



HOUSE OF COMMONS  
CHAMBRE DES COMMUNES  
CANADA

45th PARLIAMENT, 1st SESSION

---

# Standing Committee on Health

EVIDENCE

**NUMBER 027**

Wednesday, April 15, 2026

---

Chair: Hedy Fry





# Standing Committee on Health

Wednesday, April 15, 2026

• (1705)  
[English]

**The Chair (Hon. Hedy Fry (Vancouver Centre, Lib.)):** I call this meeting to order.

Welcome to meeting number 27 of the House of Commons Standing Committee on Health. We recognize that we meet on the unceded territory of the Algonquin Anishinabe peoples.

Today's meeting is taking place in a personal format, pursuant to the Standing Orders. Before we continue, I will remind you about all the instructions with regard to your phones, earpieces, interpretation, etc. Don't speak until the chair recognizes you, etc., and put your hand if you want to speak.

This meeting is requested pursuant to Standing Order 106(4) to discuss the March 12, 2026, production of document motion. So we are meeting to respond to Standing Order 106(4).

Before proceeding, I want to quickly inform members that on March 10, the clerk circulated a budget of \$7,250 for the meeting with the Canadian Centre on Substance Use and Addiction; and a budget of \$14,500 for the study of Bill C-224, an act to amend the Food and Drugs Act.

Will the committee adopt those budgets?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

**The Chair:** Thank you very much.

I now want to open the floor to members to discuss the order of today, which is the Standing Order 106(4) motion requesting documents.

Are there any hands up for members to speak to this?

Dan.

**Dan Mazier (Riding Mountain, CPC):** Thank you, Chair.

For several hours of committee time over the last month, Liberal members of this committee have been filibustering the document production order motion moved at this committee on March 12. They have been blocking these documents, avoiding transparency and keeping the truth from Canadians.

This motion covers several documents, but two documents in particular are clearly why the Liberals have staged this cover-up.

First, there is a \$250-million PrescribeIT scandal. Canadians deserve to know how a quarter of a billion dollars was spent before

the program was terminated. This is a scandal that could be far bigger than ArriveCAN was.

Second, there is the audit of the Canadian dental care plan. If this program is being managed properly by the Liberals, they should have no problem in producing the audit and letting Canadians see the facts.

After some discussions behind the scenes, I will move the following motion in the hope that it will move us closer to a resolution. I would ask that instead of the Liberals filibustering today and reading from their computers they work collaboratively with us to pass this motion so Canadians can get the transparency they deserve.

The motion reads:

That the committee order the production of the following complete and fully unredacted documents:

- a) the audit conducted by MNP that assessed the design of the financial controls framework for the Canadian Dental Care Plan;
- b) all briefing notes, recommendations and documents provided to the Minister of Health or the Minister's Office regarding the October 17, 2025 change to reimbursement criteria for laboratory fees under the Canadian Dental Care Plan;
- c) the number of Canadian Dental Care Plan patients who received prior authorizations for treatments involving laboratory fees before October 17, 2025 but received reduced reimbursement after that date;
- d) all correspondence between Health Canada and Sun Life Financial regarding the change to reimbursement criteria for laboratory fees under the Canadian Dental Care Plan;
- e) all analysis conducted on the impact the Canadian Dental Care Plan will have on dental schools in Canada;
- f) all applications and corresponding signed agreements, except with Quebec, including appendices and annexes for the Substance Use and Addictions Program since 2020 as requested by the committee on December 9, 2025;
- g) all applications and corresponding signed agreements, except with Quebec, including appendices and annexes for the Emergency Treatment Fund since 2020 as requested by the committee on December 9, 2025;
- h) all applications received by the government to administer the Vaccine Injury Support Program, including all recommendation documents provided to the Minister's Office on the applicants;
- i) all documents related to PrescribeIT, including: the 2017 contract between Canada Health Infoway and TELUS Health; all amendments, renewals, and change orders since 2017; all intellectual property ownership agreements; the 2026 termination notice and all clauses, provisions, or records relating to terminations and penalties; a list of all payments made by Canada Health Infoway to TELUS Health since 2017; and all recommendation documents provided to the Minister's Office regarding PrescribeIT funding, operations, and termination;

j) all agreements between Canadian Blood Services and Grifols related to the manufacture, processing, or supply of both blood and plasma-derived products, including all amendments and related agreements;

k) all quarterly reports and underlying data submitted to Health Canada's Office of Controlled Substances by provincial or territorial Ministers of Health, except from Quebec, pursuant to the subsection 56(1) class exemption for Urgent Public Health Needs Sites.

And that these documents be submitted, unredacted and in both official languages, to the committee clerk no later than two weeks after the adoption of this motion, and that any failure by the government to fully comply with this order be reported to the House forthwith.

Thank you, Madam Chair.

• (1710)

**The Chair:** Are there any hands up of those who wish speak to this issue?

We have Maggie and Helena.

**Helena Konanz (Similkameen—South Okanagan—West Kootenay, CPC):** Did you say that I'm first?

**The Chair:** No, Maggie put her hand up. I saw your hand up immediately after that. I'm sorry.

**Maggie Chi (Don Valley North, Lib.):** I did get on the speaking list. The clerk did acknowledge me.

**The Chair:** Go ahead, Maggie.

**Maggie Chi:** Thank you, Madam Chair.

What are we doing here?

Dan, your staff is talking to the clerk.

Can we suspend to review the motion?

**The Chair:** I'm sorry. I can't hear you.

**Maggie Chi:** Can we please suspend for a quick moment to review the motion?

**The Chair:** Yes, certainly.

**Maggie Chi:** Thank you.

**The Chair:** The meeting is suspended.

• (1710)

(Pause)

• (1720)

**The Chair:** Ms. Sidhu's hand is up.

Ms. Sidhu, go ahead.

