

Order Paper Questions

3. Did the memorandum request all employees of UIC to sign and return it to their supervisors?

4. Did the memorandum state in part "It is not permissible for employees to be directly involved in the recording, processing or adjudication of a claim for a relative or a friend or for one in which they have a personal interest" and, if so (a) for what reason was this type of instruction sent at that particular time (b) for what reason were such instructions not standard practice?

5. Previous to June 30, 1976, were employees permitted to become directly involved in the recording, processing or adjudication of claims for relatives, friends or other persons in whom they had a personal interest?

6. In each of the past four years, how many cases have been discovered of UIC employees involved personally in such claims and for what reasons were such instructions not issued until questions on the subject were raised in the House of Commons in May by the honourable Member for Leeds?

Hon. Jack Cullen (Minister of Manpower and Immigration): In so far as the Unemployment Insurance Commission is concerned: 1. No. The subject memorandum was circulated only to employees of the Unemployment Insurance Commission in the Ontario Region. The decision to circulate the memorandum was made by the Ontario Regional Director General, but was discussed at the May meeting of the UIC Executive where its usefulness was generally agreed to. Other regions have since reminded their employees of this requirement but not necessarily on the same format.

2. Yes.

3. Yes.

4. Yes. (a) As a reminder to employees of the policy of the Commission in this regard. (b) This restraint has existed since the inception of unemployment insurance in Canada and has been contained in operational manuals since that time.

5. No.

6. 1973, 1; 1974, 2; 1975, 3; 1976, 7. Instructions on conflict of interest in claims processing and adjudication are released periodically to remind employees of their responsibilities. The decision governing the release of the instructions in question was made at the UI Executive meeting of May 5th prior to the matter being raised in the House of Commons.

UIC—SPECIAL INVESTIGATION DIVISION

Question No. 91—Mr. Cossitt:

1. Since Question No. 5,825 of the First Session of the 30th Parliament appeared on the *Order Paper* on June 28, 1976, requesting information on the whereabouts of files of the now abolished Special Investigation Division of the Unemployment Insurance Commission, has a search for the files been instituted under the direction of the Headquarters of UIC at 222 Nepean Street, Ottawa, and, if so, has there been difficulty in locating any of the files?

2. Have any of the files been destroyed or are any missing and, if so, for what reason?

3. Have any of the files been dispersed to various entities including the RCMP, benefit control officers, etc., and, if so, which files and on what dates?

Hon. Jack Cullen (Minister of Manpower and Immigration): In so far as the Unemployment Insurance Commission is concerned: 1. Yes, the working files maintained by the regions were requested. No difficulty was encountered in locating the files.

2. All files are maintained and stored in accordance with Public Records Order PC 1966-1749 dated October 1, 1966.

[Mr. Cossitt.]

Some working copies of files were destroyed, however the information contained therein is available on the master file at Head Office.

3. No.

UIC—DOCUMENT ENTITLED "1977 ONTARIO REGION BUDGET GUIDELINES"

Question No. 94—Mr. Cossitt:

1. Was a document, dated June 29, 1976 entitled "1977 Ontario Region Budget Guidelines" distributed by the Unemployment Insurance Commission and, if so, what is the name and job designation of the highest ranking UIC official who authorized distribution of the document?

2. Did this document state in part "when preparing your budget, a target of twelve prosecutions per year per Benefit Control Officer should be considered. This will include employer prosecutions. It is considered that eleven benefit fraud and one employer prosecution per year per Benefit Control Officer would be a good mix" and, if so (a) is it the policy of the UIC to prosecute fraud on the basis of quotas set down the year before rather than on the basis of all frauds as they occur regardless of number (b) what is the name and job designation of the highest ranking official of UIC who arrived at the conclusion "that eleven benefit fraud and one employer prosecution per year per Benefit Control Officer would be a good mix" (c) what are the reasons that it is considered "a good mix" (d) for what reason is no mention made in the so-called quota of prosecutions against employees of the UIC itself who contravene the law or is it the policy of the government not to prosecute in such cases (e) how many employees of the UIC were prosecuted in each of the past four years and in what regions did such prosecutions occur?

Hon. Jack Cullen (Minister of Manpower and Immigration): In so far as the Unemployment Insurance Commission is concerned: 1. Yes. Director General, David Brown.

2. Yes. (a) No. The figures were not quotas but guidelines, intended for use in estimating the cost of benefit control activities in 1977. (b) Director General, David Brown. (c) The "good mix" or ratio of claimant to employer prosecutions was determined using historical data. The "good mix" criteria was sent to district offices for use as a guideline estimating the proportion of the Benefit Control Officer's time which ought to be set aside for work associated with prosecutions. (d) The prosecution of UI employees for contravention of the Unemployment Insurance Act is turned over to law enforcement agencies. There is no government policy of non-prosecution in such cases. (e) 1973, 2—Quebec 1, Ontario 1; 1974, 0; 1975, 4—Quebec 3, Ontario 1; 1976, 2—Ontario 1, Prairie 1.

UIC—H. WILLIAMS

Question No. 102—Mr. Cossitt:

1. Is Mr. H. Williams now Chief of Security at the head office of the Unemployment Insurance Commission at 222 Nepean Street, Ottawa, Ontario?

2. Was Mr. Williams formerly employed by the now abolished Special Investigation Division of UIC and, if so (a) for what dates (b) in what capacity?

3. While with the Special Investigation Division, how many trips did he make to the Vancouver area (a) on what dates (b) at what total cost (c) for what purpose in each case (d) which trips included visits to the regional pay centre in Vancouver and what was the purpose in each case?

Hon. Jack Cullen (Minister of Manpower and Immigration): In so far as the Unemployment Insurance Commission is concerned: 1. Yes.