

1. A December 1992 study jointly commissioned by Agriculture Canada and Environment Canada estimated that some 200 tonnes of methyl bromide would be consumed in Canada in 1992. The report further indicated the following breakdown;

(a) 50 per cent—Space fumigation (i.e. ship holds, grain silos, et cetera); 5 per cent—Commodity fumigation (including quarantine);

(b) 45 per cent—Soil fumigation;

(c) 0 per cent—Structural fumigation (including residential).

2. (a) Over the next several months, Environment Canada will be consulting with affected users of methyl bromide in order to identify specific means to reduce use and emissions of methyl bromide in commodity and quarantine fumigation applications.

(b) Canada will freeze imports of methyl bromide at 1991 levels of importation beginning January 1, 1995 as required by the amended Montreal protocol under the Canadian Environmental Protection Act. Canada will also reduce imports by 25 per cent beginning January 1, 1998. Over the next several months, Environment Canada will be consulting with affected users of methyl bromide in order to identify specific means to reduce use and emissions of methyl bromide in soil fumigation applications.

(c) Methyl bromide is not used in residential applications in Canada.

3. No. Labels indicating that specific agricultural chemicals have been used in the production of food commodities are not required in Canada and there are no plans to introduce such a requirement for methyl bromide or for any other agricultural chemical in the immediate future. The safety of agricultural chemicals must be established through detailed testing before they can be used in or upon foods sold in Canada. Therefore, the use of warning labels on such foods would serve no useful purpose and could be misleading to consumers.

[*Translation*]

Madam Deputy Speaker: The questions as enumerated by the parliamentary secretary have been answered.

Mr. Langlois: I ask Madam Speaker, that the remaining questions be allowed to stand.

Madam Deputy Speaker: Shall the remaining questions stand?

Supply

Some hon. members: Agreed.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

• (1510)

[*English*]

SUPPLY

ALLOTTED DAY, S. O. 81—YOUTH EMPLOYMENT

The House resumed consideration of the motion of Mr. Bevilacqua.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois): I will appreciate the hon. member for South Shore indicating to the Chair whether he will split his time with another member of his party.

Mr. Peter L. McCreath (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister for International Trade): Mr. Speaker, the gentleman I was splitting with is not available this afternoon so I will be using the full 20 minutes. I know that will bring great joy to my hon. friends opposite. I notice they always listen with such attentiveness when I speak in this place.

I would like to pick up where I left off. In beginning this discussion I had mentioned in my remarks earlier the role played by public servants in the Department of Employment and Immigration and the tremendous job they do in assisting people with employment.

I then went on to mention, and I recall there were a number of members opposite making a great deal of noise concerning themselves with this, the question of how much money was being spent. I recall the hon. member from St. Boniface in particular.

I had made available a number of statistics pointing out the sums of money the government has devoted. Interestingly enough when I made the point it seems this was at the point at which the time ran out. I was making the point that this government's philosophy is very clearly different from that of its predecessor.

It is our view that it is not the direct function and role of the Government of Canada to employ directly as many Canadians as possible regardless of the cost to the taxpayer which that process involves.

We see it rather as the role and function of government to create the environment within which the private