Oral Questions

• (1420)

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): No, Mr. Speaker, we have not reached a decision yet. There are still representations coming in from various quarters, as the hon. member knows, and we are considering them.

Mr. Broadbent: Could the Prime Minister inform the House as to when we might expect to learn the decision of the government on this very important matter?

Mr. Baldwin: After the House has adjourned.

Mr. Trudeau: As soon as possible, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Broadbent: Considering that the PLO is a terroristic organization, committed in its basic charter to the destruction to the State of Israel and that it is fundamentally still committed to that principle, would the Prime Minister assure the House that as long as the PLO remains committed to these tactics and to this fundamental objective, the government will not permit representatives to come to Canada?

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Trudeau: That is, of course, one of the important aspects of the question the government is considering. I must point out that this government has always stood very strongly in favour of the continued existence of the State of Israel. That is basic to our position. We would even go further than the hon. member and say that this government is opposed to terrorism of all kinds from wherever it originates. That is also part of the principle involved in this decision.

Mr. Broadbent: Following up what the Prime Minister has just said about his government being fundamentally opposed to terrorism, and considering that the stated objective of PLO terrorism is the obliteration of the State of Israel, which is a current member of the United Nations, will the Prime Minister commit the government not to give tacit recognition to an organization committed to such a course of action?

Mr. Trudeau: Of course this is not the issue, and Canada has not recognized the PLO. As the hon. member knows, it is the United Nations which has recognized the PLO as an observer, and this is the nature of the difficulty the government is facing. The House should remember that we have not waffled. We did vote against the PLO, and this remains our position. The House has asked me when we will make an announcement, and I said as soon as possible. If hon. members want to argue the issue before that, the government is prepared to argue.

[Mr. Broadbent.]

[Translation]

HOUSING

EFFECT OF BUDGET REDUCTION ON URBAN DEMONSTRATION PROGRAM—POSSIBILITY OF TRANSFERRING AMOUNT SAVED TO CMHC

Mr. Adrien Lambert (Bellechasse): Mr. Speaker, I should like to put a question to the Minister of State for Urban Affairs.

In a recent statement, the minister advised the House that neighbourhood improvement and urban affairs programs would be cut back by \$100 million. Can the minister tell the House whether that \$100 million cut will affect projects submitted by municipalities and having to do with neighbourhood improvement as stipulated in Bill C-133 which the House passed?

[English]

Hon. Barney Danson (Minister of State for Urban Affairs): No, Mr. Speaker. The cut in the Canadian Urban Demonstration Program does not affect existing programs under CMHC or the National Housing Act. This refers only to the urban demonstration program. Those projects which have been selected and announced will proceed with a general saving in the budgetary measures based on the priorities of the government at this time and the need to restrain spending wherever ways can be found.

[Translation]

Mr. Lambert (Bellechasse): Mr. Speaker, I have a supplementary.

I thank the minister for the information which is very important for the municipalities of Quebec and Canada as a whole. Considering the efforts made by private enterprise as well as federal and provincial governments to fight unemployment, would the minister be prepared to recommend to his cabinet colleagues the allocation of that \$100 million cut to housing, which would enable the Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation to join in that fight and respond more adequately to the numerous applications it receives.

[English]

Mr. Danson: Mr. Speaker, of course this saving was taken into consideration in the over-all expenditure posture, and is one of the reasons we were able to achieve a \$200 million increase in housing funds in this budget. There are other priorities being weighed against this which are very important on the urban scene. I should like to make it perfectly clear that this \$100 million did not relate to housing programs or CMHC programs or any of the renovation, rehabilitation, neighbourhood improvement programs or the hundreds of projects going on across Canada under CMHC to help build new housing and improve existing housing and neighbourhoods.