This employee has already had to endure savage harassment by her supervisor for a period of years, and now faces court action brought against her by a Department clearly committed to upholding the right of male employees to exact sexual perks from their subordinates.

He asks the Minister to stop this:

I appeal to you . . . to intervene personally to put an end to DNDs campaign of intimidation—

That is very strong language and, I regret to say, it is justified.

Finally, let me comment on the decision of the Department of Justice to appeal the case. I am reminded of the Department's past decisions to appeal equality cases when women win them. The Lavell case is a shameful example involving rights for native women. When the woman finally won at the federal court of appeal, it was the Department of Justice which appealed that decision requiring the woman to go to the Supreme Court of Canada. We see that practice continuing. A woman wins a case at a lower level and the Department of Justice goes for an appeal. This indicates that equal rights for women is window dressing, public relations, and when we get down to the crunch of a real case, the Government does not take its own commitment seriously.

Mr. Stanley Hudecki (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of National Defence): Mr. Speaker, I first want to pay my respect to the Hon. Member for Broadview-Greenwood (Ms. McDonald) and congratulate her on her aggressive action in pursuit of justice on behalf of women, particularly in the area of sexual harassment. In this particular case, however, I think her timing is rather poor. Neither the Minister nor I are in a position to go into the details of the case because appeals are pending before the court. Her colleague, the Hon. Member for Selkirk-Interlake (Mr. Sargeant), had an exchange with the Minister on the subject two weeks ago. At that time the Minister clarified the situation by stating that the Department is appealing the liability issue. This is the only area being appealed.

Under these conditions I can only add that the answers provided by the Minister of Justice (Mr. MacGuigan) and the President of the Treasury Board (Mr. Gray) are worth repeating. In recent years this Government has legislated far reaching and comprehensive legislation which protect the rights of all Canadians. To name a few, the access to information legislation, the Privacy Act and the Human Rights Commission, not to mention the Charter of Rights—all benefit Canadians.

Situations arising from practical implementation of these measures must be dealt with at all levels, especially in the first stage, very carefully. As they are brought before the courts precedents are set which will govern future applications. The onus is therefore on all parties to pursue these matters with the utmost care. When it is judged that appeals are required, they must be pursued.

• (1810)

If one were to summarize the intent in theirs answers, both Ministers sought to make sure that it was understood that neutrality and fairness must be guaranteed. This is the only response I am in a position to make at this time.

THE SENATE—APPOINTMENT OF EIGHT NEW SENATORS. (B) REQUEST THAT PRIME MINISTER DELAY MAKING FURTHER APPOINTMENTS

Mr. Howard Crosby (Halifax West): Mr. Speaker, on January 18, 1984 I questioned the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) about his attitude and actions with respect to Senate reform. I specifically asked the Prime Minister how he considered that his appointment of eight new Senators contributed to the process of Senate reform. Instead of providing me with an explanation of the reasons for those appointments to the Senate, he assumed the position, as he often does, that the best defense is a good offence. He simply went on the attack claiming that over a period of time the Opposition Parties had blocked any attempt at Senate reform, sometimes in conjunction with the elected representatives in the provinces of Canada.

That was not a fair approach to the very serious matter of Senate reform, Mr. Speaker. The Prime Minister knows, as well as all Members of the House of Commons, that the process of Senate reform started with the institution of the Senate in 1867, and has continued since. There were a number of reforms over this period which I will not detail. However, I will indicate that in 1978 the Government of Canada, under the current Prime Minister, proposed Bill C-60. This Bill established very far reaching reforms to the Senate and provided for a House of the federation of a quite different kind than the existing Senate. That Bill was ruled unconstitutional by the Supreme Court of Canada. The Supreme Court of Canada said that Bill C-60 was beyond the power of the Parliament of Canada. The Prime Minister used that as an excuse for taking the action that he did. He said he appointed eight Senators because there was no hope of Senate reform.

That attitude was not consistent with the facts. In December of 1982, just prior to the Christmas recess of that year, the Prime Minister, along will all Members of the House of Commons, had given unanimous approval to the establishment of a Special Committee of the Senate and the House of Commons to consider Senate reform in order to strengthen the role of the Senate in representing the regions of Canada and to enhance the authority of all Parliament to speak and act on behalf of Canadians. That was the mandate given to that Special Joint Committee of the Senate and the House of Commons which I will refer to as the Senate Reform Committee in my remarks.

Proof positive that the Prime Minister paid attention to the existence of the Senate Reform Committee and the ongoing work of the committee was the fact that on December 7, 1983 in the Speech from The Throne, when the words of the Governor General of Canada were delivered in Parliament, it was said that the Government will continue to take an active interest in the work of the Senate-House Committee on senate reform. Mr. Speaker, that sets the stage. We had a Senate Reform Committee appointed in December 1982. We had the