

*Oral Questions*

look into it. I understand that the matter is in Cabinet at the moment. Will the Minister give us an answer today?

• (1200)

**Hon. Jake Epp (Minister of National Health and Welfare):** Mr. Speaker, I cannot give an answer to the latter part of the Hon. Member's question.

I believe many of us in the House, not only as Ministers but as Members have had the experience with the issue of the amount of money available for housing and the shortfall that often takes place when a house is built, in terms of development costs. In other words, one does not only take into account the price of the house, but also development costs for such things as access. I know this is being discussed by the Minister of Employment and the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development. I am sure the Deputy Prime Minister and his colleagues will bring that to their attention.

There have been many discussions about that. The question of how much funding there should be and how much equity there should be in terms of individual housing, as an increasing number of Indian bands are moving toward a CMHC configuration as opposed to the former configuration of direct grants, is an ongoing issue.

\* \* \*

**APARTHEID****SOUTH AFRICA—SEVERANCE OF DIPLOMATIC RELATIONS—  
GOVERNMENT POSITION**

**Mr. Howard McCurdy (Windsor—Walkerville):** Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Secretary of State for External Affairs. In an article published in *The Toronto Star* the Secretary of State characterized the position that complete diplomatic sanctions ought to be imposed on South Africa as an extreme position. Of course, this was part of the position enunciated by the Prime Minister in 1985 before the United Nations.

Does the Minister's statement reflect a retreat from the position adopted and enunciated by the Prime Minister in 1985? Does this also apply to the other part of that promise by the Prime Minister that complete economic sanctions would be imposed upon South Africa?

**Right Hon. Joe Clark (Secretary of State for External Affairs):** Of course not, Mr. Speaker. If the Hon. Member would apply to the reading of that article the moderation that has been his happy characteristic in dealing with questions relating to this Government's position against apartheid, he would know that what was described as extreme was the suggestion that two years ago we should have disrupted diplomatic and other relations with South Africa.

Had we done that, I would not have been able to go to South Africa two weeks ago. I would not have been able to carry the

case, on one day, to the African National Congress, and carry the case on the next day to the South African Government, thus providing the possibility of some capacity to breathe life into the negotiations which can be the only means of a peaceful resolution to a situation that can lead to bloodshed in South Africa unless it is resolved peacefully.

The position of the Government of Canada remains as it has been, that if other measures do not work we will be prepared to sever all economic and diplomatic relations with South Africa.

**Mr. Orlikow:** When?

**Mr. Clark (Yellowhead):** We believe it is important for us not to take a blind ideological position like some members of the New Democratic Party do, but rather to try to follow the Canadian tradition of working out a peaceful means to resolve a situation that could erupt into bloodshed.

**SOUTH AFRICAN GOVERNMENT'S ADVERTISEMENT**

**Mr. Howard McCurdy (Windsor—Walkerville):** Mr. Speaker, I find it incomprehensible that the Secretary of State should become so agitated by a request for clarification, which I appreciate having received.

**Mr. Speaker:** Members sometimes do become agitated here. However, given the hour, I would ask the Hon. Member to put his question.

**Mr. McCurdy:** Mr. Speaker, in the article in *The Toronto Star* the Secretary of State also indicates a hope that negotiations may still represent a solution to the South African situation.

In *The Globe and Mail* this morning, we see an ad placed by the South African Government which attempts to demonize the ANC. In view of his hopes for negotiation, which does he think is the greater obstacle in view of this kind of activity on the part of the South African Government, the ANC or the South African Government?

**Right Hon. Joe Clark (Secretary of State for External Affairs):** Mr. Speaker, I frankly do not think it is very helpful for me to respond to that kind of question at this stage. They are both an obstacle because at this stage—

**Mr. Broadbent:** ANC is an obstacle?

**Mr. Clark (Yellowhead):** At this stage the ANC is not prepared to come to the kinds of agreements that were set forth in the negotiating position of the Eminent Persons Group regarding the suspension of violence. They have reasons which they believe to be good reasons.

The South African Government, on the basis of my conversations with it, is not prepared to enter into negotiations because of the difficulty over the same piece of language.

What I find interesting, and—if one can find hope in this circumstance—what is potentially hopeful is that neither the