

**Senator McIlraith:** I accepted your invitation to raise the point of order.

**Senator Flynn:** But you did not point out that it concerns both sides.

**Hon. Louis-J. Robichaud:** Honourable senators, at this stage I would like to—

**Senator Flynn:** Stand up!

**An Hon. Senator:** Cheap, cheap!

**Senator Robichaud:**—raise a point of order. And I can tell the honourable senator that I am standing up. I will stand up at any time against the Leader of the Opposition in the Senate, especially when he behaves in such an infantile manner as he did this afternoon.

● (1430)

**Senator Flynn:** We were on an equal footing at that time.

**Senator Robichaud:** I agree with my colleague, Senator McIlraith. It is obvious that something has gone wrong in the other place and we know who is culpable.

**Hon. Richard A. Donahoe:** Trudeau.

**Senator Robichaud:** We are not going to discuss the situation in the other place this afternoon. Let us not behave childishly.

**Hon. Martial Asselin:** Make your point.

**Senator Robichaud:** Let us not behave as others are behaving in the other place; let us conduct ourselves as honourable senators.

**Hon. G. I. Smith:** I wish to speak to the point of order raised by Senator McIlraith. I agree with what he says is the object of Question Period. I have been on the receiving and the giving end of a Question Period for many years. My experience has been that Question Period gets along best when both sides do as is suggested by Senator McIlraith, and that is when questions are asked in accordance with the rules and answers are given briefly and in accordance with the rules. If we follow that practice, we may reach the very desirable objective that the honourable senator raises.

He and I may have to be very active in pressing this point often to ensure that the question is posed and the response is given in the manner my colleague suggests. I will gladly follow my colleague's advice when I am faced with both situations, and I hope he will join me when I raise the point with reference to some of the answers.

**Senator Donahoe:** Honourable senators, I wish to direct a question to the Leader of the Government in the Senate. Would he be kind enough to tell us now—or take the question as notice—the number of bills that have been introduced in this chamber since we resumed after the Christmas recess? I am speaking of those bills, private or public, presented in the Senate.

**Senator Perrault:** Honourable senators, yes.

**Hon. John M. Godfrey:** As a supplementary question, I would point out that people have been referring to legislation, and yet some of the most important work the Senate performs is done in its committees.

My question is: In view of the paralysis in the other place, should we not jump into the breach and have our committees take over some matters? As an example, the Minister of Finance said that he was prepared to refer to a parliamentary committee—he did not say a House of Commons committee—rules relating to corporate re-organization, taxation of whole life insurance, charitable foundations, retirement allowances and work in progress. These are five areas the Standing Senate Committee on Banking, Trade and Commerce is well qualified to study.

I do not agree with Senator McIlraith that the sole purpose of asking questions in the Senate is to elicit information. Ninety per cent of the questions I ask are for the purpose of getting some action.

**Senator Donahoe:** It should be 100 per cent.

**Senator Flynn:** No reply.

## FREEDOM OF INFORMATION

### STATUS OF PROPOSED LEGISLATION

**Hon. Nathan Nurgitz:** Honourable senators, I have a very brief question for the Leader of the Government in the Senate. Some weeks ago I raised some questions concerning the freedom of information bill. The staff of the Leader of the Government is, no doubt, busily working on an answer for him.

I read, albeit late, an article that appeared in the November-December issue of *Canadian Lawyer* wherein the Solicitor General dismissed concerns about limitations on the privacy of Canadians by citing this new proposed bill that would save private citizens from, for example, letter-opening and dossiers being kept on them.

My question, which I am sure the Leader of the Government would prefer to take as notice, is: As it becomes clear that the government intends either to abandon its Throne Speech commitment respecting freedom of information legislation or, as the leader proposed last time, to wait for provincial Liberal attorneys general to surface on the scene, would the leader indicate if the government will justify the faith of the Solicitor General in that some protection for citizens will be provided by introducing other legislation, not covering the whole realm of freedom of information and privacy, but just particular legislation to protect personal privacy?

**Hon. Raymond J. Perrault (Leader of the Government):** Honourable senators, the statement that I mentioned earlier, which I said I would attempt to bring to the Senate, has not yet been completed. However, the additional question posed by Senator Nurgitz shall be forwarded to the appropriate sources and perhaps a reply to this question can be included in the main reply.