



HOUSE OF COMMONS  
CHAMBRE DES COMMUNES  
CANADA

## **Standing Committee on Health**

---

HESA



NUMBER 002



1st SESSION



41st PARLIAMENT

---

**EVIDENCE**

**Wednesday, June 15, 2011**



**Chair**

**Mrs. Joy Smith**



## Standing Committee on Health

Wednesday, June 15, 2011

• (1540)

[English]

**The Chair (Mrs. Joy Smith (Kildonan—St. Paul, CPC)):** Good afternoon, everybody.

First of all, I want to thank you for electing me to the chair. That was very gracious of you. I'm quite looking forward to chairing this committee again. It was a fabulous committee and I know it will continue to be. It's a real honour to be here.

I want to congratulate the vice-chairs, Libby Davies and Hedy Fry.

It's wonderful to have you as vice-chairs on this committee. Welcome.

I would like to go into the routine motions. Is that agreeable to everyone on the committee? Could I have a show of hands? Thank you.

We'll start with the first one, which is on analyst services, and reads:

That the Committee retain, as needed and at the discretion of the Chair, the services of one or more analysts from the Library of Parliament to assist it in its work.

**The Chair:** All in favour of adopting this motion?

(Motion agreed to)

**The Chair:** Thank you.

I would like our analysts, Sonya and Raphaelle, to come to the table.

You know Sonya, I'm sure, as she has been here with us for a very long time and has done a fabulous job.

We are pleased to have Raphaelle Deraspe with us.

Welcome. Thank you for being here.

We'll now go to routine motion number 2 on the subcommittee on agenda and procedure:

That the Subcommittee on Agenda and Procedure be established and composed of the Chair, the two Vice-Chairs, and the Parliamentary Secretary.

In the last session, the committee decided to add to this. We added that "each member of the Subcommittee [shall] be permitted to have one assistant attend at any meetings" of the subcommittee, because we found that useful.

Dr. Carrie.

• (1545)

**Mr. Colin Carrie (Oshawa, CPC):** Thank you very much, Madam Chair.

I would like to congratulate you on your re-election. I'm looking forward to working with everyone here, and I welcome the new members.

I'd like to propose a—

**The Chair:** I'm sorry, Dr. Carrie. I'm told we have to suspend because we're having a few technical difficulties. Would you bear with me for one moment? Thank you.

• (1540)

\_\_\_\_\_ (Pause) \_\_\_\_\_

• (1540)

**The Chair:** We're back online, but before we continue, I want to welcome all the rest of you to this committee too.

We have a new member. I know that everyone knows Ms. Davies, as she has contributed to Parliament for a long time.

We have with us Ms. Quach.

Welcome.

It's very nice to have you with us, Madam Sellah and Monsieur Morin.

Of course, everyone knows Dr. Fry. She has been here and contributing for a very long time, as have the rest of us, only she has been here longer than I have.

Dr. Carrie, along with Mr. Strahl, Mr. Gill, Mr. Brown, Ms. Block, and Mr. Williamson, who are new to our committee, welcome as well. We have a very dynamic committee.

I was remiss in not welcoming all of you, because we need to know each very well. I think this committee is going to go very well.

Dr. Carrie, continue.

**Mr. Colin Carrie:** Thank you very much, Madam Chair.

With the rejigging of Parliament, what I am going to suggest is something that better represents how the House of Commons is situated these days. I'm going to suggest the following: that the subcommittee on agenda and procedure be composed of five members, including the chair, the two vice-chairs, the parliamentary secretary, and a member of the Conservative Party. Quorum of the subcommittee shall consist of at least three members. Each member of the subcommittee shall be permitted to have one assistant attend any meetings of the subcommittee on agenda and procedure. In addition, each party shall be permitted to have one staff member from the House officer attend any meetings.

**The Chair:** Any discussion?

(Motion agreed to)

**The Chair:** We'll move on to motion number 3, meeting without a quorum: that the chair be authorized to hold meetings and to receive and publish evidence when a quorum is not present provided that at least.... We have to fill in the number of members. I would suggest that four members be present, including one member of the opposition and one member of the government.

Dr. Carrie.

**Mr. Colin Carrie:** I think that's a good recommendation, Madam Chair.

I'd like to add something. In the case of previously scheduled meetings taking place outside of the parliamentary precinct—because, for the new members, one of the things we may do is travel—the committee members in attendance shall only be required to wait for 15 minutes following the designated start of the meeting before they may proceed to hear witnesses and receive evidence regardless of whether opposition or government members are present.

**The Chair:** Thank you, Dr. Carrie.

Ms. Davies.

**Ms. Libby Davies (Vancouver East, NDP):** Are you suggesting that's only when we're out of the parliamentary precinct?

**Mr. Colin Carrie:** That's right.

**Ms. Libby Davies:** It's basically not to keep witnesses waiting and to get the show on the road.

**Mr. Colin Carrie:** Yes, not to be rude.

**The Chair:** All in favour, raise your hands.

(Motion agreed to)

**The Chair:** Motion number 4 is the distribution of documents: that only the clerk of the committee be authorized to distribute to the members of the committee and only when the documents are available in both official languages, and that witnesses be advised accordingly.

Dr. Carrie.

