

centre and such allowance for their performance of their duties. The question which arises in my mind concerns the money implications, the burden of such an amendment upon the Crown.

● (2222)

I have no difficulty about paragraphs (d) and (e). No question arises with regard to the provision that these people will serve on the board without remuneration. But where will the money come from to pay their expenditures? This is not clear and I hesitate to accept the part of the amendment to be found in paragraph (f). If there is a disposition to make progress rapidly, and if there is unanimous consent to allow this amendment, taking into account the fact that the service will be performed without remuneration, I might stretch the rule and accept the amendment.

**Mr. Munro (Hamilton East):** I think there is such a disposition.

**The Chairman:** Is there a disposition to agree unanimously to accept the amendment with those reservations I have mentioned? If there is, I will put it to the committee.

**Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton):** I do not want to hinder the minister, Mr. Chairman, but if we are to authorize the expenditure of public monies even for a generous purpose we ought to do it properly. I do not think it would make the bill invalid if we were to observe the proprieties.

I share the reservations expressed by the Chair. I have no difficulty in accepting the principle of the establishment of the board of directors and everything else, but I believe it is important we should observe the proper procedures and I say this solely because we are spending the taxpayer's money. The bill is open for amendment later. The board will be able to function and its worth-while objectives can be carried out.

**Mr. Munro (Hamilton East):** Fine.

**The Chairman:** Not having studied the bill, I do not know whether I am in a good position to make any suggestion, but perhaps the minister might feel there is a possibility of adjusting the numbers of governors in such a way as to achieve the purposes intended while at the same time keeping the total number of governors the same. However, after hearing the objection raised by the hon. member for Grenville-Carleton I would be disposed to accepting only the first part of the amendment, leaving out paragraph (f).

**Mr. Munro (Hamilton East):** If it would overcome the difficulty I would be agreeable, by unanimous consent, to dropping paragraph (f). The main objective of the hon. member for Nickel Belt was to secure equal representation, and we have been able to do that.

**The Chairman:** Is it the pleasure of the committee to adopt the amendment with the exclusion of paragraph (f)?

**Some hon. Members:** Agreed.

### *Occupational Health and Safety*

Amendment (Mr. Munro, Hamilton-East) agreed to.

Clause as amended agreed to.

Clauses 5 to 9 inclusive agreed to.

On clause 10—Executive board.

**Mr. Munro (Hamilton East):** Mr. Chairman, since we have dropped paragraph (d) in clause 4 it may not be necessary to proceed with clause 10. The amendment, which ensures equal participation by labour and management, would, I think, automatically ensure that a similar result is obtained on the executive board. If labour and management have an equal number of votes on the council, surely they can themselves ensure they will have the same equal representation on the executive committee without our making an amendment. I am looking toward the New Democratic Party. If it is agreeable, we could pass clause 10 as it is now worded, bearing in mind that the balance the hon. member for Nickel Belt wanted has already been achieved by the amendment to clause 4.

**Mr. Peters:** But they are two different things. I do not see how the amendment to clause 4 relates to this situation. Indeed, I cannot understand why there was any objection to the amendment to clause 4 in its entirety. The recommendation imposes no limit as to money or numbers or anything else. I think the Chair was picayune in deciding that the amendment was not drafted in accordance with the recommendation. I do not understand why there should be any objection to amending clause 10 so as to specify the number of members on the executive committee from both management and labour.

**Mr. Munro (Hamilton East):** I just wanted to see whether the NDP really felt it was still necessary to make this amendment. I tried to save time but I see that my remarks have caused us to take more time than ever. I move:

That Bill C-35, to establish the Canadian Centre for Occupational Health and Safety, be amended in Clause 10 by striking out line 14 on page 6 and substituting the following:

"the Council by the governors so that, at any time,

(a) the number of members of the executive board who were appointed to the Council under paragraph 4(d) is equal to the number of members of the executive board who were appointed to the Council under paragraph 4(e); and

(b) the aggregate of

(i) the number of members of the executive board who were appointed to the Council under paragraph 4(d), and

(ii) the number of members of the executive board who were appointed to the Council under paragraph 4(e)

is not less than fifty per cent of the total number of members of the executive board."

● (2232)

**The Chairman:** After consideration, I find the amendment acceptable. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the amendment?

**Some hon. Members:** Agreed.

Amendment (Mr. Munro, Hamilton East) agreed to.

Clause 10, as amended, agreed to.

Clauses 11 to 16 inclusive agreed to.