**Sonia Sidhu (Brampton South, Lib.):** Madam Chair, I received the motion. It looks similar to what we had. Most of the motion is similar.

I do want to spend some time on this, because I think paragraph (i) of the motion carries more weight than it might initially appear. The more closely I review this, the more concerns I have—

**Dan Mazier:** Madam Chair, I have a point of order.

**Helena Konanz:** It was Maggie and then me for the speaking order.

**Dan Mazier:** Yes, the speaking list...

**The Chair:** We are now talking about the motion as amended, so I have a new list.

**Helena Konanz:** It was Maggie and me. Do you remember?

I was second, Clerk.

• (1725)

**The Chair:** It was Ms. Chi and then you?

**Helena Konanz:** Yes, Ms. Chi. I'm sorry.

**Sonia Sidhu:** I raised my hand, Madam Chair. Madam Clerk noted that.

**The Chair:** I have a list from when we were debating this motion originally.

**Dan Mazier:** No, that's not how...

**The Chair:** It was Ms. Sidhu, then Ms. Chi and then you.

**Dan Mazier:** No, we're not on that list.

**The Chair:** [*Inaudible—Editor*] the clerk, that before Ms. Chi, Ms. Sidhu had put up her hand, and the clerk had recognized it. It's on my list. I have to go—

**Dan Mazier:** I have a point of order.

**The Chair:** Excuse me. Let me finish speaking, please.

I have to go by what the clerk tells me she saw. I did not see this. The clerk said she saw it. Therefore, she put it down in the order of the raised hands.

**Helena Konanz:** I have a point of order.

Chair, you said that it was Ms. Chi and then me, and because you happened to look over and see Ms. Chi first—

**The Chair:** That was who I saw.

The clerk of the committee looks at who has their hands up as well and helps me to keep the list. She saw Ms. Sidhu first. I had not seen Ms. Sidhu, but her name was written down here by the clerk.

**Helena Konanz:** She started speaking...

**The Chair:** I know, so Ms. Chi cannot finish speaking. Ms. Sidhu is first on the list.

I'm sorry. I'm going by the list. I have to follow the list. This is a procedure. We can spend two hours debating it, but this is the procedure. This is the list that was given to me by the clerk.

**Helena Konanz:** I'm going to have to challenge that. I'm sorry.

**The Chair:** Oh, for God's sake.

**Helena Konanz:** I'm sorry, Chair, but the reason I need to challenge this is that just 10 minutes ago, I raised my hand and you said, "I'm sorry," and that you saw Ms. Chi first, and then me, and the clerk agreed on that. Ms. Chi then started speaking, and then Mr. Mazier made the motion—

**The Chair:** I don't think the clerk agreed. I agreed, because I saw.... The clerk had seen, before me, Ms. Sidhu. I explained that. I am going by what the clerk saw. The clerk and the chair work together to look at raised hands and who put their hands up first. At the beginning of every meeting, I explain that the clerk and I try to organize hands up based on what we see.

**Helena Konanz:** You're saying—

**The Chair:** The clerk saw Ms. Sidhu. I did not.

**Helena Konanz:** —that, at the beginning of the meeting, when you said that Ms. Chi was first and then I was second—

**The Chair:** I hadn't seen Ms. Sidhu.

**Helena Konanz:** —you made a mistake. Is that correct?

**The Chair:** I made the mistake, yes.

**Dan Mazier:** I have a point of order.

**The Chair:** Okay, that's fine.

Yes, Mr. Mazier.

**Dan Mazier:** Ms. Chi moved to suspend.

**The Chair:** Anybody could move to—

**Dan Mazier:** She was speaking at the time.

**The Chair:** Anybody could move whether they were speaking or not, Mr. Mazier. What are you challenging here?

**Dan Mazier:** We are challenging the chair on that—

**The Chair:** On what?

**Dan Mazier:** I'm challenging the chair, because I believe the order was Ms. Chi and then Ms. Konanz.

I challenge the chair's decision.

**The Chair:** What you believe is not at issue here. The clerk of this committee took names down in the order in which she saw them. I did not see her order. I just saw Ms. Chi and Ms. Konanz.

The clerk is saying that, according to protocol, the first hand up was Ms. Sidhu's. Are you challenging the clerk?

**Dan Mazier:** I'm challenging the chair's decision.

**The Chair:** The chair is going according to the clerk's observation, because at the beginning of each meeting I say that the chair and the clerk work together to look at the hands up in order, and we try to do this as reasonably as we can.

Ms. Sidhu, continue.

**Sonia Sidhu:** Thank you Madam Chair.

I was talking about the new motion moved by Dan Mazier. I do want to spend some time on this motion, because I think paragraph (i) of the motion carries more weight than it might initially appear. The more closely I review it, the more concerns I have.

Let me be clear. Our government supports transparency. That has been consistent, and it has guided the work of Health Canada and organizations like Canada Health Infoway, but transparency needs to be approached carefully. It must be balanced with privacy considerations, legal responsibilities and the integrity of the system Canadians depend on every day.

In my view, this motion does not strike the balance, Madam Chair.

**Dan Mazier:** I have a point of order.

**The Chair:** Yes, Mr. Mazier.

**Dan Mazier:** We just reviewed the video. You did agree. You have the ultimate authority. You did say it was Ms. Chi and then that Ms. Konanz was coming back, so you did say that. That was your ruling, and I challenge that decision.

**The Chair:** It was not a ruling, Mr. Mazier. As I explained earlier on, before every meeting, I read out very carefully—and I can read it out to you again—that the clerk and the chair work together to recognize hands that are up. The clerk put Ms. Sidhu down first on the list. I had not seen it. I had just seen Ms. Chi and Ms. Konanz.

