

August 26, 2013 DOCUMENT

COMMISSION REVIEW
XXXXXXXXX FILE #201XXXXX

PLEASE ENSURE THAT THE RESPONDENT AND THE REVIEW PEOPLE RECEIVE AN EXACT COPY OF THIS DOCUMENT. I DO NOT WANT COMMISSION PEOPLE EDITING OR WRONGLY RE-WORDING MY POINTS, THE COMMISSION PEOPLE CLEARLY DO NOT HAVE THE INTELLECTUAL ABILITY TO UNDERSTAND THE CONCEPTS AND POINTS. Any editing could be seen as tampering with evidence and trying to obstruct the case.

1. This is very annoying, if people were doing their job properly and had the intellectual ability to understand the simple concept of limits, I would not have to do this.
2. The main point with the Commission Report is it is saying I am complaining about Special Programs and Employment Equity and implementing such is not a violation of the Acts.
3. This is wrong. I am saying that they are not doing it PROPERLY. There are limits (quotes from CHRC documents, myths, criminal code, CHRA Section 12, etc.) and this brings in violations of the Acts.
4. The Canadian Human Rights Commission (CHRC) Report is laughable, ridiculous, simpleton level, especially the part about CHRA Special Programs and Employment Equity. My main point of the limits and myths of Special Programs and Employment Equity (see Limits below) is not even addressed. THE CHRC'S OWN DOCUMENTS CONTRADICT WHAT THEY SAY AND SHOW THEY ARE WRONG. This is the big issue here. I also was complaining about a policy and the policy setters and this is not addressed.
5. I also object to the Commission Report heading Complainant's Position, this is so oversimplified it is absurd. The Report should say that CHRC's own documents agree with what I say and contradict what the Commission says in the Report. Again, I provided pages and pages of quotes and points and many issues and these are not even mentioned. The Report should be re-done by someone who has basic thinking skills. I mentioned LIMITS, myths, etc. but one simple example is the Report says I say hiring should be on merit (best regardless of race or sex). This is how government hiring is to be done as everyone should know. And so says the CHRC in many documents, one of which is:
Document 1: Overview of Employment Equity, "should not be construed ... to contradict the merit principle in the public sector"
www.hrsdc.gc.ca/eng/labour/equality/employment_equity/tools/guidelines/doc1.shtml
6. This webpage was recently deleted, but the quote is accurate. And there are many other points on merit in the heading LIMITS, like "Sacred Ground".
7. **The Report does not say that many of the Commission's own documents agree with me and say the same thing (merit). And it should say the Auditor-General says best qualified, and everyone should know government hiring is to be on merit. It should say that. And it should also say CHRC documents agree with the Complainant's many points on limits, myths, etc. and many quotes were provided, and the law and CHRC mention INDIVIDUAL RIGHTS, and the Commission Report points on Special Programs and Employment Equity are contradicted by CHRC documents and CHRC documents say some actions are a violation of the CHR Act. SAY THESE POINTS. This would change the Report's premise and shows the absurdity of the Commission position.**
8. Government jobs belong to the Canadian people, not simpleton bureaucrats trying to steal

jobs from better qualified white men. Keep your hands off government jobs. There are criminal code provisions to protect the people from people like you. This also brings up the point that **this is in the public interest and it is.**

9. The real issue is the quality of the Commission people. This is too complicated for them.

10. I object to the limit of 10 pages, there are so many points I cannot cover them all, both in the Commission points of law and with the Complainants Position. They have ignored my points that show they are wrong, and oversimplified what was in my submissions so I have to explain many points in detail. I also feel rushed because of the complexity and CHRC errors.

11. I have had to cut out many of my points so I mention that should any of my points be inadequate the Commission should ask me to explain the points further. This is the fault of the Commission's presentation of my submissions.

12. If I am expected to go through the Commission Report line by line, I want to make another submission.

13. I also point out that the Herold case mentioned in the Commission Report says "[34] Second, the Commission is not an adjudicative body and does not draw any legal conclusions." They have drawn legal conclusions with both facts and law. The Report is wrong. And, I have raised legal issues both with the Limits issue and how a "policy" complaint should be handled. Therefore this complaint should proceed.

