row. I do not know whether I should draw conclusions from the fact that he is sitting in a place normally occupied by the Opposition, or whether I should consider it a further indication of his determination to remain excessively objective in all that he does. However, as to party affiliations and caucuses, I do not consider those observations to be in the nature of positive recommendations. I may be wrong in that, and I certainly do not quarrel with Senator Molson's right, and indeed the right of any member of the committee, to make those observations, but a fair reading of the language of the report impels me to the conclusion that those remarks were more commendatory than specific recommendations.

There may be some differences of view about the suggestions, and I believe that they could be dealt with as matters concerning the individual consciences of honourable senators. Certainly, in the short time I have been a member of this house, I have been impressed by the absence of unnecessary political controversy. I have been impressed by the general desire to be as objective as possible in these matters, but as a member of the Government, I would have to take the position that I have a responsibility of going to the caucus. However this is a matter for each senator to decide and I doubt very much whether it is for the committee to prescribe that no senator shall carry on that kind of avocation.

I agree with the general tenor and intent of the report. Like some other honourable senators, I would not want to be considered absolutely bound by every word or nuance of what is a document chock-full of ideas and views. It would be a counsel of perfection to expect every independent-minded senator to accept such a large package without some reservations.

With the foregoing in mind, I support the report as presented. I think it will enable us to do what Senator Molson said in his opening speech we should seek to do, to bring our machinery into line with modern day practice to the fullest extent possible. As a result of the committee's work we now have a new set of rules, and we have a new group of functioning committees that will begin their organizational work tomorrow. These are achievements in themselves.

During the course of this debate we may hear suggestions as to ways and means of improving upon the recommendations of the committee. In any event, the committee has been able to move with alacrity, and to act constructively and comprehensively. It has demonstrated to Parliament itself, to the Canadian public, and to those who wish to really examine what is proposed, that the members of this house are anxious to serve Canada in the most constructive manner possible. This is what is behind the recommendations of the committee.

On motion of Hon. Mr. Cameron, debate adjourned.

CANADA ELECTIONS ACT (AGE OF VOTERS)

BILL TO AMEND—SECOND READING—DEBATE ADJOURNED

Hon. Hazen Argue moved the second reading of Bill S-24, to amend the Canada Elections Act (Age of Voters).

He said: Honourable senators, I am pleased at this time to move the second reading of a bill that provides for a reduction from 21 to 18 years in the age of eligible voters in federal general elections. It will be noted that this is a public bill in the name of a private senator. I believe I am correct in saying that this is the first bill of this nature in this session. There have been other public bills in the names of private senators presented on previous occasions, and I think they have made a contribution to the well-being of our country.

It may be that some significance can be read into the fact that this bill follows the excellent statement just made by the honourable Leader of the Government in reference to the new set of rules, and to the Senate itself and the way in which the Senate may be conducting itself in the days ahead. I hope that the Senate will undergo the fundamental changes that have been indicated by the leader, that it will become an action centre, and that we will roll up our sleeves and go to work. The Senate must demonstrate to the people of Canada that it is attending to the business of the country, not only by examining what the House of Commons does and giving consideration as to whether what it does is in the interests of the country—that is, acting as a chamber of sober second thought—but senators should also endeavour to use this chamber and its facilities in showing the Prime Minister, the Government, the House of Commons, and the people of Canada the way in which we, as a nation, should travel on particular issues.