Now, you want to challenge the clerk of the committee, which I have never heard of before, but you can do it. I take the clerk's word for it, and I said Ms. Chi's and Ms. Konanz's names, because that's who I saw. The clerk then pointed out to me that Ms. Sidhu had her hand up first, and I am going with the clerk's recommendation, because I have to trust the clerk—

• (1730)

**Helena Konanz:** I have a point of order.

**The Chair:** We have to trust the clerk.

If you let me finish speaking before you interrupt me, I might then be able to answer what you're going to ask about in the point of order.

I'm telling you that I am accepting the clerk's recommendation, and I took responsibility for saying I did not see Ms. Sidhu's name written down by the clerk, so I only said what I saw, which is that Ms. Chi and Ms. Konanz were the next two speakers.

The clerk is telling me Ms. Sidhu's hand was up, and I'm going by what the clerk says, because that's who the chair has to depend on for recognizing people if she sees a hand up before I do, and that's what I'm doing.

I am not going to challenge the clerk on this.

**Helena Konanz:** I will say, Chair, that at the time that Ms. Chi was speaking, you allowed her to suspend the meeting. At that point, why did neither you nor the clerk decide that she was out of order at that point?

Then we suspended the meeting for 10 minutes after you said that I would be speaking second, then you suspended the meeting, and Ms. Chi was first.

We do have it on video.

**The Chair:** I've explained to you that I did not see Ms. Sidhu, but I may tell you that anybody could have raised their hand and asked to suspend the meeting while Ms. Chi was speaking. You don't have to have the floor to call for suspension. Anyone can call for suspension, so it didn't depend on Ms. Chi being the speaker. Anybody could have done that. You could have, Mr. Mazier could have, Mr. Blanchette-Joncas could have. It could have been anybody.

The call for suspension is taken by anyone. It was called. Ms. Chi called it, even though I then realized that Ms. Chi was not up there. There you go.

**The Chair:** That's what's in Hansard, and I take responsibility for not having seen Ms. Sidhu's name written down—

**Helena Konanz:** —and for making that error. Okay.

**The Chair:** Thank you. I don't intend to challenge the clerk at all, because she keeps her eye on everything in an impartial manner, even though you think I may not be impartial. I try very hard to be impartial.

Do you have a point of order on this issue?

[*Translation*]

**Maxime Blanchette-Joncas (Rimouski—La Matapédia, BQ):** Madam Chair, I would simply like us to listen to the video recording of today's meeting. At 5:10:20 p.m., the speaking order is confirmed.

[*Video presentation*]

It would therefore be Ms. Chi's turn, followed by Mrs. Konanz.

[*English*]

**Maggie Chi:** I have a point of order, Madam Chair.

[*Translation*]

**Maxime Blanchette-Joncas:** You're right, it should be Ms. Chi and Mrs. Konanz.

[*English*]

**The Chair:** Mr. Blanchette-Joncas, I don't know if you were listening to me. I said that those were the hands I saw. The clerk had seen Ms. Sidhu; she'd written her name down, and I had not seen it. I took responsibility for not having seen that.

[*Translation*]

**Maxime Blanchette-Joncas:** No.

[*English*]

**The Chair:** It doesn't matter what I said; I was wrong about the order of speakers.

**Maggie Chi:** I have a point of order.

[*Translation*]

**Maxime Blanchette-Joncas:** If I understand correctly, Madam Chair, the clerk and you do not see the same hands being raised. Is that what you just said to me?

[*English*]

**Maggie Chi:** I have a point of order.

**The Chair:** I'm telling you that we both try to see the hands in order, and we work together to make a list that's fair and reasonable based on when we saw the hands. She saw Ms. Sidhu's hand and I didn't.

[*Translation*]

**Maxime Blanchette-Joncas:** I just want to make sure I understand—

[*English*]

**The Chair:** Thank you.

That's what I've been trying to explain all along.

**Maggie Chi:** I have a point of order, Madam Chair.

**The Chair:** I don't know if I am speaking a language that nobody understands. All I'm saying is that the clerk had seen Ms. Sidhu and I had not. I called the names of the people I saw, and I was wrong. That was not the order given by the clerk that she saw. We both cannot look at the whole table at the same time. We try to get both sides in our view. That's what I saw, and that was what the clerk saw.

You can play what you want to in terms of your video or whatever, but I'm accepting that I was wrong about that. I don't know how many times you wish me to say that, Mr. Blanchette-Joncas, but I have said it many times already.

We're going to Ms. Sidhu.

**Maggie Chi:** I have a point of order.

**The Chair:** Ms. Chi, do you have something to say on this issue?

**Maggie Chi:** I just wanted to mention that Mr. Blanchette-Joncas was playing a video into the microphone, and I don't believe that's very good for the translators. I just want us to be mindful of that.

• (1735)

**The Chair:** Thank you.

Sonia, go ahead.

**Sonia Sidhu:** Thank you, Madam Chair.

I do want to go again from the top.

I want to spend some time on this new motion that was moved by Dan Mazier.

I think paragraph i) of the motion carries more weight than it might initially appear to. The more closely I see that, the more concern I have.

I just want to be clear on this. Our government supports transparency, Madam Chair. That has been consistent, that it guides the work of Health Canada and organizations like Canada Health Infoway.

Transparency needs to be approached carefully. It must be balanced with the privacy consideration, the legal responsibilities and the integrity of the systems Canadians depend on every day. In my view, the motion does not have that balance.

I'll start with paragraph i) on PrescribeIT. PrescribeIT is an initiative that we should recognize as progress. It is a national e-prescribing service that improves communication between doctors and pharmacists, reduces errors and strengthens patient safety. It is part of a broader effort to modernize Canada's health care system.

