density requirements there. All of these things were decided last night.

The big question is, what is the federal Government going to do about it? It has had its own review. The Government has always deferred to the city on planning matters. When the city refused something, the Government agreed, or agreed to go ahead when the city approved it. Are we going to lift our freeze now that the city has said we should? Are we going to downgrade the height of those buildings to eight storeys? Are we going to preserve Harbourfront for the people of Toronto, or are we going to see what has been described as a ceramic wall erected between the lake and the people of the City of Toronto? I would like to hear the answers to those questions from the Parliamentary Secretary tonight.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Claude Lanthier (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Public Works): Mr. Speaker, the Government of Canada is proceeding with a full policy review of the role and mandate of the Harbourfront Corporation in Toronto.

[*English*]

The policy review of the role and mandate is well under way. It will be concluded in September, at which point Ministers will decide what if any changes should be made to the mandate and what if any changes should be made to the existing development plans of the corporation. I ask Members to note that the existing plans were approved in 1981 by all levels of Government, including the City of Toronto, the Metropolitan Toronto Council, the Province of Ontario, as well as the Government of Canada.

Harbourfront has had many successes to its credit. However, in spite of that, public and civic concern has risen in recent months over specific issues, most notably over the seemingly sudden appearance of high-rise residential blocks in an area which people thought would have only medium-height development, as well as the apprehension that promised parkland will not be delivered. Indeed, these concerns were raised here in the House, for example by my colleague, the Hon. Member for York East (Mr. Redway), who presented a petition in the spring identifying concerns of the petitioners regarding the height, density, recreation space and parking requirements of Harbourfront.

To support the federal policy review and the city's land use review, the Government, Harbourfront and the city placed a hold on projects on the drawing boards. I understand the process has now reached the stage where last night city council considered and took decisions on a report from the Commissioner of Planning and that the mayor will shortly be communicating the city's decision to my Minister. I further understand that city council has approved a motion that the six projects affected by the hold on development should be allowed to proceed subject to certain conditions and passage through the city's normal planning and development approval process.

• (1820)

My Minister, in consultation with other Ministers representing Toronto area constituencies and with Hon. Members of this House from Toronto, will want to sit down and consider carefully the city's views, including any possible financial implications of changing the existing plan or modifying Habourfront's role and mandate.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I wish to say that in my view, while the policy review, the city's land use review, and the hold on developments have created some uncertainties and difficulties, they are basically sound actions on the part of the Government of Canada and the City of Toronto to take the breathing space which has been created and make doubly sure that the Harbourfront vision corresponds to the wishes and needs of the people of Toronto and the millions of other Canadians who will be attracted to visit there.

REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT—NORTHERN ONTARIO—ALLEGED TRANSFERS OF PUBLIC SERVICE JOBS. (B) REQUEST FOR FREEZE ON JOB TRANSFERS

Mr. John Parry (Kenora—Rainy River): Mr. Speaker, my question on the "Late Show" today arises from my question on March 31 which was one of a number of such questions posed by myself and the Hon. Members for Thunder Bay—Nipigon (Mr. Epp), Thunder Bay—Atikokan (Mr. Angus), and Nickel Belt (Mr. Rodriguez) in the period from November, 1986, through June, 1987. We encountered what could politely be termed a lengthy saga of obfuscation, delay and non-information on the part of the Government.

Over the period of seven months during which we were asking about the proposed Northern Ontario Redevelopment Program, we received answers to our questions couched in such terms as "in a few weeks", "shortly", "soon", and "in due course" with regard to when the answers would be available. It was not until July 13 that, in response to months of pressure, the Government finally announced the Northern Ontario Redevelopment Program.

Unfortunately, the announcement was not worth the seven and a half months of wait. The program as announced could only be described as niggardly. Naturally, we in northern Ontario are grateful for any assistance we get and we can promise that it will all be put to good use. However, when we compare the assistance which has been promised in the Northern Ontario Redevelopment Fund, namely, a nominal figure of $55 million over five years, to that which has been promised to other parts of the country, we can see that northern Ontario is again getting short shrift from the Conservative Government.

The program in fact consists of approximately $40 million available for loans, grants, top-ups, et cetra, and $60 million worth of loan guarantees which is equated to $15 million. That works out to a loan loss provision of 25 per cent, which is in itself unrealistic and discriminatory.