

of results. We have also to be concerned about the reasoning in cases. We certainly were not proceeding with a view to denying the successful party her victory. Our concerns have to be much broader than that, and include the whole texture of the law.

● (1450)

#### FUNDING OF APPEAL

**Ms. Lynn McDonald (Broadview-Greenwood):** Mr. Speaker, I will direct my supplementary question to the President of the Treasury Board. His Department is, of course, funding the appeal, and has issued guidelines on sexual harassment. Can the Minister justify the use of taxpayers' money, on the one hand to fund the Canadian Human Rights Commission through the Department of Justice and, on the other hand, try to undermine the whole procedure by appealing the case as soon as the woman won it?

**Hon. Herb Gray (President of the Treasury Board):** Mr. Speaker, the new policy on sexual harassment announced by myself and the Minister responsible for the status of women last December came after this particular case arose. Perhaps had this procedure been in place earlier it might have been a simpler way to resolve the matter. Having said that, the complainant availed herself of her rights under the law to go to the Canadian Human Rights Commission. A review tribunal upheld her complaint, but the matter was appealed on the advice of the Department of Justice. The funding of the appeal was a decision by the Department of National Defence. I will say, Mr. Speaker, that the right of appeal on either side of the case, it seems to me, is fundamental to our system of justice. It is not a reflection on the fact that the complainant is a woman that this fundamental right of appeal has been used. I am sure the hon. lady would not argue that if the matter had gone otherwise the complainant should not have used her right of appeal.

\* \* \*

#### NATIONAL ENERGY PROGRAM

##### MINISTER'S STATEMENT

**Miss Pat Carney (Vancouver Centre):** Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the Minister responsible for energy I will direct my question to the Minister of State for Economic Development, who is quoted in the media as saying that the national energy policy, like any other program in a pragmatic Party, should be put on the table and examined. In view of the fact that he is chairman of his Party's economic development committee, and in view of the fact that this policy is viewed as a vindictive, malicious, and destructive program which hurt western Canada severely, could he tell us what changes he now proposes and why he has not proposed them before?

**Hon. Donald J. Johnston (Minister of State for Economic and Regional Development and Minister of State for Science and Technology):** Mr. Speaker, obviously I take issue with the

#### Oral Questions

rather curious rhetoric of the Hon. Member. This Party is known for its capacity to re-examine its programs to meet changing conditions and new challenges. The National Energy Program, for example, was updated by my colleague in 1982. I expect that, as circumstances change, it, like all other government programs, will be reviewed, reconsidered, and improved. That has always been the way with this Party, and I am sure it will continue to be that way in the future.

##### MINISTER'S POSITION

**Miss Pat Carney (Vancouver Centre):** Mr. Speaker, my supplementary is directed to the same Minister, and may I say that the curious rhetoric is his.

In view of the fact that since he has told us he is now considering these changes, and he has avoided answering the question of why he has now proposed reconsideration of a program which has caused such destruction in western Canada and hurt the Canadian consumer as a whole, what is his hidden agenda?

**Hon. Donald J. Johnston (Minister of State for Economic and Regional Development and Minister of State for Science and Technology):** Mr. Speaker, I would like to hear the quotation again. I thought the quotation, which probably was accurate, is to the effect that the National Energy Program, like other Government programs, should be subject to review. There is no suggestion even in the quotation that there are changes in mind. The fact is that, if there are changes required, they should be made. As I said, that has always been the case, so I do not quite understand the question as it arises out of the quotation.

\* \* \*

#### NATIONAL REVENUE

##### REGISTERED CHARITIES—DEPARTMENT'S INTERPRETATION

**Hon. Jake Epp (Provencher):** Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of National Revenue. There is a lot of disquiet among registered charitable and non-profit organizations arising from the interpretation his Department is placing on the activities of these organizations. I am restricting my question to churches. I have a letter from a branch of his Department concerning what is legitimate activity for a registered charity, specifically a church. The Department argues that it is acceptable for a religious organization to take a public stand on a moral issue but that a campaign designed to implement legislative changes would not be acceptable. The divorce legislation is an example of that. Why the interpretation from the Department?

[Translation]

**Hon. Pierre Bussières (Minister of National Revenue):** I think that the Hon. Member has had many opportunities to consider that matter. He knows full well that the Income Tax Act provisions concerning the definition of "charity" and