In another study by Hazelton Laboratories, sponsored by the chemical industry itself, 10 per cent of rats exposed to quantities of 2,4-D developed brain tumours. What makes the problem of 2,4-D so urgent is that the chemical is extremely widely used both domestically and in agriculture. More than 1,500 weed killing products sold in the United States alone contain 2,4-D. In Canada, approximately 7 million hectares of land are treated with products containing 2,4-D.

Also worrisome is the widespread domestic use of the chemical in lawn and garden products. Surely it is totally unacceptable that domestic gardeners and what I affectionately call lawn fanatics should put their health and the health of others, particularly children in their neighbourhoods, at risk for the sake of flowerbeds and a greener than average lawn.

We see this happen right under our noses at the House of Commons. For the last few years we are treated every summer to little yellow signs on the front lawn that warn us that the grass has been treated with some kind of herbicide and that we ought not to go on the grass because it would endanger our health. This also takes place on railway roadbeds and the sides of highways. I think it is scandalous that we should be taking such risks with these known carcinogens simply in order to have weed-free railway roadbeds or weed-free lawns. It is clearly an example of putting short-term convenience ahead of long-term health and concern for others and the environment.

The Environmental Protection Agency in the United States is accellerating its review of 2,4-D. It is encouraging that even Chemlawn, the largest U.S. lawn care company, has withdrawn 2,4-D products. Yet what has the federal Government done in Canada? It has written to the provinces, drawing their attention to the results of the American studies. Is that decisive action? The provinces have acted in a variety of ways. New Brunswick has banned the use of the chemical until December. Ontario is refusing to schedule new products containing the chemical but has done nothing to stop the use of products currently on the market. Manitoba is putting warning notices on the labels of products containing 2,4-D but unfortunately is in no way restricting their use. Other provinces have done nothing.

Our current haphazard federal-provincial arrangements for pesticide and herbicide control, combined with a lack of federal willingness to take the initiative in a case like 2,4-D, has meant that the response to the problem has been inadequate and inconsistent. Obviously we need to restructure our federal-provincial mechanisms to avoid situations such as this, where some Canadians are protected from known or suspected environmental health hazards while others are not. What is a carcinogenic in New Brunswick is carcinogenic in Manitoba, British Columbia and anywhere. The laws of toxicity do not change from province to province. We need regulations which obey the basic laws of science, as well as those of the constitution.

Another example of this confused situation is the case of Pentachlorophenol which, like 2,4-D, has also been linked to cancer and other health disorders.

As a result of mounting scientific evidence against PCP, Sweden has already banned the chemical, and the United States EPA appears to be on the verge of doing likewise. In addition, several plants around the world that produce PCP have been forced to close for a variety of environmental and health reasons. Despite this world-wide trend toward banning PCP, what do we see in this country? We are currently witnessing the bizarre spectacle of Bradbury Industries' efforts to build a PCP plant in western Canada. First, it proposed to locate in Lone Butte, British Columbia, but was forced to abandon its efforts due to intense local opposition. Now Bradbury plans to build in Alberta where it hopes the provincial Government will be more sympathetic. However, I noticed that the residents of Fort Saskatchewan were out in numbers to protest the fact that their community might be the location for such a plant.

This situation is ridiculous. Not only is Bradbury proposing to produce a dangerous product that fewer and fewer people want, but the federal Government appears content to drag its feet and allow the project to go ahead when it has it in its power to ban PCP altogether.

Finally, I draw the attention of the House to the case of Alachlor. Despite mounting evidence that Alachlor is also a carcinogen, the Government appears to be talking out of both sides of its mouth on the issue. On the one hand, last year the Government deregistered Alachlor. On the other, due to intense pressure from Alachlor's manufacturer, Monsanto, the Government has appointed an Alachlor review board that has already recommended a temporary reregistration of Alachlor and may recommend a permanent reregistration of the chemical when it submits its final report.

This ad hoc approach to these substances must stop. The Minister of Environment (Mr. McMillan) has promised what he says will be tough new environmental protection legislation to deal with toxic chemicals in this country. Government Members may have something to say about this during the course of this debate. Obviously, the control of these substances is part of a larger problem, and in so far as the environmental protection legislation lives up to the Minister's rhetoric about what to expect, I will welcome his initiative in that regard.

However, it is my understanding that the new Bill will deal primarily with new chemicals and it will do little to address the pressing concern raised by 2,4-D, PCP, Alachlor and a host of other potentially dangerous substances currently in use in this country. In addition, even if the new environmental protection legislation is to provide the so-called cradle-to-grave protection that the Minister says it will, I remind the House that pesticide registration falls under the jurisdiction of Agriculture Canada. This situation has long been of concern to both myself and many others because Agriculture Canada rarely places sufficient emphasis on the environmental consequences of the substances used in agriculture.