

senators, who do not cause anyone any harm, should be asked to move out because we are a security risk.

**Senator Graham:** Honourable senators, I believe that those and other questions should be properly addressed to the administrator of the summit conference at the meeting on Thursday morning. Since Senator Marshall is also a valuable member of that committee, I am sure he will be able to get the information he seeks at that time.

**Hon. G. I. Smith:** Honourable senators, I should like to direct a supplementary question to the Chairman of the Internal Economy, Budgets and Administration Committee. I assume, without knowing it to be the case, that the Government of Canada has jurisdiction over all Canadian property, including these two chambers. I wonder if the honourable senator can inform us specifically who is exercising that authority in commanding senators to do this or that at the present time, because it seems to me to be a matter which concerns all honourable senators. I am not in that building and will not be affected by that arrangement in any way, so far as I now know, although if things continue the way they are, perhaps they will come over here and move out members of the opposition. In any event, who has that authority?

**Senator Graham:** Honourable senators know that a special secretariat has been set up under the chairmanship of a former distinguished ambassador in this country, Mr. Derek Burney. Several months ago, when we had the initial indication that they would require this particular space, a meeting was held of the Internal Economy, Budgets and Administration Committee, when the requirements, as we even knew them at that time, were explained to all members of the committee. We then voted to accept the proposition that was put forward with respect to allowing the people who required this space to take it over between the dates that had been given and those on which we would be returning to that space.

**Hon. Fernand-E. Leblanc:** Honourable senators, as one of those honourable senators who has been moved, I would like to know why the second floor is more of a security risk than either the first or third floors. It would seem that it was agreed that the second floor was a security risk; so we were moved out last Friday. Why should it not apply also to the first floor? I understand that for security purposes it is much easier to look after the first floor than the second floor. I have been moved, and I have accepted the situation, but I do not like it.

**Senator Graham:** Honourable senators, again I am sure that all of these questions will be answered on Thursday morning. Those honourable senators who are members of the committee will recall that the actual meetings of the leaders at the summit conference to be held in Ottawa are to be held on the second floor of the East Block, and the leaders themselves, for the purpose of carrying on their ordinary work, will be occupying space that is now occupied by honourable senators.

**Senator Asselin:** Who is going to get mine?

**Senator Smith:** Honourable senators, I should like to ask a supplementary question. I am not sure that I understood correctly the answer given by the Chairman of the Internal

[Senator Marshall.]

Economy, Budgets and Administration Committee to my earlier supplementary question.

● (2050)

Perhaps I could state what I think he said, and ask him if it is correct. I think he said, in effect, that the administrator of the secretariat of this conference, to whom he referred as "the distinguished former ambassador", but whose name I do not recall, was responsible for finding the space to accommodate the people who will be attending this conference, and those accompanying them, that that administrator had made a request of the Internal Economy Committee of this Senate that certain space be made available so far as the Senate was concerned, and that the Internal Economy Committee agreed to certain things. I wonder if he would confirm whether my general understanding of that is correct, and, if so, will he tell us what the Internal Economy Committee did agree to, because I am not a member of that committee, and I would like to know?

**Senator Graham:** Honourable senators, I do not have instant recall, and I believe it would probably be more appropriate to table, at a future date—if necessary, tomorrow or Thursday—the minutes of the meeting at which that particular discussion took place. Perhaps we could also table the request for space as well as the conclusions reached during the deliberations of the Internal Economy Committee.

**Senator Smith:** I would certainly agree to that; but perhaps the honourable chairman would not mind telling me whether my recollection of what he said about who asked for this, and who is in charge, and so on, is correct.

**Senator Graham:** Yes. My understanding is very similar to yours.

## HEALTH AND WELFARE

### SACCHARIN—BAN ON USE

**Hon. Sidney L. Buckwold:** Honourable senators, my question is directed to the Leader of the Government in the Senate. I am sure honourable senators will be pleased to know that this refers to a much sweeter subject than some of those things we have been discussing this evening.

I refer to the ban in Canada on the use of saccharin. Honourable senators will recall that the Senate took a very real interest in this subject several years ago, referring the matter to our Standing Senate Committee on Health, Welfare and Science, and some of us felt that the Government of Canada at that time, through the Minister of National Health and Welfare, perhaps acted prematurely, and, indeed, perhaps over-reacted, to the situation.

The reason for my question at this time is that according to a recent news despatch—and I am quoting from a newspaper, if honourable senators will allow me to do it—our American friends have continued to extend what they call the moratorium on the ban against saccharin for another two years. In other words, they have not as yet seen fit to ban saccharin as