

the Okanagan water basin agreement in my riding, I would ask the minister whether he is going to back up this signing with money and resources to bring this to a successful conclusion, and whether in fact he is serious about this agreement.

Hon. Jean Marchand (Minister of the Environment): I am very serious, Mr. Speaker.

* * *

HARBOURS

VANCOUVER—REASON FOR INCREASE IN WATER LOT LEASE RATES

Mr. Ron Huntington (Capilano): Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the Minister of Transport, I should like to direct my question to the Acting Prime Minister. As the port of Vancouver provides well over 50 per cent of the total revenues earned by the National Harbours Board, can the Acting Prime Minister give the House the rationale behind the 92 per cent increase in water lot lease rates in the port and harbour of Vancouver?

● (1200)

Hon. C. M. Drury (Acting Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I am not sure I should like to attempt to give the rationale in answer to a question during this period. However, the fact that Vancouver has a very successful economic record of port operations does not mean that the basic rental and operational rates should not be brought up to date.

Mr. Huntington: Mr. Speaker, would the Acting Prime Minister assure the House that the cost benefit studies behind the very high percentage increase in tariffs being imposed by the Minister of Transport to overcome "deficits" do not include such unrelated items as the St. Lawrence Seaway deficit, the port deficits at Halifax, Montreal and Quebec City, the capital losses at Pickering and the champagne, caviar, tear gas party at Mirabel?

* * *

HEALTH

WATER QUALITY STUDY—ADEQUACY OF TERMS OF REFERENCE

Mr. Bob Wenman (Fraser Valley West): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of National Health and Welfare. In the minister's recently announced study of the quality of water in Canada, are the terms of reference and investigation broad enough to determine the presence of elements such as mercury, arsenic and asbestos as well as potential radiation contamination?

Hon. Marc Lalonde (Minister of National Health and Welfare): Yes, Mr. Speaker.

Oral Questions

REGIONAL ECONOMIC EXPANSION

CROCUS FOODS—POSITION OF MANITOBA WITH REGARD TO GRANT

Mr. Dean Whiteway (Selkirk): Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact it has been some two months since the offer was made by DREE in respect of Crocus Foods in Manitoba, surely the Minister of Regional Economic Expansion must have some indication now as to the position taken by the province of Manitoba regarding that DREE grant.

[Translation]

Hon. Marcel Lessard (Minister of Regional Economic Expansion): Mr. Speaker, indeed it was two months ago that an offer was made to that Manitoba corporation known as Crocus Foods and we are still waiting for that business to inform us of its decision. Of course, after an offer is made the business must consider it in terms of its project and analyze all its implications. I presume that is what they are doing now and it should not be long before they contact us to tell us about their decision.

[English]

Mr. Blais: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order with reference to both a motion under Standing Order 43 and a question asked during the question period by the hon. member for Leeds. I simply wish to call the attention of the House and the hon. member to Bill C-82 standing on the order paper which offers a complete explanation to both the point raised in the motion under Standing Order 43 and the question raised by the hon. member for Leeds.

Mr. Cossitt: Mr. Speaker, I must confess that I missed the first few remarks of the hon. parliamentary secretary, but I gathered he was referring to Bill C-82 in respect of the subject of the Thousand Islands bridge and suggesting that in fact it answers the motion under Standing Order 43 and the question I raised.

With all due respect, I must say that—I am sure unintentionally—the parliamentary secretary is misleading the House because the bill is the reason I asked the question and raised the subject in the first place. It most certainly does not answer the question. The province of Ontario has not passed an order in council; therefore, the act being proceeded with is not in accordance with the Statutes of Canada. I feel I am quite in order in asking these questions, in view of the fact that the province and the people of Ontario are further being milked by this government of \$25 million in assets which rightfully belong to them as of March 1, or as they may otherwise direct. May I say that they have not otherwise directed.

The only thing in existence is a letter from the Premier of Ontario to the Prime Minister of Canada saying that Ontario is not interested in getting into the bridge business and suggesting further consultation. I believe that is exactly where the matter stands. Therefore, the information being given to the House at this time is not entirely correct and I would ask the government to provide the House with a proper answer to the question I raised.