However, the scope of what's being requested here goes well beyond typical oversight. It includes contracts, amendments and renewals dating back to 2017; intellectual property agreements; termination details; payment records and even internal advice to the minister's office.

This is not a narrow or targeted request. It is very extensive. We need to consider what fulfilling a request of this magnitude would entail. There are clear issues around commercial sensitivity, especially with partners like Telus Health. These agreements often include property.... Releasing that information without proper safeguards could compromise future negotiations and partnership.

There are also security considerations. We are talking about digital health infrastructure systems that Canadians rely on. Making detailed internal information about these systems public could create vulnerabilities. Another major concern is the inclusion of internal recommendation documents. Public servants need to be able to provide candid, unfiltered advice that depends on a level of confidentiality. If that is removed, it risks affecting how decisions are made, and not in a positive way.

With regard to the agreement between Canadian Blood Services and Grifols, it is important to remember that Canadian Blood Services operates independently. It is a not-for-profit organization working with the provinces and territories to manage Canada's blood and plasma supply. This system is essential. It supports patients across the country who depend on plasma and plasma-derived therapies for serious and often lifelong conditions. These partnerships, including those with companies like Grifols, are key to maintaining a stable and reliable supply.

A request for all agreements and related documents raises legitimate concerns. These agreements can involve sensitive commercial information and international supply chains. In some cases, they may not fall entirely within the federal jurisdiction, so we must be cautious not to undermine confidence in a system that Canadians trust to be managed safely and professionally.

• (1740)

Finally, paragraph k) deals with data shared with Health Canada in urgent public health contexts, including all the...managed safely and professionally. We all recognize the severity of that crisis. The data referenced here goes beyond summary reports and includes underlying datasets. That also raises serious concerns about patient privacy, data protection and how that information is handled. It also touches on—

**The Chair:** Order. Order, please.

There is a member speaking. I would like it if people would actually listen to the member speaking. There has to be some order, decorum and respect in this place.

I'm just speaking to that at the moment.

Thank you.

**Sonia Sidhu:** It also touches on relationships with the provinces and territories, which share this data with the expectation that it will be safeguarded properly. It could impact future co-operation, something we cannot afford in the midst of ongoing public health challenges.

When I look at these sections together, what I see is a very broad request for large volumes of sensitive information to be provided unredacted and within a short time frame. I do not believe this is a prudent approach. We have a responsibility to ensure that oversight is conducted in a way that protects the system. We are responsible for that.

**The Chair:** Order.

I cannot hear Ms. Sidhu. People are speaking in the room. I would like to call order to this meeting, please. That applies on both sides of this room. I would like some order.

Thank you.

**Sonia Sidhu:** Madam Chair, I do not believe this is a prudent approach. We have a responsibility to ensure that oversight is conducted in a way that protects the system we are responsible for and that avoids unintended consequences.

For these reasons, I have a significant concern with the motion as it stands. I am unable to support it in its present form.

That is why I move to amend the motion by deleting the following text:

i) all documents related to PrescribeIT, including: the 2017 contract between Canada Health Infoway and TELUS Health; all amendments, renewals, and change orders since 2017; all intellectual property ownership agreements, the 2026 termination notice and all clauses, provisions, or records relating to terminations and penalties; a list of all payments made by Canada Health Infoway to TELUS Health since 2017; and all recommendation documents provided to the Minister's Office regarding PrescribeIT funding, operations and termination;

**The Chair:** Is this your amendment, Ms. Sidhu?

**Sonia Sidhu:** Yes, Madam Chair.

**The Chair:** You want the whole of paragraph i) to be deleted.

**Sonia Sidhu:** Yes, Madam Chair.

**The Chair:** All right.

We have an amendment on the floor.

**Dan Mazier:** Before we—

**Sonia Sidhu:** Madam Chair, I'd like to say something else.

**The Chair:** Yes.

**Sonia Sidhu:** As I mentioned previously, I think it's important that we take the time to really walk through what this motion is asking for. I felt it necessary to bring forward this amendment. When we look at the motion by my colleague opposite, it's entirely clear that it is not a narrow or targeted request. It is a very broad request. It is a request for a large volume of documents, as I mentioned, across multiple programs and across multiple partners. In many cases, documents are being requested fully unredacted. That is where my concern is. Transparency is important, but it has to be done in a way that is responsible.

I want to return to paragraph i), because this is really where my amendment is focused. On PrescribeIT, the motion asks for a very wide range of documents: the 2017 contract with Telus Health; all amendments and renewals since that time; all intellectual property ownership agreements; and a full list of all the recommendation documents provided to the minister's office regarding PrescribeIT's funding, operations and terminations.

When you put that all together, this is a full contractual and financial structure of a national digital health system being requested completely unredacted. That raises serious concerns. It raises concerns about commercial sensitivity, concerns about intellectual property and concerns about how releasing that level of detail could affect Canada's ability to work with its partners in the future. These are not simple documents. They involve negotiated agreements. They involve a system that involves relationships that we rely on to deliver services to Canadians.

That is exactly why I have put forward my amendment. It's to make sure that we are not putting information at risk, which could have broader consequences beyond this committee. Once that information is released, it cannot be taken back.

• (1745)

[*Translation*]

**Maxime Blanchette-Joncas:** Madam Chair, on a point of order.

[*English*]

**Sonia Sidhu:** The impact is not just immediate; it can affect how organizations choose to work—

**The Chair:** Excuse me. I'm sorry—

**Sonia Sidhu:** —with the Government of Canada going forward.

**The Chair:** —Ms. Sidhu, but there is a hand up.

[*Translation*]

**Maxime Blanchette-Joncas:** It's good to understand my colleague's amendment, but we need to receive it in order to analyze it. She's been speaking for ten minutes. I understand she wants to provide a lot of explanations, but it would be helpful to have the amendment before listening to the explanations. That seems logical to me.

