

Honourable senators, a bishopric is not secular, and a secular institution cannot be analogous to a non-secular institution.

The chairman then went on to say:

The committee felt that the use of a corporation sole in this case might extend what has been until now a very limited use of this unusual legal device, and several members—

myself included—

were uncomfortable with such an extension.

Honourable senators, what I am arguing is that we have 20 precedents, but these 20 precedents do not apply to this case.

Further on, the chairman said:

... the committee has instructed me to request the Senate to advise the government in the strongest possible terms to proceed as quickly as possible with new legislation respecting the incorporation of non-profit and religious organizations. Furthermore, in doing so, the government should consider very carefully whether there is any continuing justification for the type of corporation sole considered here.

In other words, the committee does not actually believe there is any justification for this kind of corporation sole. Opus Dei has been able to operate without being a corporation sole, so why should we create this corporation sole? If things have to change—and at some point in legislating or in logic one must stop somewhere, this is a good point to stop, because we are being asked to extend the scope of our legislation to grant equivalent status to something that is neither a bishopric nor of equal status with a bishopric.

● (1510)

Therefore, in view of the contradictory message that appears in what the chamber has received from its committee, which is to say, "We do not really like this, but do it all the same!", I urge honourable senators to send the bill back to the committee for reworking.

On motion of Senator Hébert, debate adjourned.

## GOVERNMENT ORGANIZATION BILL, ATLANTIC CANADA, 1987

### SECOND READING

On the Order:

Resuming the debate on the motion of the Honourable Senator Murray, P.C., seconded by the Honourable Senator Flynn, P.C., for the second reading of the Bill C-103, An Act to increase opportunity for economic development in Atlantic Canada, to establish the Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency and Enterprise Cape Breton Corporation and to make consequential and related amendments to other Acts.—(Honourable Senator Petten).

**Hon. William J. Petten:** Honourable senators, when I adjourned the debate last Thursday it was my understanding that an honourable senator on this side of the house wished to take part in the debate. I have ascertained that this is not so.

[Senator Gigantès.]

As I have no intention of taking part in the debate at this time, I would be perfectly happy if it were given second reading.

**Hon. Lowell Murray (Leader of the Government and Minister of State for Federal-Provincial Relations):** Honourable senators—

**The Hon. the Speaker pro tempore:** Honourable senators, if Senator Murray speaks now, his speech will have the effect of closing the debate on the motion for second reading of this bill.

**Senator Murray:** Honourable senators, naturally I regret that Senator MacEachen, the Leader of the Opposition, has decided not to participate in the debate on second reading. No doubt we will have the opportunity to hear from him either in the committee hearings or at third reading of the bill.

**Senator MacEachen:** Or in the hinterland.

**Senator Murray:** Or in the hinterland; that is possible.

I do know that a notice of motion has been placed by our colleague, Senator Graham, which, I presume, we will have an opportunity to discuss in a day or so, calling on the National Finance Committee to divide Bill C-103 into two bills. We greeted this notice of motion silently and without prejudice to our right to discuss its procedural acceptability when the matter is called as well as the merits, if any, of proceeding in this way.

I thank Senator Graham for his very thoughtful contribution to the debate the other day. If I may in a personal way, I extend thanks to him for one or two personal references he made in the course of his speech. It is very difficult for me to take an aggressive or adversarial position toward Senator Graham's speech, considering the fact that he has made such kind remarks about my late father in the course of it. Those remarks are appreciated by me and by my father's numerous progeny, to whom I shall send copies of *Hansard*, and, indeed, they would have been appreciated by my father, coming as they do from an honourable senator from whom he had a great deal of admiration and regard.

Honourable senators, with the exception of Senator Graham's comments on the Industrial Development Division of Devco—and I shall come to those in a few moments—Senator Graham did not really have very much to say in defence of the status quo. He said nothing to deny the need for a new approach to regional development in the Atlantic provinces, and he said nothing in contradiction of the facts that I had earlier set out or in disagreement with the analysis.

Although he did not say so, I take it that he does not disagree too strongly, at any rate, with my contention that the dismantling of DREE was one of the mistakes of the previous government and the creation of DRIE was an error in concept and a failure in operation. There was the inevitable and unfortunate confusion that resulted between regional development policy as such and industrial policy.

I also said in my opening remarks—and I heard no argument from Senator Graham or anybody else on this point—that the incentive programs in their design and operation had become excessively bureaucratized. Certainly that was the