**Mr. Colin Carrie:** After what you said, that only the clerk of the committee be authorized to distribute to the members of the committee any documents, I'd like to add, "including motions".

**The Chair:** Okay.

**Mr. Colin Carrie:** And that all documents that are to be distributed amongst the committee members must be in both official languages. Also, the clerk shall advise all witnesses appearing before committee of this requirement.

**Ms. Libby Davies:** Could you read the part again about motions? Are you putting that in?

**Mr. Colin Carrie:** Yes. It's that only the clerk of the committee be authorized to distribute to the members of the committee any documents—and, for clarification, to state, "including motions"—and that all documents that are to be distributed amongst the committee members must be in both official languages. The clerk shall advise all witnesses appearing before committee of this requirement.

**The Chair:** In other words, all motions and all documents would be distributed by the clerk and that the witnesses who are coming to the committee would be advised of that practice.

Dr. Fry.

● (1550)

**Hon. Hedy Fry (Vancouver Centre, Lib.):** All documents would include journal articles, etc. If, for example, those articles are not in French, will we have to get them translated into French? Is that what I'm to understand?

**The Chair:** Yes. That's what you're to understand.

**Hon. Hedy Fry:** Is that not going to hold up the production of those documents? I'm thinking about the timing issue. Is that going to stall things a lot?

**Mr. John Williamson (New Brunswick Southwest, CPC):** It's not traditionally up to this committee to translate documents or for the witnesses to translate documents.

**Hon. Hedy Fry:** No. We're talking about journal articles, etc. If there was a journal article that somebody felt should be brought to the attention of the committee and it came out of, say, *JAMA*, *The Journal of the American Medical Association*, it would be written in English. Somebody would have to translate it, not the AMA. It would come from the Library of Parliament as a supporting document and not a witness document. I'm just trying to clarify, that's all.

**The Chair:** That's a very good question, Dr. Fry.

Would you be amenable to making that decision on a case-by-case basis? There are some important journals, and I think you make a very good point that it might hold things up.

Dr. Carrie.

**Mr. Colin Carrie:** You could always ask for unanimous consent that it be done. The challenge is that sometimes we have members whose first official language, for example, is French. It would be unfair if witnesses distributed articles to English members and our francophone colleagues weren't able to understand those documents. It might change how they viewed the evidence brought forth. I think it should be made quite clear. The clerk in the past has made it quite clear that any documents that are going to be presented to this committee recognize that Canada has two official languages and that the information be presented to this committee in both official languages.

**The Chair:** Dr. Fry.

**Hon. Hedy Fry:** I understand the intent of the motion, and I agree completely with the intent of the motion. I'm not talking about witnesses bringing in documents. I'm saying that sometimes, for the edification and knowledge of the committee, the Library of Parliament may suggest we read certain things to help us better understand an issue. These will come out of a journal, not from a witness who brings them in, as part of our supporting documentation. Sometimes these can be very long documents, and having them translated could hold things up.

I think the chair suggested we do this on a case-by-case basis. I'm happy with that.

**The Chair:** That's okay if we can get unanimous consent.

**Hon. Hedy Fry:** If we think it's really an extraordinary amount and we won't get it for four weeks because the translation people have too many things on their plate at that time, that might be a thought, then. I'm prepared to accept case by case.

**The Chair:** Okay, so it's case by case, with unanimous consent of the committee, so no one feels excluded. Is that agreeable to the committee? All in favour? No?

Ms. Davies.

**Ms. Libby Davies:** I have another question on the distribution of documents. I wanted to ask why the parliamentary secretary is including motions specifically. Is there some reason for doing that? I'm just trying to think what that means. I know we'll be dealing with another motion about notices of motion in number 9. But I don't know if, informally, motions are looked at that don't necessarily go through the clerk. I just wondered why you are specifically zeroing in on motions in terms of whatever distribution takes place.

**The Chair:** Dr. Carrie.

**Mr. Colin Carrie:** In the past, sometimes members have just written out a motion and kind of presented it as they have gone along. And that's not necessarily fair to people who don't speak the other official language. Sometimes, as you know, in French and English there are subtle differences.

We want to make sure that practice doesn't become a regular thing in the committee, so we're very clear that any of these motions should be brought forward in both official languages, unless, of course, there is unanimous consent that we could....

**The Chair:** There could be unanimous consent.

**Ms. Libby Davies:** Just for further clarification, then, this is actually dealing with distribution of motions. Number 9 deals with notice of motions. I hope you don't mind me raising that, because it's relevant to what you're saying. It's recommended here that there be 48 hours' notice unless the motion relates directly to business under consideration. In most committees I've been on, if you're in a debate, if you're looking at a bill, if you're looking at an issue, you have the ability to move a motion right then and there. Sometimes there's a bit of back and forth about the translation, but basically it doesn't remove the right of a member during the discussion of a subject. So I just want to be clear that what you are suggesting in number 4 doesn't then preclude a member, when a subject is under discussion or a bill is under discussion, from moving a motion right here in the committee.

• (1555)

**Mr. Colin Carrie:** No, you can always do that.

**Ms. Libby Davies:** Okay, as long as we have that understanding—

**The Chair:** Is there any further discussion on this?

Dr. Carrie, do you want to reiterate the motion so that everyone is perfectly clear on what we're approaching here, on number 4, distribution of documents?