[*English*]

**The Chair:** I don't know that there's anything to hand out. It is requesting deletion of a full paragraph, so there's nothing to hand out. It's only to delete paragraph i), I gather. Ms. Sidhu is asking that the paragraph be deleted. That's what she's speaking to. The reason she's asking for it to be deleted is obviously—

**Maggie Chi:** I have a point of order, Madam Chair.

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

**Maggie Chi:** I think Maxime has a good point. We can pause to send in the amendment, if that's possible.

**The Chair:** I'm sorry. I didn't hear you.

**Maggie Chi:** Can we suspend so that the amendment can be sent in?

**The Chair:** Excuse me, but somebody keeps turning on my microphone. When the microphone is on, I can't hear anybody.

**Maggie Chi:** I think Maxime has a good point. If we need to suspend the meeting and send in the amendment, I think Ms. Sidhu can do that from her office.

**The Chair:** Ms. Sidhu's amendment is simple. She's asking to remove—

[*Translation*]

**Maxime Blanchette-Joncas:** Madam Chair, on a point of order.

[*English*]

**The Chair:** —paragraph i). That's all. There's nothing to send.

**Sonia Sidhu:** Madam Chair, the amendment was sent.

**The Chair:** Okay. I didn't get it, but there you go. The amendment was sent.

**Helena Konanz:** I'd like to speak to the amendment.

**The Chair:** Yes. Your name is being put down now, Ms. Konanz.

**Helena Konanz:** Okay.

**The Chair:** Your name is on the list to speak to the amendment.

**Maggie Chi:** On a point of order, Madam Chair, my colleague has been interrupted many times. There is a clerk. There is a chair. Can we please respect my colleague's speaking time?

**Dan Mazier:** You're doing it right now.

**Maggie Chi:** No, I'm acknowledging what just happened. I think I have the right to call out behaviours that I don't see fit and that interrupt your colleague's time.

**The Chair:** I have already called out the behaviours. If someone is raising a point of order, I have to know why their hand is up, Ms. Chi. I have to recognize a hand that is put up. I don't know why it's being put up, so I have to listen to know why.

Go ahead, Ms. Sidhu. You were speaking.

**Sonia Sidhu:** Yes, Madam Chair.

Thank you, Ms. Chi, for raising it.

It's as though I'm in a kindergarten class. Madam Chair, please make an announcement again that everyone listen when I'm speaking.

Once the information is released, it cannot be taken back. The impact is not just immediate; it can affect how organizations choose to work with the Government of Canada going forward.

As I mentioned previously, when I look beyond paragraph i), I see the same issue repeating itself throughout the motion. This organization is working with the government to implement a national program. The correspondence can include operational decisions, system processes and sensitive information related to how the program is delivered.

There are programs that work directly with the communities. They work with the organizations on the ground, and they serve people who are often in very vulnerable situations. Applications and agreements in this context are not just administrative. They can include financial information and information about the population being served. Again, we have to approach that carefully.

We are being asked for applications, recommendations and documents related to the support program. This brings us back to the issue of internal advice, because the recommendation documents to the minister's office are part of how decisions are made. They reflect candid, evidence-based advice from public servants. That system works because those conversations are protected. If we start routinely pulling all of that info into—

• (1750)

**The Chair:** Excuse me, Ms. Sidhu.

Colleagues, because of all the talking in the room, I cannot hear what is being said by Ms. Sidhu, despite having my earpiece on. If people wish to discuss something, please go to the back of the room where it won't disturb the chair's ability to listen to the meeting.

Yes, Mr. Blanchette-Joncas.

[*Translation*]

**Maxime Blanchette-Joncas:** Madam Chair, I suggest that we suspend the meeting to take the time to properly analyze the change to the amendment. I think it will be quieter in the room.

[*English*]

**The Chair:** Mr. Blanchette-Joncas, there is no amendment to analyze. It is completely removing paragraph i) of the motion—

[*Translation*]

**Maxime Blanchette-Joncas:** This is an amendment, Madam Chair.

[*English*]

**The Chair:** —so I don't understand what you need, except to say that's what she said. She's removing it. She's speaking to her reasons for doing so, which she's allowed to do.

With any amendment that any member moves, they're allowed to speak to their amendment and to explain why they're doing it. Then the debate that's going to happen after that is going to be a debate on the amendment and not on the original motion. This is how it works. I'm just explaining it to members so everybody is clear.

Ms. Sidhu has the floor.

[*Translation*]

**Maxime Blanchette-Joncas:** Madam Chair, I am simply asking you to—

[*English*]

**Sonia Sidhu:** Thank you, Madam Chair.

[*Translation*]

**Maxime Blanchette-Joncas:** —suspend the committee meeting so that we can take the time to talk to each other as colleagues.

[*English*]

**The Chair:** Excuse me. I cannot hear you because every time I turn on to listen, somebody.... Can you please not turn on my microphone so I can hear what people are saying? Let me deal with this myself. If you keep turning it on, I can't hear.

Okay, go ahead.

[*Translation*]

**Maxime Blanchette-Joncas:** I simply want to ask you to suspend the meeting. It will be quieter, and we will be able to take the time to discuss the proposed change to the amendment among ourselves.

[*English*]

**The Chair:** We can suspend. I just need everyone in this room to [*Inaudible—Editor*].

We have an hour meeting as indicated by the clerk, and I have already [*Inaudible—Editor*].

