

*Order for Return*

1. (a) 1981 - 857.33 person/years  
 1982 - 916. person/years  
 1983 - 965.56 person/years  
 1984 - 927.94 person/years

(b)	Overpayments Established	Penalties	Fines
1981	\$40,392,494	\$ 4,356,013	\$1,717,645
1982	53,385,322	6,557,403	2,200,568
1983	82,028,298	10,199,757	2,915,750
1984	87,925,791	12,586,537	2,749,931

N.B. C.E.I.C. is unable to segregate the amounts of money recovered in respect of unemployment insurance cheating. However, it should be noted that historically Employment and Immigration Canada collects approximately 95 per cent of all overpayments established in the UI program.

2. 1981 - 7,835  
 1982 - 6,673  
 1983 - 6,619  
 1984 - 5,449
3. (a) 1982-83 not available  
 1983-84 745,647  
 1984-85 766,146  
 1985-86 363,232  
 (to Sept. 30)

(b) Not available. However, the Commission does maintain a Comprehensive Tracking System, certified by the Auditor General, which categorizes errors by ten broad definitions, as follows:

1. Unreported earnings
2. Clerical errors
3. Employment data incorrect
4. Record of employment errors not followed-up
5. Regional computer centre processing errors
6. Incorrect agent decisions
7. Inadequate fact finding
8. Adjustment to benefits incorrect
9. Interview program deficiency
10. Miscellaneous errors

These errors are expressed in terms of the most-likely dollar value of overpayments in relation to the total benefit payout. Latest figures, at March 31, 1985, indicate a most-likely dollar value of \$2.68 of overpayment per \$100 of benefits paid during the preceding year.

[English]

**Mr. Speaker:** The questions as enumerated by the Parliamentary Secretary have been answered.

**Mr. Lewis:** I would ask that the remaining questions be allowed to stand.

**Mr. Speaker:** Shall the remaining questions be allowed to stand?

**Some Hon. Members:** Agreed.

\* \* \*

### QUESTION PASSED AS ORDER FOR RETURN

**Mr. Doug Lewis (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council):** Mr. Speaker, if Question No. 428 could be made an Order for Return, this return would be tabled immediately.

**Mr. Speaker:** Is it the pleasure of the House that Question No. 428 be deemed to have been made an Order for Return?

**Some Hon. Members:** Agreed.

[Text]

### REPORT ON TAXATION OF ARTISTS AND WRITERS

#### Question No. 428—Ms. McDonald:

1. Have any of the 31 recommendations of the sub-committee on the taxation of artists and writers been implemented and, if so, which ones and by what action?

2. Have changes been made to the Department of Employment and Immigration's programs to enable artists to benefit from them and, if so, what are they and were artists and arts organizations notified of the changes?

3. Under the capital cost allowance (a) what amount per year was permitted as tax deductions for investments in films (b) how many films produced under the tax incentive were exhibited and how many won awards?

Return tabled.

## GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[English]

### INCOME TAX ACT AND RELATED ACTS

#### MEASURE TO AMEND

The House resumed consideration of Bill C-84, an Act to amend the Income Tax Act and related statutes and to amend the Canada Pension Plan, the Unemployment Insurance Act, 1971, the Financial Administration Act and the Petroleum and Gas Revenue Tax Act, as reported (with amendments) from the Standing Committee on Finance, Trade and Economic Affairs; and Motion No. 4 (Mr. Johnston) (p. 9733).

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please. I have now had the opportunity to review the arguments that were made this morning by Hon. Members in relation to Motions Nos. 1, 2 and 3. The President of the Privy Council (Mr. Hnatyshyn) has argued that Motion No. 1, in attempting to substitute the word "person" for the word "individual", would enlarge the scope of Clause 5 since the word "person" could be interpreted to mean "corporation". The objective of Clause 5 is fairly narrow in dealing with the value of inventory of artistic endeavour. The word "individual" as defined in Section 248(1) of the Income Tax Act means a person other than a corporation, while the word "person" is defined to include bodies corporate or political. Therefore, I find the argument of the President of the Privy Council to be convincing in that the amendment is more than what was envisaged at second reading. Therefore, Motion No. 1 is out of order and will not be put to the House.

Motions Nos. 2 and 3 are interrelated. Motion No. 2 adds a definition to Clause 58 and particularly at Section 110.6 that is linked to the definition of Canadian securities found in Subsection 39(6). I therefore have some difficulty in accepting the argument that it is an amendment to an interpretation clause. The effect of these amendments would therefore restrict the scope of capital gains exemptions. I refer Hon. Members to Citation 527 of Beauchesne's Fifth Edition: