

The question was, can we put in the block appearing for each seat in the seating plan the name of the senator, the province he represents and the designation, together with the senator's party affiliation, or some combination of those elements.

The answer is that because the seating plan must be bilingual, there are cases where it is virtually impossible to get all of that information, in both languages, within a block of any appropriate size within the seating plan. It seems that the solution is to have the seating plan show the name of the senator only, though we could probably add his province and perhaps the designation. It would, however, be better to have a separate sheet listing provinces, with the senators listed alphabetically under those provinces, plus the designation and party affiliation. In those circumstances, the block would show only the name, and perhaps the province, but, ideally, I think, just the name, with all the supplementary information set out on a separate sheet. The seating plan will be computerized, so that we will not have the problem of having names not fit into the block, of having names typed in different characters, and so on.

That is the answer to Senator Godfrey's question. I believe we can look forward to having in our hands within the next month or so the plans I have just described.

CANADA ELECTIONS ACT

BILL TO AMEND—ORDER STANDS

On the Order:

Resuming the debate on the motion of the Honourable Senator Austin, seconded by the Honourable Senator Goldenberg, for the second reading of the Bill S-11, intitled: "An Act to amend the Canada Elections Act".—(*Honourable Senator Macquarrie*).

Hon. Heath Macquarrie: Honourable senators, I am sorry that I must rise again on a point of order and procedure with regard to this matter. I profoundly hope that this will be my last intervention on this particular measure.

I have said that we cannot properly proceed with this until something has been done with regard to deciding whether or not this is a government bill. Having to request the Senate to stand this matter puts me in an invidious position, since such a request might be taken to mean that I am indifferent, that I am not ready, that I do not care, that I am in a hurry, or that I simply do not want to make a speech today. That, however, does not matter, although I maintain that I am not ready to speak simply because of the matter to which I have alluded already, namely, the importance of knowing whether this is a government bill.

I suggest to the deputy leader that he ascertain whether or not this is a government bill or whether he does not know, or whether no one in the government can tell him. Should the latter be the case it would probably be purer, procedurally, to withdraw the measure and to start again properly.

[Senator Frith.]

I wonder if the deputy leader, who is a most excellent man, despite his affiliations, could find out what the real disposition of the government is on this measure. Electoral machinery and legislation with regard to it are important matters. I do not want to be put in the position of having to ask the members of this house to stand this order again.

Hon. Royce Frith (Deputy Leader of the Government): Honourable senators know that I share Senator Macquarrie's passion for procedural purity, and they also know that I share his analysis of the procedural dimension of this order, namely, that since it was first introduced as a private bill its sponsor has become a minister of the Crown.

The second fact is that it is quite undesirable—in fact, I think it is quite improper—that a private bill stand in the name of a minister of the Crown and create ambiguity as to whether it is a private bill or a government bill.

A third factor is that it is perfectly true that Senator Macquarrie, in whose name this order stands, has been very patient with regard to his request to have this procedural impurity corrected. I have taken steps, as he knows, as recently as last evening, as a result of his questions of yesterday, to clarify the situation, and have asked that I be authorized, on behalf of the government, to make a statement by Tuesday evening as to exactly what we are going to do with this order and, if I understand Senator Macquarrie's question properly, as to what we are going to do with the subject matter involved.

I am not going to stand here and say that we want to drop the whole thing. It may be that I will say that we want to drop this order, but it seems to me that I am going to have to say also what we want to do about the subject matter, the so-called electoral clock.

Order stands.

BUSINESS OF THE SENATE

On the motion to adjourn:

Hon. George J. McIlraith: Honourable senators, before the adjournment motion is put, I wish to raise one matter with the Deputy Leader of the Government in the Senate. Although the effect of this motion is that we adjourn until Tuesday evening, based on the motion that was put and carried earlier today, could he, in light of the unusual situation in the other place, tell us whether his motion should be amended so as to indicate an adjournment to a later date?

Hon. Royce Frith (Deputy Leader of the Government): Honourable senators, I can understand that question being raised. The present situation is unusual. We normally take it for granted that the other place will sit every week, but we do not know whether it is going to be sitting next week because of what, as far as I am concerned at any rate, is a very unusual procedural situation over there. Senator McIlraith, of course, has a much longer memory than I, and would be able to tell us whether this has ever happened before.

We do have a certain amount of business in the Senate that could occupy us next week, however. There is the question of