

**Madam Speaker:** This motion requires the unanimous consent of the House. Is there unanimous consent for this motion?

**Some hon. Members:** Agreed.

**Some hon. Members:** No.

\* \* \*

[English]

### HEALTH

DANGERS OF DIOXIN CONTAMINATED FISH—MOTION UNDER S.O. 43

**Mr. Jim Fulton (Skeena):** Madam Speaker, I, too, rise under the provisions of Standing Order 43. In view of levels of dioxin contamination in Lake Ontario and the environmental problems and health issues that must be addressed; and in view of the recent studies of Dr. James Allen on the effects of dioxin on animals, which confirm that as little as one microgram of dioxin per kilogram of body weight gives evidence of contamination, I move, seconded by the hon. member for Beaches (Mr. Young):

That in view of the dangerous contradictions between the Minister of National Health and Welfare, the Minister of the Environment and the Minister of Fisheries and Oceans—first, Health and Welfare allowing the Canadian public to dine on fish twice as contaminated as allowed in the United States; second, Fisheries and Oceans allowing the export for consumption in Europe of fish prohibited in Canada due to contamination; third, the Minister of the Environment saying that no dioxin is allowed in food in Canada, the Liberals should come clean on this vital health issue and inform Canadians why no dioxin is allowed in food, but that one can eat fish polluted with 20 parts per trillion, and that anything more contaminated can be exported to poison others.

**Madam Speaker:** Is there unanimous consent for this motion?

**Some hon. Members:** Agreed.

**Some hon. Members:** No.

\* \* \*

### POST OFFICE

HANDLING OF REGISTERED MAIL AND OF LETTER SENT BY MEMBER OF PARLIAMENT—MOTION UNDER S.O. 43

**Mr. Tom Cossitt (Leeds-Grenville):** Madam Speaker, I rise in regard to the receipt of two anonymous brown envelopes containing first-class mail addressed to persons in Ottawa which Canada Post failed to deliver to their destinations, the circumstances of which illustrate the shocking postal inefficiency for which the government disgracefully wants Canadians to pay almost 100 per cent more. I move, seconded by the hon. member for Prince George-Peace River (Mr. Oberle):

That the Canada Post and the Royal Canadian Mounted Police be requested to investigate, first, the handling of a registered letter bearing registration number 606, mailed by a high official of the Yugoslav Embassy at Ottawa substation 3 to a recipient in Ottawa who never received nor signed for it, and to which is still attached the acknowledgement of receipt card requested by the Yugoslav Embassy; second, a letter written by a prominent member of this Parliament to an Ottawa recipient, which was also never received; and finally,

### Oral Questions

that an immediate apology be extended to both persons involved, namely, to the member of this House and to the Yugoslavian ambassador for these outrageous examples of improper handling of first-class mail and registered mail.

**Madam Speaker:** Is there unanimous consent for this motion?

**Some hon. Members:** Agreed.

**Some hon. Members:** No.

● (1415)

### ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

[English]

#### VIA RAIL

COURT ACTION RESPECTING ORDER IN COUNCIL CANCELLING PASSENGER SERVICES

**Hon. Don Mazankowski (Vegreville):** Madam Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Transport. Yesterday in the House of Commons the minister said that if there was any doubt about the legality of the order in council which has been proposed to eliminate one fifth of Canada's rail passenger service he would merely pass a new order in council and have it registered.

Has the minister consulted with his legal officials on this matter since the government order does nothing to amend the existing CTC order, namely R26-520, which prescribes an ongoing statutory responsibility on CN and CP to provide rail passenger service, and since this argument is part of the argument which is being advanced by a group seeking a legal injunction in the federal court of the province of Saskatchewan? In order to facilitate the court action would the minister not now undertake to have this matter referred to the proper court with a proper reference, so that it can be cleared up, or does the minister simply intend merely to issue another order in council to get around this other legal requirement?

**Hon. Jean-Luc Pepin (Minister of Transport):** Madam Speaker, I am sure that what we have done is legal, and consequently there is no reason to do what my hon. friend suggests. There are two aspects to this matter. One has to do with CTC order R-6751 and CTC order R26-520, being orders under which the railways would have to continue operating routes. What I am pleased to tell my hon. friend is that CTC order R-6751 was revoked by CTC order R31-300 on August 14, 1980. I am pleased to tell him that CTC order R26-520 has been varied by the order in council on August 6, 1981. Item 3 of schedule XV refers to the final plans for western transcontinental passenger train service as implemented by CTC order R26-520. Therefore, there is no problem at all.

**Some hon. Members:** Oh, oh!