

as something that, had it even occurred here in Canada, would not have been regarded as an industrial or occupational disease, yet it was thought that because of the climate and other very dangerous conditions there it was probably aggravated or caused there in the first place. However, we had no choice but to reject it.

E. Russell Hopkins, Law Clerk of the Senate: That would be covered under the amendment?

Mr. Currie: In the future that type of thing would be covered under the amendment. You might say that particular case is outstanding. As occasionally happens here in Canada, people are disabled in the course of their employment and do not fall squarely within the existing provisions, and almost invariably the Government by an ex gratia arrangement or special provision in the Appropriation Act will provide a benefit if it can be clearly established that it had a causal relationship to the man's employment.

The Chairman: In other words, there is provision for a value judgment on doubtful cases.

Mr. Currie: That is so. Another question concerned persons who might be working for corporations and who might in fact be taking training with a view to becoming an employee of a corporation. Well, as the chairman I believe indicated, this only applies to prospective employees of any federal Crown corporation to whom the act itself applies. It would not apply to any private corporation.

The Chairman: What would be the case where a private corporation was engaged to do a job for the Crown? Would they then be covered?

Mr. Currie: I would not think so, sir. There would have to be the condition that they must be an employee or prospective employee of a federal department or a Crown agency.

Senator Grosart: And this would be established by the matching contribution of the employer?

Mr. Currie: In this particular instance, Senator Grosart, the total contributions, if any, are paid by the employer, but, generally speaking, under the Government Employees Compensation Act the Government departments and Crown agencies, other than those like Polymer Corporation, for example, have

no employer contribution either. All of these costs are paid out of a statutory vote coming out of the Minister of Labour.

Senator Roebuck: How do these amendments cover the case that you have mentioned in Delhi, where some person became ill because of the climate or something of that nature?

Mr. Hopkins: It is under (b) on page 2, senator.

Senator Roebuck: Thank you.

Senator Grosart: Mr. Currie, did I understand you to say that under the Government Employees Compensation Act the employee makes no contribution?

Mr. Currie: This is correct.

Senator Grosart: So this is sort of an extra fringe benefit?

Mr. Currie: Yes.

Senator Grosart: I am not objecting to it, because I am all for it.

Mr. Currie: This is the nature of it, as indeed it is in the private sector, too. It is part of the compromise that was reached between workers and their employers about 50 years ago, when we first introduced workmen's compensation legislation in this country. The worker gave up his rights to sue his employer in case there was any negligence, so there is no contribution of any kind from any employee.

Senator Grosart: How is the fund maintained? Or is there a fund maintained?

Mr. Currie: There is no fund as such. We operate under annual grants from Parliament under an Appropriation Act.

Senator Grosart: Do I understand, then, that the Government itself does not actually make a contribution to a fund? It merely makes a payment when a claim can be established?

Mr. Currie: It does not make any contribution to any accident fund, such as the Workmen's Compensation Board of Ontario, Quebec or Alberta. It only pays its costs.

The Chairman: Is it correct that the cost of this runs to about \$50,000 a year?

Mr. Currie: This is very difficult to estimate, Mr. Chairman, but as nearly as we can calculate it would be something of that order. This was just to indicate that it is not a very