**Mr. Colin Carrie:** Yes. It is that only the clerk of the committee be authorized to distribute to the members of the committee any documents, including motions, and that all documents that are to be distributed amongst the committee members be in both official languages. The clerk shall advise all witnesses appearing before committee of this requirement.

**The Chair:** All in favour?

(Motion agreed to)

**The Chair:** Thank you.

Number 5 is on working meals: that the clerk of the committee be authorized to make the necessary arrangements to provide working meals for the committee and its subcommittees.

This motion was adopted by the committee at the last session.

Dr. Carrie.

**Mr. Colin Carrie:** I have a recommendation, Madam Chair. As you remember, last time we did meet over lunch. We did have things brought in, because that was the only chance members would have to eat. But now we're not, so I was going to recommend that the committee hereby authorize the clerk of the committee, in consultation with you, the chair, to make the necessary arrangements to provide for working meals as they may be required and that the cost of these meals be charged to the committee budget. This would also mean that if we decided to add meetings and things like that, you would be able to provide that for the members.

**The Chair:** I would just remind everybody that meetings are going to be from 3:30 to 5:30. Perhaps we could add coffee and tea toward the end of the day. I know some of you really like your cup of coffee or some cheese and crackers or something. I don't know how you feel about that. But this did come up last time. Could we have some agreement on that?

Dr. Fry.

**Hon. Hedy Fry:** I'm not trying to be cute, but I would like to add something that says, "and, given the nature of this committee, that those meals be balanced and nutritious".

**The Chair:** Of course!

**Hon. Hedy Fry:** They're not always. Tons of cookies can come through with these meals, and a lot of bread, and a lot of....

**The Chair:** Can we leave that at the discretion of the clerk, to make sure it's as healthy as possible? Great.

**Hon. Hedy Fry:** "Balanced". I like that word.

**The Chair:** "Balanced". There we go.

Go ahead.

**The Clerk of the Committee (Mrs. Mariane Beaudin):** And “taking into account availability”?

**Some hon. members:** Oh, oh!

**The Chair:** She's not going to bake any cookies, then.

With taking into account availability, can we agree, on motion 5, that working meals be done in this manner?

Dr. Carrie.

**Mr. Colin Carrie:** Is that the one I read out, basically?

**The Chair:** Yes—to make the necessary arrangements, after this discussion as just understood; and we'll provide tea and coffee and things like that if people are asking.

Okay?

All in agreement?

(Motion agreed to [See *Minutes of Proceedings*])

**The Chair:** Thank you.

By the way, if you have any allergies or food restrictions, please let the clerk know.

If you have any ideas for a balanced menu, Dr. Fry, give her a call.

**Hon. Hedy Fry:** Absolutely.

**The Chair:** There we go.

The next motion concerns the travel, accommodation, and living expenses of witnesses: that, if requested, reasonable travel, accommodation and living expenses be reimbursed to witnesses, not exceeding two representatives per organization; and that, in exceptional circumstances, payment for more representatives be made at the discretion of the chair.

Now, this particular motion was adopted by the committee last session, because there were occasions when we had more than one representative and it was prudent to cover their costs.

Just to let you all know, witnesses have 60 days to make a reimbursement claim. I know that some of the witnesses—for those who are new on this committee—were a little late getting that reimbursement in. We would go to a special committee, which I am part of...

What was it called again?

**Ms. Libby Davies:** The liaison committee.

**The Chair:** Yes, the liaison committee; thank you.

That's where we made the decisions, and the witnesses were never turned down. It's just that it happens sometimes, because people are people.

Is there any discussion on this particular motion?

Yes, Mr. Williamson.

• (1600)

**Mr. John Williamson:** Why is it two representatives per organization as opposed to one?

**The Chair:** I think we've found that sometimes it is just one. This says “not exceeding two” because we've found that sometimes they have different perspectives. That is just our practice in terms of what's happened in past years.

But that's a very good question. Thank you.

Yes.

[*Translation*]

**Mrs. Djaouida Sellah (Saint-Bruno—Saint-Hubert, NDP):** I am wondering why it says: “Que les témoins qui en font la demande soient remboursés de leurs frais de déplacement et de séjour...” You are specifying that it applies to those who make a request. Why doesn't the committee reimburse travel expenses to all the witnesses who come here? Why is it only those who make a request? If we forget to tell them that...

[*English*]

**The Chair:** No. I'm sorry, Madam, I'll explain it a little differently. Every witness is reimbursed; it's just that sometimes they miss the 60-day deadline.

[*Translation*]

**Mrs. Djaouida Sellah:** Okay, but saying “qui en font la demande” sounds confusing.

[*English*]

**The Chair:** I am trying to fill you in on some of the things that happen.

Let's say you brought a witness in and they were very busy and they didn't get their receipts in. They have to present their receipts. Well, there is another committee, called the liaison committee, that you can come to and make a little motion and say, “Please, could the liaison committee pay my witness? They missed the deadline.” It's always accepted, although we do like people to submit their expenses before 60 days.

That's just to let you know about some of the nuances.