14. I also mention that the Commission has changed their website, the web pages I provided quotes from are no longer at the web addresses. I did not check the addresses regularly but I believe the website was changed in May 2013, which is after I sent my submissions. The web addresses and quotes were accurate when I made my submissions. This could be seen as an admission that I am correct and a deliberate attempt to sabotage my complaints. I have electronic copies of the webpages and some paper copies that I picked up from the Commission office (in Ottawa and elsewhere).

15. This brings up the question whether the Commission Report is an attempt to cover up their misconduct. They deleted their own webpages that show they are wrong, ignored my many points that showed they are wrong and tried some silly drivel that would only fool a simpleton too dumb to understand limits, myths, etc.

16. At the least the Commission should explain themselves (truthfully) and prepare another Report. Or this should move to the Tribunal level.

17. The Herold case mentioned in the Report says at paragraph 3, the Commission is to conduct a thorough and neutral investigation. The Commission did not do this, they ignored my many points that show they are wrong, points THAT ARE FROM THEIR OWN DOCUMENTS, and deleted the webpages that I quoted from. This is not a thorough and neutral investigation and is not impartial and unbiased treatment of a complaint.

18. Also, I mention I also made complaints against the Canadian Human Rights Commission (CHRC) for (A) Promoting preferences and stealing jobs from white guys and (B) Blocking reverse discrimination complaints. With the Complaints against the CHRC, they have a conflict of interest with these complaints and may be trying to protect themselves with this complaint. I do not know if they told the Respondent this and they did not mention it in their report. An argument could be made that the conflict means they cannot act on and make decisions on Complaints that they are involved in. And, I believe the Commission may be involved in telling people to violate the limits and if so, any involvement with this case is actually them judging their own actions, which is clearly a conflict of interest and them trying to cover up their misconduct. And, again I point out their own documents contradict what they say.

19. I do mention that with my complaint against the CHRC they did acknowledge that someone else should be involved and gave me the choice of another Human Rights Commission or another federal department (letter of April 15, 2013). I chose another federal department because I suspect the Human Rights Commissions are full of the “steal jobs from white guys and too dumb to think that far”, crowd.

20. The above points show that these complaints should be sent to a Tribunal or at least the Commission Report should be re-done with someone with basic reading and thinking skills.

21. It also surprises me that no one who read my submissions is saying “hey, this guy is right” and correcting the errors. They really are the steal jobs from white guys crowd. If they were competent “Rights people” they would be saying white men have rights too. Their reaction shows what they really are, they should be apologizing and compensating the victims, instead they try some silly drivel that would only fool a simpleton (again I provided pages and pages of quotes from CHRC documents that show the limits (no reverse discrimination, preferences, quotas, myths, merit, criminal code, Bill of Rights, etc.)).

22. And who do you people think you are? You are stealing from decent hardworking people. Are you too dumb to think that far or are you just a thief? You give up your job so we can see how you like what you want being done to you. And, should I tell the white guys to send their bills to you?

23. You are the same as those you are supposed to be against, like Chinese or Blacks need not apply, you are the “white men need not apply” crowd which is doing the same thing to other people. You should be ashamed because you are supposed to be against discriminating against people but want to discriminate against people, and embarrassed that you have such poor thinking skills that you did not think of that. Or are you one of the simpletons who say they do not discriminate then want to discriminate against white men. Get a dictionary, this is dumb.

24. And if you are going to steal from people or infringe on their rights you compensate them. This is Canada not some third world country.

25. You are the real Racists and Sexists, you really are. The CHRC 1996 Annual Report says “racism is differential treatment based on race or colour” (page 40), giving jobs based on race is racism by the Commission's own definition. And “poisonous effects of racist thinking” (page 46). This is from my notes so there may be a page number error here, but the quotes are accurate, and shows what you people really are.

26. Anyone who does not understand that when you have preferences you displace, pass over and bar people, which is stealing jobs, and money, is too dumb for the job.

