Oral Questions

Ms. Joy Langan (Mission—Coquitlam): Mr. Speaker, I would like the minister to review my question in *Hansard* and point out where I have erred.

I have here a document obtained through the access to information from a researcher in the Clinical Advisory Division to the Chief of Research in Standards Division.

The memo is dated January 1989. It says: "I believe that the risk of the severity of the complication outweighs the apparent possible advantage of such an implant," referring to the Meme.

Could the minister explain why he did not immediately act to get the Meme off the market? What research is being done now to ensure that those women who have Memes have the kind of protection they need from the risk? Will he undertake an independent inquiry to ensure us that the department acted properly on the information it clearly had? I would like to table the document.

[Translation]

Hon. Benoît Bouchard (Minister of National Health and Welfare): Mr. Speaker, there have been numerous studies on breast implants. Incidentally, the Meme implant was taken off the market a year ago. It is no longer available. The manufacturer is no longer marketing this type of implant. Studies are going on at this very moment. I felt that six months would give us a chance to do further studies.

We have just had a report, and now the hon. member is asking for another study, another investigation. I believe we now have the mechanisms we need, and meanwhile, we intend to make a decision within the next six months. For once the hon. member for Hamilton East congratulated me at the press conference on the decisions I made because I felt they were the right ones to protect the well-being of Canadian women.

[English]

DOMESTIC WORKER PROGRAM

Hon. Warren Allmand (Notre-Dame-de-Grâce): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister for Employment and Immigration.

Yesterday the minister implemented changes in the Domestic Worker Program, despite the fact that the House of Commons committee was still studying his proposals of January 30 and had not yet reported to the House.

In fact the committee was awaiting further information from his department in order to schedule additional meetings and write its report.

I want the minister to tell this House why he proceeded with his announcement yesterday before the committee reported its recommendations. Why has the minister totally snubbed, debased and humiliated this parliamentary committee?

Hon. Bernard Valcourt (Minister of Employment and Immigration): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member knows me. He knows, I am sure, that I would never snub colleagues of the House of Commons.

The announcement I made on January 30 resulted from a two-year consultation process and study of the then foreign domestic program. I know that the subcommittee of the standing committee is looking at that program.

If hon, members on the committee come up with recommendations to improve this program, I will look at them seriously. I do not think that this takes away from the efforts of the subcommittee of the standing committee.

Hon. Warren Allmand (Notre-Dame-de-Grâce): Mr. Speaker, the government talks about parliamentary reform and the important role of committees, but time and again it ignores the committees and disregards their advice.

In this case, not one witness before the committee supported the government's proposals. None were consulted as alleged by the minister, and his official failed to provide information requested by the committee on February 26. That is two months ago. In these circumstances, again I ask: why did the minister proceed with these changes yesterday and will he not put these changes on hold until the committee reports in a few weeks?

Hon. Bernard Valcourt (Minister of Employment and Immigration): No, Mr. Speaker, I will not because this is not an immigration program. This is a labour market program. There is a demand for live-in care givers by Canadian families. The program was suspended in January. Because of the need, we have decided to proceed.