[*Translation*]

**Mrs. Djaouida Sellah:** Yes, but that's not what the French says. I understand that the Liaison Committee will handle it and that there is a 60-day deadline. But, in my view, it would have been easier to say: “Que les témoins soient remboursés de leurs frais de déplacement dans un délai de 60 jours”; it is clearer. Saying “qui en font la demande” means that those who don't know that information will not send a request and will not be reimbursed.

[*English*]

**The Chair:** Yes, that's a very good point. Thank you for pointing that out.

The reason the clerk wrote this motion this way is that we don't reimburse all the witnesses. If people from the department come or government employees come...

Maybe you would like to explain more thoroughly to her in French. Thank you.

**Mrs. Djaouida Sellah:** I understood it in English. I am bilingual, but I have more flexibility with French.

**The Chair:** I wondered if I was explaining it to you well. They're very versed in the motions, so I thought that maybe you would like to hear from them.

**Mrs. Djaouida Sellah:** Thank you.

**The Chair:** You're welcome.

Are all of you in agreement?

(Motion agreed to [See *Minutes of Proceedings*])

**The Chair:** Thank you.

Motion 7, access to in camera meetings, states that, unless otherwise ordered, each committee member in attendance be permitted to have one staff member attend in camera meetings. In addition, each party shall be permitted to have one party staff member attend in camera meetings.

Dr. Carrie.

**Mr. Colin Carrie:** I do want to make one slight change there. If we say that each committee member in attendance shall be permitted to have one staff member...

For those of you...the in camera meetings are the ones that are private, so we have one staff member each in any of the in camera meetings. In addition, each party shall be permitted to have one party staff member.... Instead of "party staff member"—

**The Chair:** Yes, just "one staff member".

**Mr. Colin Carrie:** Yes. It would say that in addition, each party shall be permitted to have one staff member from a House officer attend in camera meetings. In other words, that's somebody from the whip's office, so you're not just going to have a party staff member there.

**The Chair:** Dr. Carrie, I've been asked that you clarify what you mean by "a House officer". From the whip's office...?

**Mr. Colin Carrie:** It's somebody from the whip's office, basically, or your House leader or someone like that.

**The Chair:** Is there any further discussion?

Ms. Davies.

**Ms. Libby Davies:** So what you're saying is that in an in camera meeting, each member of the committee would be able to have one staff member and then, in addition, each party would have one officer representative. Okay.

**The Chair:** Yes, if they so choose, to give them that leverage.

Is that clear to everybody?

Is there any further discussion? All in favour?

(Motion agreed to [See *Minutes of Proceedings*])

**The Chair:** Thank you.

The motion on transcripts of in camera meetings states that one copy of the transcript of each in camera meeting be kept in the committee clerk's office for consultation by members of the committee or by their staff.

As you know, for an in camera meeting, we don't distribute that. Is there discussion?

All in favour?

(Motion agreed to)

**The Chair:** Thank you.

On notices of motion, I want a little bit of clarification on the motion, which states that 48 hours' notice be required for any substantive motion to be considered by the committee unless the substantive motion relates directly to business then under consideration; that the notice of motion be filed with the clerk of the committee and distributed to members in both official languages; and that 48 hours' notice be calculated in the same manner as for the House, that is pursuant to Standing Order 54.

At the last session, the committee decided that notices given on Fridays after 3:30 were deemed to have been given the following Monday. There has been a suggestion that they should be submitted no later than 6 o'clock from Monday to Thursday, but on Friday, when we end the session early, it would be 2 o'clock rather than 3:30. I would like to have some discussion on that. We want to have it clarified.

When should the 48 hours be established? When the motion is received by the clerk or when the motion is distributed by the clerk? Those are two issues that we need to talk about.

Dr. Carrie.

• (1605)

**Mr. Colin Carrie:** What if we added this, Madam Chair, and said that completed motions that are received by the close of business—in other words, depending on that day, because Friday would be a little different—shall be distributed to the members the same day?

In other words, if somebody presents a motion on a Friday, let's say by noon, if we have to debate it on Monday, we want to make sure that we have it on Friday so we can look at it over the weekend. We've had problems in the past. Sometimes they get the motion in and then, boom, on Monday morning you get it. That might put a little more work onto the clerk, but I think if we get it in by the end of business that day... We have e-mail and you can get it to us. Because we're meeting on Monday, right?

**The Chair:** Yes, Ms. Davies.

**Ms. Libby Davies:** What do you mean by "the end of business on Friday"? Do you mean the end of House business? That would be 2:30. You said noon.

**Mr. Colin Carrie:** What do you think?

**Ms. Libby Davies:** My interest is for all of us to have the ability to submit a motion on Friday and that it could be considered on Monday. I agree it has to be a reasonable time to get it around and translated. I don't know what is a reasonable time.

If the clerk wants to—

**The Chair:** Could the clerk speak to what is good for you?

**Ms. Libby Davies:** Private members' business goes until 2:30—

**A voice:** The deadline is 2 in the House.

**Ms. Libby Davies:** It is 2 o'clock in the House, so maybe we should make it the same as the House, 2 o'clock.

**The Chair:** So Friday by 2 o'clock.

Ms. Fry, do you want to add anything else to that?

**Hon. Hedy Fry:** No. I was responding to the deadline of noon. I thought noon was a bit soon, and 2 o'clock is fine.

**The Chair:** Then 2 o'clock is good for you.

What about Monday to Thursday? When does the House business day end Monday to Thursday?

