

NOTE: THIS COMMUNICATION WAS SENT TO THE PEOPLE LISTED AT THE END, SOON AFTER THE PROBLEM ERUPTED AGAIN IN LATE 2005, FORCING ME TO APPEAL TO THE SOCIAL BENEFITS TRIBUNAL LEADING TO THE HEARING ON JANUARY 17TH 2007.

ROBERT T. CHISHOLM – ALLEGED SOCIAL ASSISTANCE “OVERPAYMENT “

SUMMARY OF ESSENTIAL POINTS.

Date: December 6th, 2005

Full report and all documentation is on my web site. Click on the link at the end of this summary.

- **Current problem (details - see bottom of next page)** caused indirectly by refusal of Unemployment Insurance benefits back in 1994
- **Original problem:** refusal of Unemployment Insurance benefits, back in December 1994, based on so-called “lack of insurable weeks” after quitting an employer because of non-payment of wages and impending employer bankruptcy.
- Kept my M.P., Marlene Catterall, informed from the beginning, in writing, and requested help. All documented. No help ever forthcoming, based on the notion of “not possible”, “due to the legislation”.
- Quit the employer after 17 weeks (in December 1994) for the reasons already stated. Later, applied to Ontario Wage Protection Program for compensation concerning outstanding wages, which they paid after about 9 months delay; had to request my MPP (Bob Chiarelli – now City of Ottawa Mayor Bob Chiarelli) to intervene / expedite it, which he did.
- BEFORE QUITTING THE EMPLOYER, consulted local U.I. office concerning no. of insurable weeks needed to “qualify”. At the time, informed that 17 weeks was the minimum required. Filled in U.I. application and stated reason for quit as impending employer bankruptcy / non payment of wages. Included supporting document with the application
- Then (late December 1994) informed that not eligible for U.I. benefits. Reason: re-classified as “...new entrant or re-entrant to the labour force...”, therefore minimum weeks required was 20 and not 17. This was later reduced by HRDC to 18 weeks, but I was still excluded from benefits.
- Prior to working for this **latest** employer, was out of work for 26 months / no work available (except for 1-2 weeks proofreading work for a printing firm). **No notification to me at any time, during this period, of any re-classification of me as “Not in the Labour Force”, or some such, when U.I. benefits expired after working for a previous employer.**

- Therefore applied for Welfare – choice was either to do this or not be able to pay rent / become homeless. Also was part owner of small rental property in Montreal (bought with aid of small inheritance from deceased mother) but this was losing money; simultaneously, sale without losing whole investment impossible due to real estate market downturn since purchase in 1988. In addition, Ontario General Welfare regulations effectively pretended that the mortgage payments were not allowable expenses for income calculation purposes, giving rise to the legalistic corruption and false pretence that we were making a profit on the property, when the opposite was the case. Only option appeared to try keep it going till I got work and / or real estate market improved to the point where a sale was possible without losing the entire original investment of money and subsequent work to maintain or improve the property. The purpose of having the property was that it would be an eventual source of retirement income once the mortgage was paid off.
- Appealed against U.I. refusal to Board of Referees - they refused, notwithstanding the circumstances. This also automatically excluded me from “:ON-SITE” and other programs for out of work professionals. My interest in ON-SITE was documented right from the start.
- Therefore appealed to the Umpire, who allowed my appeal and instructed the Unemployment Insurance Commission to “...make the proper determination...” in my case (but no specification as to what that included or excluded, by way of access to ON-SITE program, etc.).
- Eventually U.I. paid me 17 weeks of benefits, in two lump sums 1-2 weeks apart; last U.I. benefit statement said my U.I. claim had expired. No mention of ON-SITE, no acknowledgement by U.I. concerning my interest in it – notwithstanding previous documentation submitted, no statement of whether I could still access ON-SITE or not, which I assumed meant “yes” barring any statement to the contrary.
- Complained to the Umpires’s office about this several times. A lawyer from HRDC Legal Services Department, Jonathan P. Langsner, then became involved in excluding me from the ON-SITE program. Final result: got nowhere, based on lies and legalistic sophistry by Mr. Langsner. (Aug. 1996). All documented on web site. Among other things, Police and RCMP became involved (April 1996), after I had “demonstrated:” about what was going on, at an M.P.’s office. This basically amounted to suggestions of my getting a criminal record based on “trumped-up” charges (“uttering threats”, or some such). Nobody whom I had informed about these problems previously made any effort to resolve them; that is still the case today, nearly 10 years later

