bill is passed, is authorized to procure the dissolution of Harbourfront Corporation. Period, paragraph. That is the end of the Progressive Conservative commitment to Harbourfront.

The minister made a commitment in the House and we cannot find the equivalent of that commitment or the substance, the legal powers demanded to what he promises to do in the legislation. That is very, very disturbing. There are no safeguards. There are no conditions in the legislation.

We know that the book value of Harbourfront today is \$31 million.

Mr. Mills: That's a give-away.

Mr. Caccia: This was going to be owned by the public of Canada, the people of Canada. Suddenly, this is going to be given away. Who knows how, who knows to whom, and who knows for what purpose? Certainly to make a buck. That we know because that is what the Tories understand well.

Now that we know what the minister promises, now that we know what is in the bill—

Mr. Bosley: Don't tell us about leases.

Mr. Caccia: Madam Speaker, I suppose that the member for Don Valley West finds my intervention perhaps a little bit too Latin and temperamental, but apart from that he does not like to hear what is being said in here. He comes from Toronto and he may perhaps be worried about the future of Harbourfront, too. I know him to be a very public-spirited, public-minded member of Parliament. If I were in his shoes—and I do not know what happens in the Tory caucus—I would have fought tooth and nail against this bill. Would you not have, Madam Speaker? This is a dismantling of the waterfront in his own city.

This is the access to the lake that we are discussing. It is the greatest environmental asset which the city of Toronto has. Attempts have been made since 1972 to provide an open publicly-owned area, which unfortunately has been partially cluttered. Nevertheless, there is a possibility still to see the lake and have access to it.

Government Orders

Suddenly, we are saying: "Well, let's sell it. Harbourfront can go. Give up your lake and say goodbye".

• (1020)

That leads me to this excellent report, *The Water Shed* by the former member for Rosedale. He was a very fine minister while he was here in Ottawa and probably left because he was utterly frustrated. On page 129 of that report, under the heading "The Future of Harbourfront", the Royal Commission on the Future of the Toronto Waterfront states: "The lands, properties, and residual interests now managed by Harbourfront Corporation and those still in the inventory of Public Works Canada should be held and administered by Public Works Canada, on a temporary basis, until appropriate agreements with the city are implemented." That is not in Bill C-73 and it is very legitimate for the Opposition to raise this at this point and to ask why it is not in Bill C-73.

In making recommendations regarding the future of the Toronto waterfront in another report, the same author, Mr. Crombie, stated, and I quote from *Parks, Pleasures and Public Amenities*, volume 4, at page 68: "We recommend first that there be no further sale of lands currently held in public ownership." How do you like that?

Where is the co-ordination, the integration, the synchronisation between the government and its own Royal Commission? Maybe someone from the government benches will rise to offer an answer, a justification, or some kind of an explanation.

What is the point of having the Royal Commission on the Future of the Toronto Waterfront produce this outstanding documentation and give recommendations, only to have a silly little bill, Bill C-73, ignoring the work that has gone on for the protection of one of the most important waterfronts in Canada? It does not make sense. It is insane.

Time does not permit me to analyse what is being proposed in Vancouver. Again, another beautiful, private grab is shaping up in that city as well. I will stick to my own home city.

It is quite clear that this bill, Bill C-73, is reflective of the Tory vision. It is a vision which uses the public and what is in public ownership for the promotion of the interests of large business and powerful interests in society. Not only that, but it offers the opportunity to the private interests in society, utilizing investments originally made with public funds. First, the public is asked to take the risk. The public is asked to make the investment. Then, at the threshold where that investment promises to be profitable or become an opportunity for