**Dan Mazier:** [*Inaudible—Editor*]

**The Chair:** I know you did, Mr. Mazier, but it was during a suspension, so the meeting was up.

**Dan Mazier:** I'm asking now. How many resources do we have? Can you ask the clerk, please?

**The Chair:** Yes, I will ask the clerk.

**Dan Mazier:** You're going to pull that one, because it was a suspension. I asked you. I asked you before, but that's good. Let's recess.

**The Chair:** Let people answer when you speak. The minute you asked me that, I asked the clerk to find out, and she did, so don't say I'm pulling something on you.

**Dan Mazier:** What did she say?

**The Chair:** I'm just pointing to her to speak, and you're not allowing me to do that because you keep speaking. Let the clerk answer the question.

**Maggie Chi:** I have a point of order.

**The Chair:** Your question about resources did not happen during the meeting, Mr. Mazier. It happened outside. I did you the courtesy of trying to get that information, so don't ask me about what I'm pulling, Mr. Mazier. Please let's not get paranoid around here. Let's have respect for each other. You asked me. I asked.

Go ahead, Clerk.

**Maggie Chi:** I have a point of order.

**The Chair:** Excuse me. The clerk is going to respond to this.

**Maggie Chi:** On a point of order, this is a trend I've been noticing. I noticed the exchange between Mr. Mazier and the chair, and I've also noticed the interruptions that my colleague Ms. Sidhu has endured throughout her speech. The level of disrespect I've noticed in this particular meeting is really up there.

I just want to remind folks that we are all honourable members here, and we are all part of the committee. At the end of the day, we're all working together here. Let's please respect everybody here, including speaking members and the chair.

I'm just respectfully asking that because the level of behaviour I've noticed here is really.... I've witnessed better behaviour. I implore folks to follow the best decorum.

Thank you.

**The Chair:** Thank you, Ms. Chi.

The clerk informed me that there are resources available until 7:38 p.m. It's up to the committee to make a decision about how they want to do this meeting, but that's the information you requested, Mr. Mazier.

Now that you requested it formally, I'm giving you the answer. Are you good?

**Dan Mazier:** Formally, thank you very much, Chair.

Thank you, Clerk.

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

Ms. Sidhu still has the floor, but somebody called for a suspension.

Maxime, did you call for a suspension?

• (1755)

**Maxime Blanchette-Joncas:** Yes.

**The Chair:** The meeting is suspended.

• (1755)

(Pause)

• (1815)

**The Chair:** I call the meeting back to order.

Go ahead, Ms. Sidhu.

**Dan Mazier:** No, [*Inaudible—Editor*].

**The Chair:** Ms. Sidhu was speaking when we suspended. I'm sorry, Mr. Mazier.

**Sonia Sidhu:** It's all right, Chair. I'm done.

**The Chair:** We now have a list.

Mr. Strauss, go ahead.

**Matt Strauss (Kitchener South—Hespeler, CPC):** I think we've been here for over an hour now. The only person we have heard from is my colleague, Ms. Sidhu. She was reading a prepared statement, as it appeared to me, for an hour. I think that qualifies as a filibuster.

I'm going to take a bit of time, maybe a couple of minutes, to ask why you are putting us through this. I'm an intensive care physician. I spend a lot of time with people at the end of their lives. Not one of my dying patients has ever said to me that they wish they had spent more time becoming a member of Parliament so they could go to Ottawa to filibuster and waste everyone's time to hide a \$250-million boondoggle from the taxpayers of Canada.

I honestly implore each of you in this room, members and staff... What are we doing here?

**The Chair:** I allowed you to speak because I thought you were speaking to the amendment.

**Matt Strauss:** I am.

**The Chair:** Go ahead. Speak to the amendment.

**Matt Strauss:** The amendment is to delete our investigation, which is this committee's attempt to procure documents related to a \$250-million boondoggle.

There is no question about whether it's a boondoggle. It is a program that has been cancelled and the taxpayer got nothing. It is the same amount of money, \$250 million, that was wasted, corruptly and fraudulently, in the sponsorship scandal that brought down the Paul Martin government.

I did my best to listen to Ms. Sidhu's prepared remarks. I couldn't make much sense out of them. I'm not sure if—

**The Chair:** Excuse me, Mr. Strauss. I would like to caution you about accusing Ms. Sidhu of something. Some people do not speak off the cuff as well as you do, Mr. Strauss. They sometimes need to read the notes that they made on a debate. You've seen it in the House. People stand up and read from a piece of paper in the House. It's not a prepared document if it was prepared by them to speak to the issue. That is what Ms. Sidhu did.

Let's not jump to conclusions, please. Be careful how we cast aspersions.

**Matt Strauss:** Thank you for the kind words initially, Chair.

I don't think I was making an accusation. I think you said that if the document is prepared, it's not a prepared document.

**The Chair:** I did not say that.

I said people in the House use paper to speak all the time.

**Matt Strauss:** I know that.

**The Chair:** I said that some people may not be able to speak off the cuff as well as you can, so they prepare their documents. Whether she was reading from a document is not a real issue.

If you wish to speak to the actual amendment, I will entertain it. If not, I will move on to the next person.

**Matt Strauss:** Of course I want to speak to it.

I'm not making an accusation, because, as you say, it's totally legitimate to speak from a document. When you do it for an hour, it is filibustering. It's obstructing this committee's very important work and the very important motion that's before us.

To go back, \$250 million is what was blown on the sponsorship scandal. The Gomery inquiry, which the Paul Martin government convened, looked at a million documents to get to the bottom of what happened.

I heard my colleague during her remarks say that this is not a narrow motion or it's too expansive. We're not looking for a million documents. We just want to see the contract. We don't want this to happen again.