It is 6 o'clock, so can we be consistent there as well? For Monday to Thursday it is 6 o'clock, and for Friday it is 2 o'clock.

**Ms. Libby Davies:** Could we just check with the clerk? Are we creating difficulty? What was it for?

**A voice:** There was no time.

**Ms. Libby Davies:** It was just 48 hours.

**The Clerk:** On Friday, 3:30 would be deemed received on Monday. It is whatever the committee decides.

**Ms. Libby Davies:** Do we even need to do anything for Monday to Friday? It's just the Friday, isn't it?

**The Chair:** We found last year that rather than have people debate it after the fact, it was good to be clear on when it should be submitted. That came up this year. That is why we put the time in. It is the will of the committee.

Is it 4 o'clock Monday to Thursday?

•(1610)

**Mr. Colin Carrie:** That would be fine.

**The Chair:** Okay, it is 4 o'clock Monday to Thursday. We'll change that notice to "by 4 o'clock Monday to Thursday, and by 2 o'clock on Friday".

(Motion agreed to [See *Minutes of Proceedings*])

**The Chair:** We are at motion number 10, time for opening remarks and questioning of witnesses: that witnesses shall be allowed up to ten minutes to make their opening statements, and that during the questioning of witnesses there be allotted seven minutes for the first round of questioning and that thereafter five minutes shall be allotted for each questioner in the second and subsequent rounds of questioning at the discretion of the chair.

That is what we did last year. That is open for discussion.

Dr. Carrie.

**Mr. Colin Carrie:** Madam Chair, I showed you an idea of what was done in other committees. I don't know if anybody else has had an opportunity to think about it, to be representative with the new House. We are open to discussion, but would you be able to put forth the recommendations that you and I talked about earlier, if you think that is reasonable?

**The Chair:** Yes, if I could find the paper it would be very reasonable.

I'm sorry, I don't have that paper with me. Dr. Carrie, do you have a copy of it?

On the rounds of questioning, what I have is seven minutes for the first round and five minutes—

**Mr. Colin Carrie:** It is seven minutes for the first round and thereafter five minutes shall be—

**The Chair:**—five minutes shall be allotted to each questioner in the second and subsequent rounds of questioning.

**Mr. Colin Carrie:** That sounds good.

**The Chair:** Basically, it is seven minutes per person in the first round and five minutes after that. Is that what you're referring to, Dr. Carrie? Yes.

Dr. Fry.

**Hon. Hedy Fry:** I don't know if I have the right piece of paper, but it's my understanding that there is a suggestion of four minutes in subsequent rounds instead of five minutes.

However, the concept that the Liberals would have only one question out of eleven questions does not seem to be at all fair. In many other committees, when the NDP had only one person on the committee, the NDP were allowed far more rounds than just one. It doesn't seem to me to be appropriate or fair at all to give the Liberals just one question out of eleven.

**The Chair:** Monsieur Morin.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Dany Morin (Chicoutimi—Le Fjord, NDP):** Nowhere in the French version does it say "seven minutes"; it says either "ten minutes" or "five minutes". So there is a small translation problem. I just want to make sure that all our francophone colleagues can be on the same page.

[*English*]

**The Chair:** Thank you for letting us know that.

Is there any further discussion on this?

All in favour of seven minutes for the first round of questioning and thereafter five minutes for each questioner in the second and subsequent rounds of questions? Could we have a show of hands?

(Motion agreed to)

**The Chair:** Now we'll go to the speaking order, that the order of questions for the first round of questioning be as follows.

There was a suggestion that I'm going to bring forward. The order of questions for the first round of questioning should be as follows: Conservative, NDP, Conservative, Liberal. The questioning during the second round should alternate between the government members and the opposition members in the following fashion: Conservative, NDP, Conservative, NDP, Conservative, NDP, Conservative, based on the principle that each committee member should have a full opportunity to question the witnesses. If time permits, further rounds should repeat the pattern of the first two at the discretion of the chair.

Is there discussion?

Ms. Davies.

•(1615)

**Ms. Libby Davies:** I didn't get all that you said, but one thing that jumped out at me is that again in every committee I've ever been on it seems to me that the opposition goes first in the questioning. So I'm not sure why it's switching over to the government. That's been a long-standing practice. There would still be the same number of questions, but they would begin with an opposition member. I can't think of a committee in which it didn't happen that way.

Can you hand that out? It seems kind of odd that we're setting rules about making sure we distribute motions so people don't get surprised, yet we're kind of rushing through the very basic rules of the committee. I actually want to go back to one of the earlier ones we did for which you were obviously reading from some written proposal that we haven't seen.

**The Chair:** There's no written proposal other than my notes that I'm reading from.

**Ms. Libby Davies:** I heard the parliamentary secretary say that he had a—

**Hon. Hedy Fry:** We had a written proposal.

**Ms. Libby Davies:** On this we do, but not on what the chair just read regarding the speaking order.

**The Chair:** This is up for discussion right now.

Dr. Fry, do you have some comments on it too?

