

country is going to need and, by golly, that is what the universities are going to have to pump out? Is it concerned that the social sciences and humanities are going to fall by the wayside, because in these times of economic restraint the arts, philosophy and the social sciences are surely frivolous? In fact, it is in those areas particularly, Mr. Speaker, that federal support has fallen so drastically during the 1970s. Is it the government's design to really change our universities into technical institutes because this will fit into its grand economic plan and strategy?

We are not opposed, Mr. Speaker, to future economic planning but it has to be done openly and honestly. It has to be done in consultation with industry, the provincial governments and the universities. It has to be a co-operative process, not a unilateral process. It cannot be something which comes out of the back room of some government bureaucrat—"The new fad for this year is to change our universities". Surely Canada has had enough of governments which deal with one fad this year and another one next year. We need responsible government, Mr. Speaker, and this bill we have in front of us today is irresponsible government. It damages the institutions which have been built up over the years. These institutions can, of course, be changed; that is part of natural evolution. But it should not be hacked and chopped to pieces in the way being threatened by this legislation.

Let there be no doubt, Mr. Speaker, that we in this party will stand opposed to and will fight this legislation. I suspect that in years to come, in other debates in this House, the remarks and predictions made today and yesterday will be quoted, as we in turn are quoting people like Tommy Douglas.

Mr. Kempling: Don't count on it.

Mr. de Jong: What we are seeing is a progression of irresponsible behaviour which will take years to correct. My colleagues and I, Mr. Speaker, stand opposed to this legislation.

PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION

[English]

SUBJECT MATTER OF QUESTIONS TO BE DEBATED

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. It is my duty, pursuant to Standing Order 40, to inform the House that the questions to be raised tonight at the time of adjournment are as follows: the hon. member for Waterloo (Mr. McLean)—The Budget—Impact on voluntary sector and municipalities; the hon. member for Athabasca (Mr. Shields)—National Energy Program—Effect on Alsands project. (b) Request that minister change policy; the hon. member for Kootenay West (Mr. Kristiansen)—Finance—Taxation of northern allowances—Request that minister meet union representatives. (b) Request that minister withdraw budget measure.

Federal Transfers to Provinces

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[Translation]

FEDERAL-PROVINCIAL FISCAL ARRANGEMENTS AND ESTABLISHED PROGRAMS FINANCING ACT, 1977

MEASURE TO AMEND

The House resumed consideration of the motion of Mr. MacEachen that Bill C-97, to amend the Federal-Provincial Fiscal Arrangements and Established Programs Financing Act, 1977, and to provide for payments to certain provinces, be read the second time and referred to the Standing Committee on Finance, Trade and Economic Affairs.

Mr. Jean-Guy Dubois (Lotbinière): Mr. Speaker, I feel that Bill C-97, tabled last week by the Minister of Finance (Mr. MacEachen) and amending the Federal-Provincial Fiscal Arrangements and Established Programs Financing Act, 1977, will have a tremendous impact on the federal system in Canada and especially on the economy.

First of all, may I point out that I shall be speaking mainly from the perspective of the province of Quebec, which I represent. Members of *la belle province's* provincial government will, of course, express their dissatisfaction, as usually happens when there is a federal-provincial discussion. It is most unfortunate, at this stage, that no agreement could be reached on this very delicate matter, but I feel that in the coming months or perhaps in the days or weeks to come, Quebecers will be hearing a lot about this bill which is being debated here in the House. They will be hearing a lot of figures and as usual, the provincial government will be saying that Quebecers are always penalized and that they are not getting their fair share. It is clear, Mr. Speaker, that Quebecers, and they are still Canadians, must be told first of all that Bill C-97 does not create a situation that is unfavourable to Quebecers, and that many representations made by the provinces, especially by the province of Quebec, were considered when the new fiscal arrangements policy was established.

Earlier, I heard my colleague, the hon. member for Laval (Mr. Roy), discuss the fiscal arrangements situation, and he said that many Quebecers were surprised to hear that much of the funding for post-secondary education came from the federal government. They were surprised because what happens is that federal contributions in the context of federal-provincial programs tend to be, as has already been said by one of our colleagues here in the House, the Minister of Justice (Mr. Chrétien), the best kept state secret in our country. Quebecers are not allowed to know what they get from Ottawa, because they might start to wonder about the representations made by our provincial authorities regarding the finances of the province of Quebec. Now about this situation, I was very surprised yesterday to hear anglophone Progressive Conservative colleagues discuss the predicament of