Do my colleagues on the other side know how many hospital beds could have been made with \$250 million? How many school lunches could have been prepared with \$250 million? For all of these things they want to get done that they've lectured us on for the last 11 years, they could have done a lot of them with \$250 million, but they blew them. We just want to find out why.

I overheard other strange things in those prepared remarks, like that this could have to do with correspondence with vulnerable communities. There is nothing about vulnerable communities in the part of the motion that she is trying to delete. There's nothing about correspondence in the part of the motion that she's trying to delete.

We listened to her for an hour. The things she said do not comport with the reality of what we are asking for. We are just asking to see the contract. I think more and more Canadians are going to wonder.

There are 11 points in this motion. Why is this the one point they will not—

• (1820)

**The Chair:** Again, Mr Strauss, there's an amendment on the floor. Why the amendment was put is not the issue. What the amendment says is the issue that you're speaking to, not why. I'm sorry.

Speak to the amendment, for or against, but let's not go ahead with thinking about why people did the things they did. That's not really an agenda item.

**Matt Strauss:** If we're going to vote on the amendment, are we going to have to think about why we're voting for it or not?

**The Chair:** You're asking why she was spending so much time speaking about an amendment that you did not agree with. I want you to speak for the amendment or against it, not why.

**Matt Strauss:** I believe she was arguing that we should vote for her amendment, and I'm arguing that we should vote against the amendment. My reasoning includes why the amendment exists. I think questions of why are pretty relevant.

As they spend more and more of the resources of their one precious life trying to hide this contract, more and more Canadians are asking why, I think, so I urge them to stop this. Let us see the contract. That's it. We have another hour of committee time. We can vote on it at any point. It would be a great pleasure even if they just explained why they're doing this.

Thanks.

**The Chair:** Thanks, Mr. Strauss.

I now go to Mr. Mazier.

**Dan Mazier:** Thank you, Chair.

To follow up on Mr. Strauss's point, \$250 million.... I really like where he was going regarding what else we could have done with that, especially when it comes to health care in Canada. We have six million Canadians who do not have a family doctor. We have 13,000 physicians who were brought into Canada through this failed Liberal immigration program. They came to Canada to practise and to serve Canadians and customers, and the Liberals blew it. We could have used the \$250 million to get them trained up and to get practice-ready assessment programs working—things we can do to make sure our health system works.

Like Mr. Strauss, I cannot imagine why the Liberals are filibustering this and trying to cover this up. There was \$250 million—everybody knows about it—spent on this program, and they just cancelled it out of nowhere.

I would like to move a subamendment to add the following words at the very bottom of the motion:

And that one three hour meeting be held no later than April 24, 2026 with one hour each dedicated to 1) TELUS, 2) Canada Health Infoway, and 3) government officials, in that respective order, for testimony on PrescribeIT

**The Chair:** Can you send that to everyone? I am trying to write it down as you speak.

**Dan Mazier:** They have it.

**The Chair:** Clerk, will you make sure everybody has this?

Mr. Mazier, is that all you have to say? Do you want to continue speaking?

**Dan Mazier:** That's the subamendment.

• (1825)

**The Chair:** We will go to Mr. Eyolfson.

**Maggie Chi:** I have a point of order, Chair.

Can we suspend to get the wording of the subamendment?

**The Chair:** Yes.

• (1825)

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

• (1845)

**The Chair:** We have a subamendment on the floor by Mr. Mazier. The subamendment is obviously in order, because there is language left in the paragraph, which he's adding to. We will talk to the subamendment by Mr. Mazier.

Is anyone's hand up to discuss Mr. Mazier's subamendment? Did all of you get the subamendment?

**An hon. member:** Yes.

**The Chair:** Is there any discussion on the subamendment or shall I call the vote? Can we call the vote quickly on the subamendment?

**An hon. member:** Yes.

**The Chair:** I'm sorry. You're not the only person. I hear you. I heard you the first time.

• (1850)

**Maxime Blanchette-Joncas:** I gave you my answer.

**The Chair:** I heard you the first time. Thank you.

We're voting on the subamendment presented by Mr. Mazier.

(Subamendment agreed to: yeas 8; nays 0)

**The Chair:** We'll go back to Ms. Sidhu's amendment, which has been amended by the subamendment.

Is there any debate?

(Amendment as amended agreed to: yeas 8; nays 0)

**The Chair:** We now have an amended motion.

Go ahead, Ms. Konanz.

**Helena Konanz:** I'd like to make an amendment to the motion. I'm hoping it will have UC.

In section f), I'd like to cross out "except with Quebec".

In section g), I'd like "except with Quebec" crossed out.

In section k), I'd like "except from Quebec" crossed out.

I can start again, if that will help.

**The Chair:** No. I know what you're saying. I'm just looking at which part of this motion I'm dealing with now.

I have the one motion that was moved by Matt Strauss on Thursday, March 12. Under section j), there was nothing that said "except for Quebec".

I'm looking for your new motion that you moved today, which was amended by Mr. Mazier. I'm trying to find where that is.

I know what you're saying, but I don't have it in the motion I have in front of me. The motion I have in front of me was the one originally moved by Mr. Strauss. Mr. Mazier brought in a different motion today.

Can I see it, Dan?

Thanks.

• (1855)

**Maggie Chi:** Chair, may I make a suggestion? We can say that every time we see "except Quebec", we'll remove it, instead of going through it clause by clause.

**An hon. member:** Yes to that.

**Maggie Chi:** Yes.

**Helena Konanz:** That seems [*Inaudible—Editor*].

**Maggie Chi:** Yes.

**The Chair:** I heard you, Ms. Konanz.

Mr. Mazier is pointing something out to me.

