

more spaces for the use of senators. This is the time of year when many of our members, perhaps many more than was the case some years ago, bring their cars to the Senate from their homes, particularly from Montreal, Toronto, and other nearer places. This problem only arises because we cannot get sufficient space allocated to us by the Department of Public Works. I think any further discussion on this subject should take place at the next meeting of the Standing Committee on Internal Economy, Budgets and Administration.

Hon. Mr. Desruisseaux: My point in raising this question is to have the whole situation reconsidered. I am not complaining; I do not use the parking, nor do my guests, but it is about time the whole question of these grounds was re-appraised.

Hon. Mr. Smith: We do not own the grounds, nor do we control them. That is the problem. The Department of Public Works is responsible for the administration of the grounds.

Hon. Mr. Croll: If the honourable gentlemen were interested in the grounds it would not be a bad idea if now and then they attended caucus. The grounds, parking facilities, and many other questions that affect them are fully discussed in caucus. Since they are absent from caucus, naturally they wonder about these things. However, plans to provide improved facilities for members and senators have been under discussion for the last two months.

Hon. Mr. Desruisseaux: I would like something done about this. It is a very strange thing to say that I should attend caucus. I do not go to caucus because I am a member of the Standing Senate Committee on Banking, Trade and Commerce, which holds its meetings at about the same time.

FOREIGN AFFAIRS

PROTOCOL ON CONSULTATIONS BETWEEN CANADA AND U.S.S.R. AND JOINT COMMUNIQUÉ ON VISIT TO SOVIET UNION BY PRIME MINISTER OF CANADA—NOTICE OF INQUIRY

Hon. M. Grattan O'Leary: Honourable senators, now that our parking privileges and rights have been resolved, I should like to inquire with respect to another privilege. Does the Leader of the Government not agree with me that the protocol signed in Moscow on the occasion of the visit of the Prime Minister, and the communiqué issued after his visit should be explained in this house with appropriate comments of the Government Leader?

Hon. Paul Martin: Honourable senators, before we came into the chamber Senator O'Leary indicated his intention to put this question to me. I did not have an opportunity to discuss the matter with the Leader of the Opposition (Hon. Mr. Flynn) beforehand. On this account I thought I would not tonight ask leave of the Senate to explain the communiqué, which was tabled tonight, and the protocol, which I tabled last week. However, I think the question is a proper one. The Senate should be

informed about the nature of the protocol and the communiqué.

With this in view, with leave of the Senate, I give notice that tomorrow, Wednesday, June 2, 1971, I will call the attention of the Senate to the protocol done at Moscow, May 19, 1971 between Canada and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics respecting consultations on important international problems of mutual interest and on questions of bilateral relations, tabled in the Senate on May 25, 1971, and to the joint communiqué on the visit to the Soviet Union of the Prime Minister of Canada, May 17 to 28, 1971, tabled in the Senate, Tuesday, June 1, 1971.

RADIATION EMITTING DEVICES ACT

REGULATIONS—QUESTION ANSWERED

Hon. Paul Martin: Honourable senators, on May 18 Senator Phillips asked me this question:

What is the reason for and significance of section 3(1) of the Regulations published in Part I of the *Canada Gazette*, dated May 15, 1971, by which television receivers and extra-oral dental X-ray equipment are prescribed as classes of radiation emitting devices for the purposes of the Radiation Emitting Devices Act?

Were any discussions held with the Canadian Dental Association regarding this regulation?

The Government's answer to this question is as follows:

The Radiation Emitting Devices Act (1970) is designed to prohibit the sale or import of any device capable of producing radiation when the device does not meet specified standards with respect to its design, construction or function. Notice of certain proposed regulations for two classes of device was printed in the *Canada Gazette* of May 15, 1971. This was done to give interested parties an opportunity to comment and make representation before the regulations are promulgated in final form. This procedure provides an opportunity for discussions with the Canadian Dental Association and any other organization or person.

Hon. Orville H. Phillips: I thank the Leader of the Government for his detailed explanation. As one of those concerned with the regulation, I find it very strange that when speaking of radioactivity we set the minimum time, which is one-tenth of a second, and there is no mention of a maximum time. On what basis are these regulations drawn up?

Hon. Mr. Martin: I do not think I can give any fuller answer than the one I have just given. The regulations which have appeared in the *Canada Gazette* are notice to those interested to make representations before the regulations take final form. That kind of question, of course, can under the Statutory Instruments Act be responded to in more detail.