27. I also point out that neither you nor anyone can give away my rights.

28. With the review of this Report by the Commission, I want someone who has basic reading skills and basic thinking skills and the intellectual ability to understand simple concepts (if there are such persons in the Commission) to look at this. The CHRC report is again laughable, ridiculous, simpleton level.

29. Again, this has shown me that the real issue is the quality of the Commission people. They have ignored (or cannot intellectually understand) the concept of a limit and do not understand many other points and concepts including their OWN DOCUMENTS.

30. I have designed and developed complex computer systems, and have even done some technical computer consulting systems engineer and sales and marketing work and clearly understand the staff level (as opposed to line) function of developing policies and procedures. This requires the skills and knowledge to understand principles and limits and properly apply such when developing policies and procedures.

31. I want someone who understands the concept of a limit, understands what the limits are and has the intellectual ability to properly apply the limits in varying situations. This requires skills and abilities that are clearly beyond the people that prepared the Report. The Commission may not have the ability to handle this properly. If so, then someone else smarter and better should review this, or it should be passed to a Tribunal.

32. In my submissions (documents of October 29, 2012, February 27, 2013, March 15, 2013 and May 9, 2013), I REPEATEDLY provided pages and pages explaining the concepts (like a limit, merit, no reverse discrimination, no preferences, no quotas, criminal code, etc.) and have again, provided quotes FROM CANADIAN HUMAN RIGHTS COMMISSION'S OWN DOCUMENTS AND WEBPAGES, and obviously these are too complicated for the people involved. The Report is not addressing my main point that there are limits.

33. I also ask, DO WE HAVE THE CANADIAN HUMAN RIGHTS COMMISSION LYING TO THE CANADIAN PEOPLE WITH THEIR DOCUMENTS AND WEBPAGES OR WITH THE DRIVEL IN THEIR REPORT ? Which is a lie? Civil servants lying is a serious issue.

34. And, what is the Commission doing, making things up as they go along? Their own documents do not say what they are saying and actually say the opposite, as I pointed out over and over.

35. The quotes I provided show to a competent staff level person with basic reading and thinking skills what the principles and limits of Special Programs and Employment Equity are.

36. The Commission is also ignoring the issue with me. I mentioned that I am complaining about the policy setters and against a "policy" (CHRA Section 10) not about an act of discrimination. This should be handled differently and I doubt the Commission has the skills to understand this.

37. I have a right to defend my rights, especially against simpleton civil servants who cannot read or understand simple concepts. You so-called "rights" people should understand that.

38. This is also an issue of public interest, the people have the right to question the government and a bunch of civil servants and to know what is going on and not to be discriminated against. And protect the merit system and government hiring.

39. And, I made multiple complaints, I am complaining against the policies of stealing jobs from better qualified white men. As I mentioned in my submissions, there have been many news stories that essentially say any one can displace, pass over and bar white men from jobs and I have been told many stories and I provided many web pages that say the same. As someone who has basic reading skills, and in this situation thinking and pattern recognition skills, it is obvious that there is some kind of policy or policies that say white men have no rights and any one can discriminate against them and steal jobs from them. This is what my complaints are about. And, I showed these violate the limits. I am looking at this at a staff level.

40. In my May 9, 2013 submission I pointed out the Commission forms did not seem to handle Section 12 and other section complaints properly and they are not handling these complaints properly. I am again complaining against the policy setters.

41. You are just trying to block a complaint about discriminating against and stealing jobs from white men and this is laughable. Get someone with the intellect to understand limits, and what the limits are and how to apply the limits to varying situations. The Commission Report shows these people do not even have the skills to understand the concept of a limit.

42. I also would like to know what the Commission told the Respondent and if they tried to give the Respondent some kind of defense.

43. I also point out you are also being used in an election rigging scheme; sleazy corrupt politicians use the promise of government jobs to get votes and support. And you are helping

them. Work hard so some politician can use your job to be a hero to special interest groups trying to get preferences for themselves and steal jobs from better people. I have evidence of a politician (Shiela Copps) talking to ethnic groups, saying she will double the number of visible minorities in federal service if she is elected. What special program or employment equity would this fall under? This is just some sleazy politician promising government jobs.

