

speech. In the early part of his speech he took the Government to task for having failed to consult young people in particular with respect to the demise of the Summer Canada program. It is not clear to me whether his concern is about the failure to consult or about having broken a promise to consult. If it were the former, I would ask the Hon. Member, if his concern is about consulting, how does he reconcile that with the failure of the government of which he was formerly a part to consult with students and young people concerning cuts in post-secondary education for which that government was responsible?

Mr. Caccia: Mr. Speaker, I cannot understand the inevitable attraction for the Hon. Member to try to score political points in this House on a matter on which he displays abysmal ignorance. If the Hon. Member were informed, Mr. Speaker, and if he knew what had been done in the Thirty-second Parliament by the Liberal Government, then he would know that post-secondary education was one of the major concerns of the Liberal Government. Post-secondary education received funding and increases in funding, but if there were a shortcoming in the provision of funds it was because we never knew whether the respective provinces would channel the earmarked funds to destination.

Now we hear from the new Tory Government—because the Hon. Member's Party will never form a government—that there is a new notion in the country whereby we are going to consult the provinces, that we are going to do things as if a new era had started. We will be watching Hon. Members across the aisle in the Government to see how they will ensure that funds to post-secondary education will reach their destination. We will watch Hon. Members across the way to see how they will reconcile the backward position of provincial governments across the nation on native rights and the commitments made by the former Minister of Indian and Northern Affairs which recognized that the native people have legitimate rights and aspirations.

We will watch and find out how Hon. Members across the way will reconcile the energy interests of Ontario with those of Alberta in this holding hands under the table, which seems to be the latest gospel proposed by the Party opposite. We will watch them on a number of federal-provincial relationships. I, therefore, welcome the question of the Hon. Member for Windsor-Walkerville (Mr. McCurdy).

Mr. Heap: Mr. Speaker, regarding consultation with students, the Hon. Member for Davenport (Mr. Caccia) never answered the question. He expressed his government's great interest in post-secondary education, but he never said what consultations were held with the students before a couple of hundred million dollars was taken out of the budget, taken out not by the provincial governments but by the government of which he was a member.

● (1410)

He also raised the question of whether the provincial governments could be relied on to use the money. He probably

recalls that this Party asked that legislation be amended so as to require provincial governments to use the money for the purpose intended. His government would not introduce such legislation or would not support such an amendment.

When the Students' Administrative Council of the University of Toronto asked permission to be heard, with a very thoroughly documented brief opposing the cuts by his government earlier this year, what response did his government make to that request and to the request of other councils like it when they asked for consultation on the question of cuts to post-secondary education?

When answering that, I would be glad if the Hon. Member would tell us what consultation the then Minister of Public Works held with the Co-operative Foundation and the non-profit corporations of several cities when he cut their budget, cutting co-ops to about half and practically wiping out Section 56(1) of the National Housing Act. What consultation was there with the co-operative and non-profit housing industry? We know he consulted with the private profit builders; but what consultation was there with the non-profit and co-op builders?

Mr. Caccia: Mr. Speaker, if the Hon. Member had been here yesterday, he would have had the benefit of the meeting with the Federation of Canadian Students in which the whole question of past and present consultations was elaborated. Also, he would have learned some of the answers. He would have learned the answer to the pseudo question he just posed.

In the past, as far as I can recall, long before the Member was elected to this House we launched programs in close consultation with the groups affected. In the case of co-op housing in Toronto, we have developed one of the most outstanding programs of social housing in the whole western world. We did that in very close consultation with organizations, not only with that one. The Liberal Government funded organizations so that they could be formed, when they expressed that intention, in order to provide criticism at times, support at times any ideas and policy changes that they from their experience saw fit to make at given intervals. This is why he and I can rightly claim that we have a social co-operative housing movement in this country.

It is true that there has been a change in that policy. It is a proposed change whereby the former Minister of Public Works, to whom the Hon. Member for Spadina (Mr. Heap) alludes, indicated that at this stage of development of our housing policy it was desirable also to find ways of improving the quality of rental housing in the downtown urban areas of Canada. This includes housing that needs to be upgraded and housing for single person households with a very limited income. They require as much attention as those who have found accommodation through co-op housing.

We were discovering a new public responsibility towards a group of Canadians who until then had perhaps not received the attention they deserved.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: We shall now resume debate.