**Hon. Hedy Fry:** I support Ms. Davies on the concept that the opposition always spoke first and the government was always the last on the round. But I also want to bring forward the idea that out of a round in which you have 11 questioners, the Liberal Party has only one question in all of the 11. In the past in all committees, even when there were majority governments, I note that the NDP always had one person on the committee and that the NDP certainly had more than one round. One round doesn't allow for someone to ask the perfect question. I would like to suggest that this be a lot more equitable, because this is totally weighted in favour of just one question for the Liberals. We never did that when the NDP were in that position. It seems to me that we shouldn't be doing this kind of punitive and unfair practice.

**The Chair:** Dr. Carrie.

**Mr. Colin Carrie:** I think I may have a solution. As Madam Davies said, why don't we start the first round with NDP, Conservative, Liberal, Conservative? Then questioning during the second round shall alternate between the government members and opposition members in the following fashion: Conservative, NDP, Conservative, NDP, Conservative, NDP, Conservative, Liberal.

**The Chair:** Madam Sellah.

[*Translation*]

**Mrs. Djaouida Sellah:** First of all, I would like to remind you that it's Dr. Sellah.

Second, Madam Chair, I wanted to draw your attention, to the fact that the document I have before me does not reflect what you are saying. This French document even mentions the Bloc Québécois. I am really confused. I am not able to follow what is happening with the time allotted to opening remarks and the questioning of witnesses. Could we have a properly written document?

[*English*]

**The Chair:** Thank you.

Yes, just to clarify, you have the routine proceedings from the last committee. That's what the clerk distributed to you. Now we're having an open discussion to see what we're going to do for this committee. This is used as a guideline just to help us out. The clerk distributes that at the beginning of the committee just to help us out, to kind of remind us what we had at the last committee. There are no Bloc members on this committee.

[*Translation*]

**Mrs. Djaouida Sellah:** Okay. I was just trying to follow you in English, and what I was reading in French did not really match what you were saying. That's why I was reading that...

[*English*]

**The Chair:** Well, I'm glad you asked that question, then.

[*Translation*]

**Mrs. Djaouida Sellah:** It's not a big deal. It's fine.

[*English*]

**The Chair:** Thank you.

So the last recommendation from Dr. Carrie was NDP first, Conservative second, Liberal third, and then Conservative. The second round was Conservative, NDP, Conservative, NDP, Conservative, NDP, Conservative, Liberal.

Correct?

Is there further discussion?

Ms. Davies.

•(1620)

**Ms. Libby Davies:** This would be just a slight modification.

The recommendation means that there would be two Conservative questions back to back. Usually it flips back and forth. So we could, on the second round, just flip it around again. Otherwise, we go from four, which is Conservative, and then to five, which is Conservative.

I'm not suggesting that we change the overall balance. We still have the Liberal as the last one.

**The Chair:** You're saying that in the second round it's NDP, then Conservative.

**Ms. Libby Davies:** Yes. Otherwise you have two Conservative questions back to back, and we don't usually have that.

**Hon. Hedy Fry:** So it would be NDP, Conservative, NDP, Conservative, Liberal on that subsequent round.

**Mr. Colin Carrie:** Either way, if we're looking at...we're going to have a back-to-back question for the NDP.

**Ms. Libby Davies:** Oh, okay.

**The Chair:** So are you saying leave it the way it is because we're going to have a back-to-back question, or...?

Mr. Strahl.

**Mr. Mark Strahl (Chilliwack—Fraser Canyon, CPC):** I was trying to get clarification from Ms. Davies on what her proposed second round looked like.

**The Chair:** Ms. Davies, what were you saying?

**Ms. Libby Davies:** We'd rather have it as it was before, so that you still get two back-to-back questions, as opposed to where you have it now, four and five.

**Mr. Colin Carrie:** So you want us to have the back-to-back at the end, before the Liberal?

**Ms. Libby Davies:** Yes. I think it's consistent with previous practice.

**The Chair:** Just to clarify, then, could you read it out?

**Ms. Libby Davies:** Yes.

I would propose, or amend, if we're doing it that way—

**The Chair:** The first round; do it first.

**Ms. Libby Davies:** It would be NDP, Conservative, Liberal, Conservative, and then NDP, Conservative, NDP, Conservative, NDP, and then Conservative, and then Liberal...or two Conservatives there.

**Mr. Colin Carrie:** So it would be Conservative, Conservative, Liberal.

**Ms. Libby Davies:** Conservative, Conservative, Liberal.

**The Chair:** So that's where you want the back-to-back?

**Ms. Libby Davies:** Yes.

**The Chair:** Okay.

To go over it again, to clarify, the last suggestion is NDP, Conservative, Liberal, Conservative, first round; NDP, Conservative, NDP, Conservative, NDP, Conservative, Conservative, Liberal.

Is that correct, Ms. Davies?

**Ms. Libby Davies:** Bravo.

**The Chair:** Is there discussion?

**Mr. Colin Carrie:** We just want to make sure that all our members get the opportunity to speak, right? Can you just give us a moment?

**The Chair:** Yes.

Can you give your suggestion, Dr. Carrie?

It all works?

**The Clerk:** Yes.

**The Chair:** Okay.

Yes, Mr. Williamson.

**Mr. John Williamson:** Just as a point of clarification, although I'm sure it's in the notes, when a witness appears, is there a timeline? I can calculate the numbers for all these speakers, but in the last line it says if time permits.