44. With the Complaints against the CHRC I sent documents dated March 15, 2013 that again explained what the Commission's own documents say and pointing out limits and saying if the Commission people were too dumb to understand these points they should resign. The Commission document is dated July 30, 2013 and was written after I sent these points and they do not even mention them. Obviously these points are too complicated for them.

45. In the Commission Report the last few paragraphs are laughable, there are limits, etc.

46. I also mention similar people tried a similar thing with the Edmonton Firefighters, years ago. The white guys complained and won.

LIMITS

47. Again, I have sent the Commission many documents explaining the limits of Employment Equity and Special Programs, that you are not to steal jobs from white men (no reverse discrimination, preferences, quotas, merit, criminal code, Bill of Rights, Myths, etc.). The following is an amalgamation of points I sent and includes some added points. Because of the page limit I have had to cut many points, so I do have more points.

48. Again, the CHRC has changed their website and the webpages are no longer at the web addresses below (indicated by "http://www..."). These were there in May 2013. That the CHRC has changed their website does not change the points. And I have found similar points on the current website (see Myths below).

49. The Canadian Human Rights Commission (CHRC) document, GUIDE TO SCREENING AND SELECTION IN EMPLOYMENT, heading "SPECIAL PROGRAMS AND EMPLOYMENT EQUITY" says "However, in the event of a complaint, the employer must be able to show that the data collected have not been used to discriminate, either in the hiring process or later when deciding promotion opportunities." From:

http://www.chrc-ccdp.gc.ca/publications/screening_employment-eng.aspx

50. This covers the main point, SPECIAL PROGRAMS AND EMPLOYMENT EQUITY. This is also discussed under the new webpage Myths below where it says the same thing. This means do not discriminate against anyone (including white men). This also means no preferences, displacing, barring, and/or passing over. THESE ARE THE LIMITS THAT ARE SUPPOSED TO APPLY TO ALL Special Programs and Employment Equity and CHRA Section 16. And any actions no matter what they are called. This is from the CHRC's own documents.

51. They are using race and gender numbers (representative numbers) to discriminate in the hiring process which they are not to do. And which anyone with a brain would not do, what steal jobs from people over some silly, inaccurate (self-identified) numbers.

52. This also shows that reverse discrimination complaints should not be blocked. And, shows the standard to be applied to this complaint, the Respondent has to show that numbers "have not been used to discriminate, either in the hiring process or later when deciding promotion opportunities". Which means do not discriminate against any one and do not discriminate because of the representative numbers.

53. Also, I am not sure of the source, "Reverse discrimination means less favourable treatment based (substantially or partially) on a prohibited ground of discrimination (i.e. gender, race) that results in a "denial of employment" (a phrase defined in Gravel v Air Canada 91 CLLC 16,388, at

16,393)." Also see a "loss of opportunity to compete for a position" on the same page. Also, deterred. Also CHRA Section 3.1. You are practicing reverse discrimination.

54. This shows limits and shows that people can complain and that the respondent has to show they have NOT discriminated against anyone. What is supposed to happen. Commission people are supposed to know the appropriate sections.

55. I also mention I have multiple paper copies of this document. That you may have changed your website does not change the points.

56. Also, the same document says on page 4, under heading "The Canadian Human Rights Act", "The Canadian Human Rights Act entitles all individuals to equal employment opportunities without regard to race or colour, national or ethnic origin, religion, age, ..." Underling by me. Notice **individuals, without regard**, not what is being done. This is a summary of Section 2 of the CHRA which says the same thing. Section 2 says "to the principle that all individuals should have an opportunity equal with other individuals" which is a principle that is to be applied to all sections of the Act. This means "INDIVIDUALS".

57. You are also trying to ignore merit (best regardless). From your own webpage:
 Document 1: Overview of Employment Equity, "should not be construed ... to contradict the merit principle in the public sector"
www.hrsdc.gc.ca/eng/labour/equality/employment_equity/tools/guidelines/doc1.shtml

58. The Auditor-General has said government jobs go to the best qualified, which is merit.

59. CHR Annual Report, 1997, on page 61, merit is "Sacred ground" and "not to "set aside the merit principle". Merit is the basic premise with rights.

