

So, honourable senators, when I am told: "Pass this bill now to regularize a situation which is not regular because we are applying the provisions before they have been approved by Parliament and we will look at it and maybe try to amend it next year for the years that follow so that the poor families will not be hit, and the middle-class families will not be hit," I would believe any senator, but can I believe the government? In view of its performance so far, I have to say that I cannot believe the government.

[Translation]

I oppose Bill C-70. I propose that it be referred to the Senate Committee on Social Affairs, Science and Technology, to be amended. Those inequities, those undue attacks on the poor, and those privileges granted to the rich will be changed. Then there will be some fairness in our system.

The Hon. the Acting Speaker: Senator Gigantès, do you move that the debate be concluded and the bill referred to the committee?

Senator Gigantès: No, this is not a motion, as such, Your Honour, merely a suggestion.

Hon. Norbert L. Thériault: Honourable senators, I move the adjournment of the debate.

The Hon. the Acting Speaker: It is moved by Hon. Senator Thériault, seconded by Senator Le Moine, that the debate be adjourned until the next sitting of the Senate.

[English]

Hon. Orville H. Phillips: Honourable senators, I understood from Senator Frith yesterday that there would be two speakers on this order this afternoon. Now the debate is being adjourned with the usual tactic of only one speaker. What happened in the interval?

Hon. Royce Frith (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): First, let me say what happened yesterday before we get to the interval. What happened yesterday was that I said that Senator Thériault was not here, that Senator Gigantès was not ready to proceed, that we would try to double up—those are the words I used—today. We are just not able to, so Senator Thériault will speak on the order tomorrow.

I do not know why that is funny, but—

The Hon. the Acting Speaker: Honourable senators—

An Hon. Senator: So much for a commitment.

Senator Frith: Just a minute. There was no commitment. I said we would try to double up. I could not say that we would double up because I had not spoken to Senator Thériault. So, if we are going to put this question on the basis of "so much for a commitment," then so much for my trying to help. I said I would try to bring that about, and I promised to try to bring that about, and I did try to bring that about. It is not a matter of "so much for a commitment"; the commitment I made was that we would try to do it, and I have fulfilled that commitment.

Senator Phillips: The commitment was that Senator Gigantès would speak today after Senator Thériault. I have that straight from *Senate Debates*.

Senator Frith: That is not what I promised; I could not promise that Senator Thériault would speak today because he was not in the chamber yesterday. I said that I would try.

[Translation]

The Hon. the Acting Speaker: Honourable senators, it is moved by Senator Thériault, seconded by Senator Le Moine, that the debate be adjourned until the next sitting of the Senate.

Is the motion carried, honourable senators?

Senator Flynn: On division.

On Senator Thériault's motion, debate adjourned on division.

● (1540)

[English]

TORONTO HARBOUR COMMISSIONERS' BILL, 1985

SECOND READING

On the Order:

Resuming the debate on the motion of the Honourable Senator MacDonald (*Halifax*), seconded by the Honourable Senator Murray, for the second reading of the Bill C-76, intituled: "An Act respecting the operation of the Toronto Island Airport by the Toronto Harbour Commissioners".—(*Honourable Senator Stollery*).

Hon. Peter A. Stollery: Honourable senators, I shall be quite brief. When I first looked at Bill C-76, I thought it was a fairly simple bill. However, as I read the bill in conjunction with the evidence in the other place, and as I know something about the Toronto Harbour Commission, I became less persuaded that it was as simple a matter as I had thought.

For the information of honourable senators, the area of Toronto from Union Station to the lake is built on landfill, and the Toronto Harbour Commission has a great deal of power over some of the most valuable land in Canada—land to which the title is unclear.

Some years ago I had the experience of assisting with the assembly of the land for the Harbourfront Park in Toronto, so I speak with some knowledge of the matter and of the Toronto Harbour Commission. As I read the bill, which affects rules and regulations concerning the airport—and the Toronto Island Airport is one part of the area to which I have referred—I found much of the testimony given in the other place confusing. I find the bill to be extremely technical in the sense that some of its implications should be more clearly set out than they are. Therefore, I am of the opinion that the Senate is the appropriate place to study the bill which could more greatly affect citizens of the area in question than might be considered at first glance. In my opinion, this bill should be referred to a Senate committee.

When I considered which committee it should be referred to, even that was not clear to me. Obviously, the airport is a transportation issue and the appropriate committee, I would suggest, should be the Standing Senate Committee on Transport and Communications. On the other hand, the bill seems to