Is it 90 minutes? Is it an hour per witness?

**The Chair:** We usually give them five minutes, if I recall correctly.

**Mr. John Williamson:** But this says if time permits, further rounds shall repeat the pattern of the first two at the discretion of the chair. If you decide you want to hear another round.... Is that...?

**The Chair:** It depends on the time that's left. Let's say we get through the witnesses really quickly and there is still time. We'll say, let's do another round, if the committee so.... Sometimes you kind of run out of questions. Sometimes the committee says, no, we've heard enough, let's proceed. That's why it says "at the discretion of the chair".

• (1625)

**Mr. John Williamson:** Okay. Thank you.

**The Chair:** I take my cues from you guys.

Ms. Block.

**Mrs. Kelly Block (Saskatoon—Rosetown—Biggar, CPC):** Thank you, Madam Chair.

When I look at what we've set out here, depending on the number of witnesses we have, we've suggested that they be allowed 10 minutes to make their opening statements. If we were to have three witnesses appear, that's 30 minutes. Given the first round, four speakers—that's 28—we really will only have time in the second hour for six speakers at five minutes each.

**The Chair:** That's a very good comment. We take it depending on how many witnesses are there. Sometimes it's not prudent to do it that way. There have been times when the committee has said, look, we need this and this, and there have been a lot of witnesses, so we've cut it down to three. We make that agreement depending on the topic and depending on who is available. Sometimes we have witnesses who can come on one day and not the other day.

**Mrs. Kelly Block:** What I'm suggesting is that we should determine how many speakers make a round, because we have seven listed in the first proposal and eight listed in the second.

What is a round of speaking? Is it an hour?

**The Chair:** No. The first round is the four: NDP, Conservatives, and Liberals. That's your first round. Then you go into your second round.

**Mrs. Kelly Block:** So what is the second round? How many speakers would make up a second round? Eight?

**The Chair:** Eight.

**Mrs. Kelly Block:** Okay.

**The Chair:** So your first round is four, because it's longer, and your second round is eight.

Good question. Thank you.

**Hon. Hedy Fry:** I have written.... I saw six in the second round.

**The Chair:** Eight. I guess you have written it incorrectly, Dr. Fry.

**Hon. Hedy Fry:** I probably have, yes.

**The Chair:** You stand to be corrected—good—and it's my pleasure to do that.

We've had a lot of discussion on that. Going over it again, I'm going to put this forward: first round is NDP, Conservative, Liberal, Conservative; second round is NDP, Conservative, NDP, Conservative, NDP, Conservative, Conservative, Liberal.

That is what I'm asking whether you will all accept now.

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

**The Chair:** Thank you.

There is one other thing. I'm wondering about next week.

Dr. Carrie, could you...?

**Ms. Libby Davies:** Before you do that, could I just go back to number 2, the subcommittee? I know we voted on it, but it happened very quickly.

Usually those subcommittees, sometimes called steering committees, are meant to be a process whereby you try to arrive at a consensus. The way we have it right now we actually have three Conservatives, one NDP, and one Liberal. The way it was proposed on the sheet was basically the chair, the two vice-chairs, and the parliamentary secretary. If you couldn't arrive at a consensus, then it presumably would come back to the committee. I do feel we've kind of changed that, and I wonder if we could review that. I don't know why it has to be three Conservatives. Basically you have a clear majority on the steering committee, which kind of undermines the idea of a consensus.

**The Chair:** Well, first of all, I want to ask the will of the committee. You make a good point. We need to decide whether we're going to open this up again, because it was voted on and we passed this motion.

You made some good points on number 2. Thank you, Ms. Davies.

Is it the will of the committee to open up number 2 again?

It's defeated.

Is there any other discussion?

Yes.

**Mr. Colin Carrie:** Maybe I could just point out, though, that everything goes back to the main committee anyway.

**Ms. Libby Davies:** But the purpose of the subcommittee is to try to find a consensus, right?

**The Chair:** I know. We've had this discussion. We voted on it. So let's carry on.

**Ms. Libby Davies:** The makeup of that committee kind of sets that dynamic, whether you strive to do that or whether it just becomes pro forma...and everything becomes a vote. We'll figure it out, I'm sure.

• (1630)

**The Chair:** Thank you.

Dr. Carrie, is there anything else you wanted to discuss?

**Mr. Colin Carrie:** I was wondering if I could propose a motion that the committee, at its earliest convenience, undertake a review of the proposed tobacco regulations and report back to the House.

**The Chair:** You want to discuss tobacco regulations at the committee's earliest convenience. Is there discussion on that?

Dr. Fry.

**Hon. Hedy Fry:** I agree. I would like to see us do this before we rise. I think this is urgent. It's something everyone has discussed to the nth degree. There should be no witnesses as far as I am concerned. We should just say, "Yes, let's get it done before we leave for the summer."

**The Chair:** Is there any further discussion on that?

**Ms. Libby Davies:** Yes. I'd just like to say we're very eager to get the regulations dealt with as quickly as possible, notably so that we can get them back into the House before the House rises. We have not heard of anyone who wants to be a witness. It seems to me it was discussed before. So we should try to move ahead on it quickly.

