

Urquhart

Subject: FW: Update on meetings with Ministry of Consumer Services regarding our Complaint

From: Carol Sampson [mailto:sammygirl1@rogers.com]

Sent: July-20-11 9:27 AM

To: lessiambre@liberal.ola.org; bchiarelli.mpp.co@liberal.ola.org

Cc: esteel@liberal.ola.org; csousa.mpp@liberal.ola.org; csousa.mpp.co@liberal.ola.org; jrochon@rochongenova.com; SakieTambakos; JackieBodie; McavoyGreg; JoséeMarin; Urquhart

Subject: Update on meetings with Ministry of Consumer Services regarding our Complaint

Hi Lauren

Sorry for the confusion. I would appreciate if you could please print this off and give to the Hon. Bob Chiarelli.

Thank you very much.

Sincerely,

Carol Sampson

sammygirl1@rogers.com

613-224-2791

To the Hon. Bob Chiarelli,

I am writing this letter to update you on the meetings that the former Nortel Disabled, Diane and Hugh

Urquhart, and our lawyers Joel Rochon and Sakie Tambakos, are having with numerous individuals from the Ministry of Consumer Services.

Our legal team met June 16th and July 15th with two different groups of Ministry staff to discuss whether the May 30, 2011 complaint was within the legal jurisdiction of the Consumer Protection Act. At the June 16th meeting, Jim Girling, Director of Legal Services assigned to the Ministry of Consumer Services within the Ministry of the Attorney General, agreed with Sakie Tambakos's assessment that Nortel's disability insurance and Sun life's related administrative services were within the legal jurisdiction of the Act. However, he was concerned that the complaint fell outside of the Internal Policy of the Ministry. The Internal Policy has been to not use the Act for employer and employee relationships. Mr. Girling, at this first meeting, agreed the disability insurance and related administrative services fell within the English language definitions for consumer and consumer transaction in the Act and were not within the list of exceptions where this Act does not apply. At the second meeting, originally set up to discuss the need for change of the Internal Policy, an Assistant Deputy Minister and a subordinate legal counsel from the Ministry of Attorney General, both not in attendance at the first meeting, informed our group that the Ministry staff have determined the complaint is not in the legal jurisdiction of the Act due to it being (a) terms and conditions of employment; and (b) a workplace dispute. We asked numerous times for the Ministry to provide us with the legal reasons to justify these exclusions from the Act. We were met with objections stating that the Ministry does not have to provide this information to us. I think as a taxpayer, these civil servants must be compelled to provide us this legal information.

It also strikes me to very strange that we supplied a large package of evidence to the Ministry of Consumer Services in the morning of July 12, 2011 by email. Diane Urquhart received a call that same afternoon around 4:30PM to advise Diane that they had made a decision. On July 12, 2011 they told her that it was not within their legal jurisdiction. How in less than one day, did they review so that much evidence covering not only the misrepresentations, but also the features of our disability insurance services affecting the jurisdiction decision?

;

On July 18, 2011, I received an email from Frank Denton advising us that the Ministry is not willing to commence an investigation into our complaint. I left our July 15th meeting with the understanding that the Ministry agreed that Joel Rochon and Sakie Tambakos would submit their detailed legal arguments on jurisdiction before the Minister would make its determination. I am devastated about everything being back tracked. This is such an important issue to us, and we feel that the evidence we have submitted shows that we have been unfairly taken advantage of by Nortel's and Sun Life's business practices.

Can you please help us make the Minister of Consumer Services aware that the Ministry staff has not provided legal arguments to support their conclusion that the Consumer Protection Act does not have jurisdiction to investigate our complaint and has not waited to see our written detailed legal arguments before making their own decision as we agreed they would. Both our legal arguments for jurisdiction and our evidence of misrepresentations of our group disability insurance services provide compelling support for a

successful Ministry prosecution of offences under the Act. We expect our Government to use all the regulatory and judicial tools it has to prevent our poverty and possible premature deaths due to wrongdoing by our employer and insurer.

Sincerely

Carol Sampson

sammygirl1@rogers