

2. Yes. (a) March 1973 to April 1975. (b) Co-ordinator of Ontario, Prairie and Pacific Regions.

3. Four. (a) March 31, 1973; September 21, 1973; November 30, 1973; January 9, 1974. (b) Expenses, \$449.60; Air Fare, \$1,024; Total; \$1,473.60. (c) Organization, liaison, monitoring of operations, computer programs and selection of personnel. (d) November 30, 1973. Familiarization Tour of Regional Pay Centre in conjunction with other duties.

UIC—MR. F. E. LEBLANC

**Question No. 106—Mr. Cossitt:**

1. On or about May 19, 1976, did Mr. F. E. Leblanc receive a telephone call from the honourable Member for Leeds requesting information concerning the subject of alleged defrauding of the Unemployment Insurance Commission and also asking about charges laid against former UIC employee Mr. Gordon Gunn of Ottawa and, if so (a) did Mr. Leblanc decline to comment (b) did he refer the Member to his superior, Mr. J. Third?

2. Are managers of UIC offices under instructions not to discuss any matters with Members of Parliament and, if so (a) for what reason (b) who authorized such a regulation?

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

2. No.

UIC—MR. J. THIRD

**Question No. 108—Mr. Cossitt:**

1. Did Mr. J. Third, Director of Operations, East, Unemployment Insurance Commission, receive a telephone call on or about May 19, 1976 from the honourable Member for Leeds concerning alleged defrauding of UIC and charges laid against former UIC employee Mr. Gordon Gunn of Ottawa and, if so, what was his reply respecting the furnishing of any details?

2. Was Mr. Third advised by the honourable Member for Leeds that the matter would be raised that same day in the House of Commons and, if so, what was his reply concerning the significance of the case and the involvement of the so-called bogus company?

3. Did Mr. Third, approximately thirty minutes later, telephone the honourable Member for Leeds and, if so, what was his advice respecting (a) the seriousness of the matter (b) the raising of the matter in the House (c) the involvement of the so-called bogus company (d) the lack of awareness by the Minister of Manpower and Immigration of the situation?

4. Did Mr. Third state that within a few minutes of the matter becoming public in the House there will be a great burning of files and, if so, to what files was he referring?

5. What were the reasons for the second call in a period of thirty minutes and what is the name and job designation of any person that he contacted to discuss the matter during the interval?

**Hon. Jack Cullen (Minister of Manpower and Immigration):** In so far as the Unemployment Insurance Commission is concerned: 1. Yes. Mr. Cossitt was referred to the RCMP regarding the charges laid against Mr. Gunn.

2. Yes. Details of the case were not discussed.

3. Yes. (a) The case was not as serious as the honourable member seemed to think. (b) The raising of the matter in the House could jeopardize the on-going RCMP investigation. (c) It was suggested that the naming of a specific company at this time could jeopardize the RCMP investigation still underway.

*Order Paper Questions*

(d) Mr. Third had reported the case to his superior, however, he was not in a position to know whether the Minister had been briefed on the case.

4. Yes. The files referred to were those of the bogus company.

5. To re-emphasize that the success of the investigation would be jeopardized by premature publicity.—D. Brown, Director General, Ontario Region. U.I.C.

TREATMENT FOR SEXUAL OFFENDERS

**Question No. 209—Mr. Orlikow:**

1. Are inmates in the penitentiary system being treated by aversive conditioning methods and, if so, how many?

2. Are sexual offenders presently being treated with aversive conditioning, using electric shocks to the genitals as the aversive stimulus and, if so (a) how many (b) how is "informed consent" obtained from the inmates for these procedures?

3. What review procedures are used to determine whether (a) consent is truly voluntary and informed (b) the treatment is effective and should be continued?

4. (a) Does an Ethics Committee exist to consider, in each case, the use of the procedure and the nature of the consent considering the experimental nature of such treatment (b) does such a Committee have inmate representation?

**Mr. Art Lee (Parliamentary Secretary to Solicitor General):** 1. Treatment for sexual offenders is available at the Regional Psychiatric Centre (Ontario). The program lasts for twelve weeks. During the first half of the program, aversive conditioning is given and in the second half of the program, the patients receive group therapy. Some fifteen patients are involved in each program.

2. Aversive conditioning using electric shock is not applied to the genitals as the aversive stimulus. It is applied to the index and middle finger. (a) and (b) not applicable.

**NOTE: Re: "Informed consent"**—The patient's file is first studied to ensure that he is not mentally ill or suffering from mental retardation. In other words, this is done in order to ensure that there is no problem with regard to his being able to give informed consent. Next he is given an outline of the treatment program to study and may, of course, not wish to enter it. The program is then discussed with him by a staff member and videotapes of equipment, etc., are shown. If he wishes, he may then sign the consent form and following this he may withdraw from the program whenever he wishes to do so.

3. (a) Review procedures are not presently in effect to determine whether the consent is truly voluntary and informed. (b) While those released are followed up by research