Dr. MORRELL: I saw copies of them, yes.

Mr. NICHOLSON: Were they sent in such a form that the doctor could not help but have his attention directed to the importance of the situation?

Dr. MORRELL: I thought they were sent in a proper manner. They were sent in a long envelope, and it is true that the manufacturers' name I think was on the corner, but also in large bold faced type at the lower left hand corner was printed: "IMPORTANT DRUG WARNING". This was to call to their attention not to throw it unto the waste paper basket.

Mr. HARLEY: Apropos of that I can give Mr. Nicholson copies of it.

Mr. FAIRWEATHER: I would like copies of all of them.

Mr. VALADE: I have a question on administration. Dr. Morrell, how many persons do you have that are responsible to you in the directorate?

Dr. MORRELL: In the whole directorate? They are not all concerned with drugs.

Mr. VALADE: I mean just those concerned with drugs.

Dr. MORRELL: About 40 per cent of our staff works on drugs, and 40 per cent of 400 would be around 160.

Mr. VALADE: Did you make an estimate as to the required minimum number of persons that your directorate would need in order to comply with the necessities?

Dr. MORRELL: It would be difficult to say.

Mr. VALADE: Let us say the minimum necessities.

Dr. MORRELL: I was told a while ago, and I think it made pretty good sense, that if you ask the chief of police how many policemen he needs, he always needs more, but if you ask the mayor, he or she may not be in agreement with it.

Mr. HAIDASZ: I would like to ask Dr. Morrell a question. In view of his experience with this drug thalidomide, what, in his opinion, should some of the new regulations in the Food and Drugs Act be and which of them should be legislated?

Dr. MORRELL: If we start at the beginning, there should be some changes in C.01.307 which is the section related to the control and investigation of drugs. I think we should have authority to demand all information that the manufacturer has at that time. In many cases he has more information than he gives to us. I think the regulation says that all he needs to do is to give us an identifying name in respect to the drug. However, I think we ought to have the authority to say that this is not enough and that we want to know the exact composition. If the manufacturer has not got it, then we want to know something about the nature of the drug, for example, if it is an extract of glands, or else we would like to have the exact chemical composition. He can give us a great deal more information.

Secondly, I think we should have a little closer check on the selection of qualified investigators. It will be difficult I think to define in any regulation what a qualified investigator is because there is such a variety of them that I do not think it would fit a regulation, but something will have to be worked out in this respect to improve what we now have.

Thirdly, I think perhaps we should know in advance to whom the manufacturer is going to send his drug for investigation, whether it be a clinical trial or some other trial. I presume that the minister would have authority to disagree with the manufacturer's proposal if that was thought to be necessary. Certainly, during this stage of investigation the manufacturer himself should have adequate controls to standardize the drug, at least to a certain extent. This is something that we suspect is not always known.