**The Chair:** Dr. Carrie.

**Mr. Colin Carrie:** I would be in agreement that we undertake this as quickly as possible, hopefully Monday, but I do think we should have witnesses.

**The Chair:** Is there any further discussion?

Number one, do you all agree that Monday we should deal with the tobacco regulations?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

**The Chair:** Also, the second deal we need to talk about is the witnesses. Do you have time to get witnesses between now and Monday? Good.

All in favour of having witnesses?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

**The Chair:** Please give to the clerk some names of witnesses and organizations you would like to bring in. I would say have them in to her by nine o'clock tomorrow morning. We've studied this very thoroughly, so we already have a list of witnesses we have used. If there are people you want in, submit their names to the clerk.

Is there anything else?

Well, I think we're all set for Monday.

Thank you so much. It was a great meeting. We look forward to looking at tobacco regulations on Monday.

The meeting is adjourned.





**MAIL  POSTE**

Canada Post Corporation / Société canadienne des postes

Postage paid

Port payé

**Lettermail**

**Poste-lettre**

**1782711  
Ottawa**

*If undelivered, return COVER ONLY to:*  
Publishing and Depository Services  
Public Works and Government Services Canada  
Ottawa, Ontario K1A 0S5

*En cas de non-livraison,  
retourner cette COUVERTURE SEULEMENT à :*  
Les Éditions et Services de dépôt  
Travaux publics et Services gouvernementaux Canada  
Ottawa (Ontario) K1A 0S5

Published under the authority of the Speaker of  
the House of Commons

### **SPEAKER'S PERMISSION**

Reproduction of the proceedings of the House of Commons and its Committees, in whole or in part and in any medium, is hereby permitted provided that the reproduction is accurate and is not presented as official. This permission does not extend to reproduction, distribution or use for commercial purpose of financial gain. Reproduction or use outside this permission or without authorization may be treated as copyright infringement in accordance with the *Copyright Act*. Authorization may be obtained on written application to the Office of the Speaker of the House of Commons.

Reproduction in accordance with this permission does not constitute publication under the authority of the House of Commons. The absolute privilege that applies to the proceedings of the House of Commons does not extend to these permitted reproductions. Where a reproduction includes briefs to a Committee of the House of Commons, authorization for reproduction may be required from the authors in accordance with the *Copyright Act*.

Nothing in this permission abrogates or derogates from the privileges, powers, immunities and rights of the House of Commons and its Committees. For greater certainty, this permission does not affect the prohibition against impeaching or questioning the proceedings of the House of Commons in courts or otherwise. The House of Commons retains the right and privilege to find users in contempt of Parliament if a reproduction or use is not in accordance with this permission.

Additional copies may be obtained from: Publishing and  
Depository Services  
Public Works and Government Services Canada  
Ottawa, Ontario K1A 0S5  
Telephone: 613-941-5995 or 1-800-635-7943  
Fax: 613-954-5779 or 1-800-565-7757  
publications@tpsgc-pwgsc.gc.ca  
http://publications.gc.ca

Also available on the Parliament of Canada Web Site at the  
following address: <http://www.parl.gc.ca>

Publié en conformité de l'autorité  
du Président de la Chambre des communes

### **PERMISSION DU PRÉSIDENT**

Il est permis de reproduire les délibérations de la Chambre et de ses comités, en tout ou en partie, sur n'importe quel support, pourvu que la reproduction soit exacte et qu'elle ne soit pas présentée comme version officielle. Il n'est toutefois pas permis de reproduire, de distribuer ou d'utiliser les délibérations à des fins commerciales visant la réalisation d'un profit financier. Toute reproduction ou utilisation non permise ou non formellement autorisée peut être considérée comme une violation du droit d'auteur aux termes de la *Loi sur le droit d'auteur*. Une autorisation formelle peut être obtenue sur présentation d'une demande écrite au Bureau du Président de la Chambre.

La reproduction conforme à la présente permission ne constitue pas une publication sous l'autorité de la Chambre. Le privilège absolu qui s'applique aux délibérations de la Chambre ne s'étend pas aux reproductions permises. Lorsqu'une reproduction comprend des mémoires présentés à un comité de la Chambre, il peut être nécessaire d'obtenir de leurs auteurs l'autorisation de les reproduire, conformément à la *Loi sur le droit d'auteur*.

La présente permission ne porte pas atteinte aux privilèges, pouvoirs, immunités et droits de la Chambre et de ses comités. Il est entendu que cette permission ne touche pas l'interdiction de contester ou de mettre en cause les délibérations de la Chambre devant les tribunaux ou autrement. La Chambre conserve le droit et le privilège de déclarer l'utilisateur coupable d'outrage au Parlement lorsque la reproduction ou l'utilisation n'est pas conforme à la présente permission.

On peut obtenir des copies supplémentaires en écrivant à : Les  
Éditions et Services de dépôt  
Travaux publics et Services gouvernementaux Canada  
Ottawa (Ontario) K1A 0S5  
Téléphone : 613-941-5995 ou 1-800-635-7943  
Télécopieur : 613-954-5779 ou 1-800-565-7757  
publications@tpsgc-pwgsc.gc.ca  
http://publications.gc.ca

Aussi disponible sur le site Web du Parlement du Canada à  
l'adresse suivante : <http://www.parl.gc.ca>