

come to deal with the second branch of our inquiry, namely, pesticides, insecticides and so on; and, judging from what you have said, we shall be making most careful inquiry into the existing situation, bearing in mind that we will be making certain recommendations.

That brings up the question of just how far, in a divided federal jurisdiction, we, as the parliament of Canada, are going to be able to make suggestions which will be valid. I suggest that we might consider calling—if the committee so wishes—somebody from the Department of Justice. I think this should be done at the latter part of the proceedings, and it should be someone who would be able to tell us on what basis the present Food and Drugs Act rests, and on what basis the establishment and legality of any recommendations we make in the future will rest; and at the same time, we should bear in mind that provincial governments all have some jurisdiction as well. This might give us some indication as to what steps have been taken by the provincial governments along the lines into which we are making inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN: We shall check into that and have it put on the agenda, if it is the pleasure of the committee.

Mr. MITCHELL: I would like to commend the committee on accepting the invitation to go to visit those two pharmaceutical manufacturing plants in Montreal. It is not particularly new to some of us on this committee, but it will be particularly new, and very interesting, for those who have never had that opportunity. It should also satisfy some of the questions which might be asked about the subject of control of pharmaceutical preparations and of other chemicals through to their being found in marketable form. I think it should serve to answer some of the questions which might be asked.

Mr. NICHOLSON: I am also very pleased to see that the visits to these manufacturing plants are included. I wonder if, in the course of our visit to Montreal, we might include a visit to a proposed pharmaceutical manufacturer whose background is not purely Canadian, but more that of North America. I have in mind Ciba, whose parent office is in Switzerland, or something of that kind.

The CHAIRMAN: We will take a note of that for consideration by the committee. The only problem of this visit is that it means that for two days, to be visiting these three people that we recommend initially, we would have to be running around the place. If we crowd in too many people in that two-day visit I do not think we would get any value out of the investigation. But if the committee wishes to make the visit at some particular time, I think it might be in order for us to go.

Mr. NICHOLSON: I know something about the chemical industry and of the differences which exist between Canada and Europe, and the United States and Europe in that regard.

The CHAIRMAN: Would you give me your permission to investigate this, Mr. Nicholson, and I shall report on it at the next meeting?

Mr. HORNER (*Jasper-Edson*): I think a lot of these European companies do not have full manufacturing facilities in Canada, but I have in mind one of them which may do all its North American testing in Canada. I think it is Ayerst, McKenna and Harrison Ltd.

Mr. MITCHELL: I think the European companies with branches in Canada and the United States would be more in the way of packaging operations than that of test control.

Mr. VALADE: May I ask of a question of Mr. Nicholson for clarification? Are you talking about the rough material, the production of raw material which goes into chemicals and pharmaceuticals?

Mr. NICHOLSON: Yes.