60. Also, "Employees need to understand clearly that employment equity and merit are not mutually exclusive. Employment equity is in fact a commitment to merit, as reflected in the title of the report prepared by the Parliamentary Committee which studied Bill C-64, the new Employment Equity Act. (Report of the Standing Committee on Human Rights and Disabled Persons, Employment Equity: A Commitment to Merit, tabled June, 1995.)
http://www.hrsdc.gc.ca/eng/labour/equality/employment_equity/tools/guidelines/gdln4.shtml

61. A quote from the document mentioned, Employment Equity: A Commitment To Merit, on page 7, it says: "Positive public perceptions are critical to the success of any government policy and the Committee believes that concerns pertaining to reverse discrimination, quotas and preferential treatment must be alleviated to the fullest extent possible. Indeed such actions as job advertisements that appear to discourage applications from non-designated group members must be prohibited. Even though this type of employment practice violates the Canadian Human Rights Act, it still creates misconceptions about the nature of employment equity, and it also serves to destroy the credibility of such initiatives."

62. This means no reverse discrimination, quotas, preferential treatment, and no restrictive jobs and no advertisements that even appear to discourage applications from non-designated group members. Which also means no barring white men from jobs. This shows a limit to anyone that read above simpleton level. This also shows the Commission drivel is drivel.

63. And notice "violates the Canadian Human Rights Act", this shows a violation of the act, you Commission people are supposed to know the appropriate sections. This shows that such advertisements or webpages violate the act, which again shows a limit of Employment Equity. I do understand this requires the ability to understand the concepts involved but if you do not that is your problem. Get better and smarter people.

64. From CHR Annual Report 1994, page 19: "No doubt even these explanatory definitions will fail to placate those who see nothing in employment equity but a conspiracy to deny jobs to

white able bodied males with superior qualifications." This is what you are doing, stealing jobs from better qualified white men. That you do not seem to have the intellect to understand that is your problem.

65. Also, "explaining the myths about employment equity (claims of reverse discrimination, quotas)".

http://www.hrsdc.gc.ca/eng/labour/equality/employment_equity/tools/guidelines/gdln2.shtml

66. Also, I had a look at the new webpages in August, under Equal Opportunity and a few links came across similar points on the webpage "Employment Equity - Myths and Realities".

http://www.labour.gc.ca/eng/standards_equity/eq/pubs_eq/myths.shtml

67. Some quotes (my comments are in brackets):

68. Employment Equity - Myths and Realities.

Myth: Employment Equity results in "reverse discrimination". (No reverse discrimination.)

Reality: Employment Equity means everyone has equal employment opportunities - not just a select group. (Everyone includes white men.) ... "does not mean people will lose their jobs because organizations have made or will make room for designated group members. It does not mean that all people hired or promoted will be members of designated groups either. ...

However, if anyone feels he or she is facing discrimination in the workforce, he or she can seek protection and redress under human rights legislation in Canada. The Canadian Human Rights Act, for example, includes the following as prohibited grounds of discrimination: race, national or ethnic origin, colour, ... sex" (This is saying that complaints can be made and that Special Programs and Employment Equity have the above limits. ** THIS IS THE SAME AS SAID IN THE GUIDE MENTIONED ABOVE. ** That the Commission staff do not understand this is their problem. Do not discriminate against anyone (including white men). The Commission Report is drivel for the zillionth time.)

69. There are many other points on this page that say the same as my points, like no quotas, EE "means providing all qualified and qualifiable individuals with equal employment opportunities, not just a select few", "not about putting someone in a job solely because he or she is a member of a designated group", "ensures and emphasizes that hiring and promotion standards are not lowered in order to recruit employees from designated groups".

70. CHR Annual Report 1996, page 63, "It has never been the purpose of the Employment Equity Act to indulge in recrimination or to substitute one form of discrimination for another." They now discriminate against white men. Which shows the twisted drivel in the Commission document is wrong, the limit is not discriminate against anyone.