CURRENT PROBLEM:

Threat of legal action from City of Ottawa, concerning social assistance “overpayment”, when the situation which led to this had its origin in problems involving incompetence and legalistic corruption at HRDC. The amount in question is \$6,007.55. This threat of legal action surfaced in 2003 but the problem appeared to be solved after I brought it to the attention of Councillor Rick Chiarelli in late 2003. The problem erupted again in September this year, when I had been led to believe that it was resolved in 2003. Like the last time, I brought it to the attention of Councillor Rick Chiarelli, but this time the lawyers are claiming that I still have to pay the money, notwithstanding any instructions that Councillor Rick Chiarelli might wish to give them.

Thus the lawyers seem to claiming the right to be “laws unto themselves”, notwithstanding the circumstances. This problem has its ultimate roots in incompetence and corruption at HRDC back in 1994/96, as described above and documented on my web site.

There are no legitimate grounds whatsoever for those in authority to refuse, collectively, to deal with the problem, notwithstanding current or previous legislation. I am not to be turned into another “Kimberley Rogers”, or some such.

If problem(s) are found with the legislation then they must be corrected – in my case – at once.

“Reasons” involving everybody saying “...it’s not my department..” or “...we can’t talk to so-and-so because the regulations don’t allow it...”, or some such, should be recognized as un-professionalism based on deliberate inattention to the facts, the variables involved, logic and ethics.

The overall requirement here is for coordination, among the responsible persons in authority, to resolve the problem in a manner acceptable to all the parties involved, including myself.

I AM DEMANDING REMOVAL OF JONTHAN P. LANGSNER FROM HIS EMPLOYMENT AND EXPULSION FROM THE LEGAL PROFESSION FOR THE FOLLOWING REASONS:-

- 1. Incompetence, lying and legalistic sophistry whilst he was employed in the Legal Services Department of HRDC.**
- 2. Reliance on this legalistic sophistry, by Mr. Langsner, as a means of preventing me from contributing to the tax base.**
- 3. Parasitic hooliganism by Mr. Langsner, in which he consumed government money and time in the course of working to prevent me from becoming a taxpayer again.**

MORE IMPORTANTLY, I DEMAND RESOLUTION OF THE PROBLEM, TO MY SATISFACTION, BASED ON ONE OF THE FOLLOWING, OR A COMBINATION THEREOF:-

- 1. Compensation from HRDC to cover the alleged social assistance “overpayment”, currently \$6007.55**
- 2. A special instruction from the Government of Ontario to waive the current claim on me for \$6007.55**
- 3. A special instruction from the Mayor of the City of Ottawa, after he has had time to consider the matter in all its aspects, that the claim on me for \$6007.55 be waived.**

The eventual solution will be based on what is the most appropriate one, having regard to who and what caused the problem to occur in the first place.

Robert T. Chisholm,

Ottawa,

December 5th 2005

WEB SITE:

(In the original document circulated, there was a link to the narrative and documents, referred to under point 3 on the site home page, detailing the problems with refusal of Unemployment Insurance benefits and refusal of admission to ON-SITE. This mentions the involvement of Roger R. Presseault and Jonathan P. Langsner, among other things)

Scroll down the web page to where it says

WITH RESPECT TO (c) - 1994 / 96 :-

- and go from there

DISTRIBUTION OF THIS SUMMARY

1. The Mayor of the City of Ottawa, Mayor Bob Chiarelli.. Bob.Chiarelli@ottawa.ca
2. City of Ottawa Councillor Rick Chiarelli, Rick.Chiarelli@ottawa.ca
3. Ms. Carole Sherman, City of Ottawa Overpayment Recovery Unit., OverpaymentRecovery@ottawa.ca
4. Mrs Marlene Catterall, federal Member of Parliament, Ottawa West / Nepean
Catterall.M@parl.gc.ca and cattem1@parl.gc.ca
5. Jim Watson, M.P.P., Ottawa West-Nepean, jwatson.mpp.co@liberal.ola.org