

The CHAIRMAN: I must apologize, Dr. Haidasz, for not bringing the list which you sent me, although I might mention that you did send a letter to me listing all those companies that you felt should be asked to appear.

Mr. HADASZ: I feel that as well as calling representatives from the companies which manufacture food additives, particularly in respect of children's foods, we should also have representatives appear from companies that have made available in Canada the drug known as L.S.D., namely the Sandoz company, in order to air the complaints made by the various psychiatrists in clinical research in respect of alcoholism and schizophrenia. I feel, therefore we should call some representative from the Sandoz company.

Mr. BALDWIN: Mr. Chairman, I might point out in respect of the question raised by Dr. Harley that the definition of the word "drug" itself in the act refers also to drugs used in connection with animals or human beings.

Mr. HARLEY: It was my suggestion that the drugs used for meat tenderizing and for the fattening of cattle, such as hormones, would not be covered.

Mr. HORNER (*Jasper-Edson*): Mr. Chairman, I think these are all covered in the act.

Mr. HARLEY: What does the chairman visualize as our hours of sitting?

The CHAIRMAN: This chairman visualizes a long session. It was our thought that we would meet regularly on Tuesdays and Thursdays at 9.30 in the morning and sit until 12 or 12.30. We also thought that if it was the desire of the committee to complete the evidence of a witness we should sit after orders of the day until perhaps 5.30, using Wednesday mornings from 9.30 until 10.30 in order to complete a witness's testimony of the previous day. It is also our feeling that we should deal with the drugs section first, complete that, and then consider the second section in respect of contamination of foods and insecticides.

Mr. HARLEY: I take it there would be no objection to questioning one witness in relation to the second section even though the witness was called in respect of the first section?

The CHAIRMAN: I think that will be satisfactory providing that we do not become side-tracked and involved in an extensive discussion resulting in a loss of the main theme of continuity. I do not foresee any problem in this regard.

Mr. BALDWIN: Although most witnesses will probably do so, it might be suggested to them that they prepare and send briefs to us so that we can follow the briefs at the time they are presenting their evidence. I think this practice is a very useful one. They should, of course, be informed that they will be allowed to expand upon the remarks contained in the brief.

Mr. FAIRWEATHER: I think that is a good suggestion providing we do not follow the practice of allowing the witnesses to read their long briefs. We can all read, or at least that is the assumption.

The CHAIRMAN: I think we will find that individuals representing trade and professional associations appearing before this committee will have briefs, although perhaps certain biologists, chemists, pharmacologists and professional people from universities and independent laboratories may not present briefs. They will, of course, be called on to explain their positions in respect of certain fields. I will, however, indicate in my letters to these companies and professional peoples that it would be preferable that they submit briefs to this committee before their appearance.

Mr. HORNER (*Jasper-Edson*): Mr. Chairman, one of my colleagues happens to be the medical director of S.K. and F. and has offered the use of a film in respect of the Kefauver inquiry into drugs in the United States. It is about one half hour in length. He has suggested that perhaps this committee would like to see this film and, if so, he will make it available.