tions are not here at this stage, it would be very helpful to parliament if the regulations which are so vital to the operation of the bill were produced at the same time as the bill, so that members of parliament, and not just opposition members, could study them. This is particularly so when we are dealing with a bill of this nature which is really dependent upon the regulations for its operation.

The parliamentary secretary suggested that at a future time these regulations will be available to members of the House or the members of the standing committee which will deal with the bill. However, they will only be available some considerable time after the bill has become law and perhaps after the regulations have come into effect.

● (1430)

It may well be that members of the committee from all sides of the House interested in this matter would find the legislative process to be assisted if they were given an opportunity to examine the regulations. This is just one bill among many which fall into that category. If members of parliament are to attempt to make a really useful contribution to the understanding by the public of important pieces of legislation, then I would ask the parliamentary secretary to convey that message to the government House leader so that he might consider the matter.

I realize the difficulty which exists in respect of committee of the whole, but not all legislation goes to committee of the whole. It is sort of a legislative accident in this case that the legislation is being considered in committee of the whole. There are bills which on second reading are referred to the standing committees, and at those standing committees it might be very helpful to the legislative process if the regulations were there. While the regulations might not be in final form and could be in draft form, the bill has been on the order paper and has been involved in the parliamentary process for some time. It was introduced first in the Senate, as I read the number. There has been considerable opportunity, in terms of time, for the consideration of these regulations.

I wish to emphasize to the parliamentary secretary that this is not intended as a criticism of the hon. lady or of the government, but I am putting forward the possibility that this might be a way in which the parliamentary procedure could be assisted at a particular time when the government seems to be indicating great interest in changes to the parliamentary procedure.

Miss Campbell: Mr. Chairman, the reason I made the statement I did is that if the regulations were promulgated it would be anticipating a decision of the House prior to its being made. I went on that assumption. However, I would point out that a portion of the regulations which would also apply to proprietary medicines are already in existence under the Food and Drugs Act and regulations.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Chairman, I have been through the experience so often of trying to get regulations before they are published that I know how difficult that matter is, and therefore I do not intend to drag it out at this point. However, it seems to me there is one point the parliamentary secretary is missing which I think my friend the hon. member for Grenville-Carleton also missed. They both spoke about regulations being passed under this statute. Bill S-9 does not give anyone authority to pass anything. When Bill S-9 is passed, the Proprietary or Patent Medicine Act will be gone. I suggest that the authority for regulations is contained in the Food and Drugs Act and that authority already exists. If the government wished to level with us and show us the new regulations, it could do so without any contempt of parliament at all.

Mr. Yewchuk: Mr. Chairman, I should like to ask the hon. lady whether the regulations in total are now ready, or whether there is still a good deal of work to be done in finalizing them.

Miss Campbell: Mr. Chairman, I am told they are still in the process of preparation.

Mr. Yewchuk: Mr. Chairman, during my earlier remarks I asked a question concerning the testing procedures used by the new division set up in the Food and Drug Directorate. The hon. lady said that if any new claims are made, they will have to be substantiated by the manufacturer. However, I am of the impression that some information is not necessarily accurate.

I should like to know specifically what testing procedures will be used by the Food and Drug Directorate, because it seems to me that simple reliance on the manufacturer to provide information about the efficacy of a new drug is an unreliable way to obtain information. It is possible, for example, for the manufacturer of a new drug to conduct 100 different tests, and 95 of those 100 tests might show an undesirable result and five of them the desired result. The manufacturer may choose to provide information by saying that it tested five cases which showed the desirable result, perhaps neglecting to mention the others which showed an undesirable result. I think this happens not only in respect of patent medicines but also in respect of prescription medicines. I want reassurance from the parliamentary secretary that action is being taken to correct this type of situation.

Miss Campbell: The minister in his speech already referred to the nature of the regulations respecting this point that will be promulgated out in the future.

Mr. Yewchuk: Tell me what the testing procedure is.

Miss Campbell: I do not think we have at any time said we would test proprietary medicines for safety and efficacy. Rather, we require that the manufacturer, when registering a proprietary medicine with the health protection branch, submit a protocol for testing, and conform with it before he is allowed to put that patent medicine on the market. I would think the manufacturing industry should accept the onus for satisfying the requirements of the health protection branch concerning the safety and efficacy of their products.

Mr. Yewchuk: I must say, Mr. Chairman, I am disappointed with that answer. Do I take it to mean that the Food and Drug Directorate simply says that it is not interested in verifying a claim made by a manufacturer, and that in fact it refuses to do the testing and must rely on the information provided by a manufacturer who is in business primarily for profit? I have outlined a possible