

the study of political science and psychology and that kind of study.

Instead of keeping that as a second group the government has seen fit to lump the two together as a cost saving measure. We have seen no figures yet on how much money is to be saved by this merger.

I suggest when we look at the total savings projected from this bill and projected in the budget, they are peanuts. In the particular case of the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council I am sure the savings are minuscule. Most of the staff will have to be retained to do the work. It will do it out of the Canada Council office which may save a little in rent but I expect it had to expand offices to accommodate this group. The important work of the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council is carried out in the course of peer review of the applications for funding.

Most of the peer review—I think I can say all of it—is done for free. There is no charge levied by the social scientists, the sociologists, the political scientists, whoever, who sit on the review panels to decide who receives grants from the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council.

There is a central processing office where the grant applications go. There is apparently some initial screening and then there is peer review of the various applications done gratuitously, free, by Canadians involved in this work across this country.

All that costs the government nothing. What it does is provide an excellent review of the work which is of benefit to the social scientists involved, but it also then assists the council in making a decision as to who and who does not get the funding.

It seems to me that given that approach, why should this group be lumped with the Canada Council whose aims and objectives are really quite different from the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council? The government has decided as apparently some kind of cost-saving measure that these two bodies should operate out of one place. It is not reasonable and the government should abandon this part of the bill.

My time has expired. I will continue my remarks the next time this bill is called.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): The hon. member will then have 11 minutes remaining in his speech, plus 10 minutes questions and comments.

Private Members' Business

[*Translation*]

It being 3 p.m., the House will now proceed to consideration of Private Members' Business as listed on today's Order Paper.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

[*Translation*]

PARLIAMENT OF CANADA ACT

MEASURE TO AMEND

Mr. Guy Saint-Julien (Abitibi) moved that Bill C-372, an act to amend the Parliament of Canada Act, be read the second time and referred to a legislative committee in the Departmental envelope.

He said: Mr. Speaker, first of all I would like to thank the Conservative member for Don Valley East for seconding my motion today. I also wish to thank the Conservative member for Terrebonne, who seconded it the other day when I tabled this bill, whose purpose is to amend the Parliament of Canada Act.

I stand here in Parliament today on behalf of all Canadian taxpayers, the people who pay our salaries and our expenses. As I said on November 19, the purpose of this bill is to require the disclosure of expenses made by members of the House of Commons in connection with their parliamentary functions.

I propose that every member of the House of Commons shall, each year, within 30 days after October 31 and within 30 days after March 31, prepare a statement of expenses incurred in connection with a member's parliamentary functions. This bill would take effect on the first day of the Thirty-fifth Parliament, in other words, after the next election.

I think that is appropriate, since all members of this House—and there are 295—will go before the electorate in every riding of this country, and that is where, the effectiveness of a member, whatever his political stripe—whether he is a New Democrat, a Tory, a Liberal or a member of the Bloc Québécois or an independent member—will be judged.

What will they tell the voters? Will they be in favour of disclosure of their expenses or will they be against disclosure? In any case, Mr. Speaker, I would like to say,