**Dan Mazier:** What letters were they? They were f), g) and k).

**The Chair:** Thank you. Is there one more?

**Helena Konanz:** There's one more.

In the second sentence of the last paragraph, I would like to strike out "and in both official languages".

**The Chair:** Excuse me. I cannot hear, because conversations are going on around me. Please, if staff wish to come and speak to the clerk, could they do so in a manner whereby I can pay attention to what's going on?

I'm sorry, Helena. Go ahead.

**Helena Konanz:** In the second sentence of the last paragraph, I'd like to strike out "and in both official languages". That's it.

**The Chair:** It doesn't say that here. Okay. It's "and in both official languages".

Thanks.

**Helena Konanz:** Strike that out. That is it.

**The Chair:** Thank you.

We have an amendment on the floor. You all know what it is.

**Helena Konanz:** Can we get UC for that?

**The Chair:** Excuse me. I'm asking the committee, not just one member.

Can the committee tell me if you are clear on what Ms. Konanz's amendment is?

**Some hon. members:** Yes.

**The Chair:** We're going to either debate this amendment or call the vote on it.

Is there debate on this amendment?

**Helena Konanz:** Can we get UC for that?

**Dan Mazier:** We ask the committee if we can have unanimous consent.

**The Chair:** I will ask the committee if we have unanimous consent, Mr. Mazier.

Is the committee in agreement with this?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

(Amendment agreed to)

**The Chair:** Thank you.

**Maggie Chi:** Chair, I would also like to clarify that all documents will respect the Privacy Act. Do I need to seek unanimous consent on that one as well?

**The Chair:** You would need to move it first. You're moving an amendment to say that all documents will respect the Privacy Act.

Please move the amendment.

**Maggie Chi:** I move the amendment.

**The Chair:** Can you repeat it, please?

**Maggie Chi:** I move to add at the beginning of the last paragraph:

That all documents will respect the Privacy Act

**The Chair:** Good. Is there any discussion or debate on the amendment that all documents will respect the Privacy Act?

I see no hands raised.

**The Clerk of the Committee (Catherine Ngando Edimo):** Is she adding it?

**The Chair:** Yes.

You're adding it, Ms. Chi.

**Maggie Chi:** Yes.

**The Chair:** Let's be clear about what we're trying to do. Thank you.

Basically, Ms. Chi's adding to this that all.... Please repeat it.

**Maggie Chi:** All documents will respect the Privacy Act.

**The Chair:** Is there any debate on this amendment?

Seeing none, we'll call the vote on it.

**Maggie Chi:** Can I seek unanimous consent from the committee?

**The Chair:** Do you want to speak to the amendment?

**Maggie Chi:** I want to seek unanimous consent from the committee.

**The Chair:** I will do that, Ms. Chi. That's what I'm doing.

**Maggie Chi:** That sounds good.

**The Chair:** I'm going to ask for a vote. If everybody agrees, it's called unanimous consent. That's what I'm trying to do. People do not say that they are seeking unanimous consent. The chair asks that question.

I'm hearing no debate. We have unanimous consent.

(Amendment agreed to)

**The Chair:** Is there any further discussion regarding the document we have in front of us?

**Maxime Blanchette-Joncas:** No.

**The Chair:** Therefore, we need to vote on the motion as amended.

Shall the motion as amended carry?

Yes, Mr. Strauss.

**Matt Strauss:** I'm sorry. I'll speak after the vote.

**The Chair:** We will call the vote on the motion as amended. Is everyone in agreement?

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

**The Chair:** All right.

Mr. Strauss.

**Matt Strauss:** Madam Chair, I believe that if you seek it, you will find unanimous consent for the following motion:

That the Chair request both 1) Health Canada and 2) Manitoba Chief Medical Examiner to provide the committee with the final reports and findings of the investigation(s) into the recent deaths of two individuals at Grifols plasma collection centres in Winnipeg, Manitoba; and be provided within 14 days of the adoption of this motion.

**The Chair:** I'd just like to inform the committee that we got the documents that you requested from Grifols, and they are confidential. I'm going to ask you how you want us to deal with the Grifols confidential documents.

You also want Health Canada to come and speak on why they found no fault with Grifols. Is that it?

• (1900)

**Matt Strauss:** Yes, this is to ask for the reports of Health Canada and the chief medical examiner to be delivered to the committee with separate documents.

**The Chair:** You don't want them to appear. Do you just want them to be delivered?

**Matt Strauss:** It's just a document production motion.

**The Chair:** You just want them sent to the committee.

Is there unanimous consent on that?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

(Motion agreed to)

**The Chair:** That's something the clerk will make sure happens.

Is there any further business?

Ms. Chi.

**Maggie Chi:** Madam Chair, may I move to adjourn the meeting?

**The Chair:** I was going to do that right now if I didn't have anybody who wanted to say anything.

The meeting is adjourned.

---







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

---

### SPEAKER'S PERMISSION

---

The proceedings of the House of Commons and its committees are hereby made available to provide greater public access. The parliamentary privilege of the House of Commons to control the publication and broadcast of the proceedings of the House of Commons and its committees is nonetheless reserved. All copyrights therein are also reserved.

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.

---

Also available on the House of Commons website at the following address: <https://www.ourcommons.ca>

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

---

### PERMISSION DU PRÉSIDENT

---

Les délibérations de la Chambre des communes et de ses comités sont mises à la disposition du public pour mieux le renseigner. La Chambre conserve néanmoins son privilège parlementaire de contrôler la publication et la diffusion des délibérations et elle possède tous les droits d'auteur sur celles-ci.

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 des communes.

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.

---

Aussi disponible sur le site Web de la Chambre des communes à l'adresse suivante :  
<https://www.noscommunes.ca>