71. Criminal code provisions with influencing offices, advantage and public trust, and election offences and corrupt practice. What is really going on. Any manipulation of merit is corruption and brings up the criminal code. Also, if government jobs can be manipulated by schemes (no matter what it is called, employment equity, etc.) then all jobs are susceptible and any scheme can be used. The merit system was brought in to stop government jobs from being influenced by politicians and civil servants. That you do not like this is your problem.

72. The Canadian Bill of Rights says laws should be construed and applied as not to abrogate, abridge or infringe or to authorize the abrogation, abridgment or infringement of any of the rights or freedoms herein recognized and declared. Notice not to infringe.

73. And if you are going to take jobs from people you compensate them, what is this some third world country. What are you, cheap?

74. There have been some politicians that have said "Federal departments should continue to reach out to under-represented groups, but final hiring decisions will be based on merit." which

is what should be done.

75. Also see CHRA sections 40.1 and 54.1(2) which means representative numbers do not matter and a tribunal cannot order actions to increase representation, or give away white men's rights, even if there is proven discrimination. No one can.

76. I understand you people do not like that, but it is normal to have variances and there are many possible reasons for such. Some simple examples, women plumbers, men nurses, jobs that require strength and stamina, people with the skills and knowledge, people have different interests, language skills, etc. And, what possible difference does it make if an Engineer or accountant is whatever gender or race. What matters is what they know, not what they are. Again, this is laughable, simpleton stereotypical thinking.

77. We all know what is really going on here, they are displacing, passing over and barring whites and men from jobs, that is discriminating based on race and/or sex in employment. They have a policy of doing so. And this is just your way of trying to jerk me (and white men) around.

78. [Page #'s are from my notes, there may be an error, however the quotes are accurate.]

ISSUES RELEVANT TO REVIEW

79. The Commission has made conclusions of law which are wrong, they do not seem to have the intellect to understand the concept of limits and do not understand their own documents. This is laughable. This Review has to be looked at by people who have the intellectual ability to understand the concept of a limit, what the limits are and how to apply the limits in varying circumstances. This raises a question of law (limits).

80. I made multiple complaints. As I said I want the complaints to be against the people that set the policies. Policy complaints should be handled differently, the Commission is looking at this like a single act of discrimination, I am looking at it as a staff level person looking at the policies, this is against the policy of discriminating against better qualified white men and stealing jobs from them. This raises a question of law (policy handled differently) and fact (what are the required facts for a policy complaint). And this is clearly in the public interest, government hiring is in the public interest.

81. The Respondent has admitted they have a policy. They are trying to hide behind some made up defense but they are saying they have a policy. I want to question it against limits. I provided webpages and have been told many stories, these show reasonable grounds. And, we all know what is really going on here. The Commission Report is trying to say this is a Special Program and EE, again, I want to question the limits. This raises a question of law (defense) and fact (what they are really doing).

82. I have raised multiple questions of law and fact. This means that it is not plain and obvious my complaints cannot succeed. Therefore the Complaints should advance.

83. Also, my facts are to be taken as true. And, if there are any questions of evidence I want to have time to send out interrogatories to get the evidence.

NOT APPLYING

84. With me not applying, I do not intend to apply, although I may pursue some contract ideas I have (see below). Again, I am complaining about those setting the policies.

85. I also mentioned "deterred" which the Commission does not seem to understand. This is a common term in this industry. A person does not have to apply when they know the employer is going to discriminate against them. I can explain this further if required. Also, I refuse to be defrauded, applying or preparing proposals costs time, effort and money and they are not telling people they will be displaced. My real world business experience tells me this fraud. I also am not dumb enough to make an effort where I will be discriminated against. Also, I will not have

anything to do with people that treat me this way, I have rights too and I am complaining against the simpleton level bureaucrats who cannot even understand the simple concept of a limit. This brings up public interest. Also, as I mentioned in my submissions, the policies issue affects whether I will have my schemes to influence offices and promise government jobs (both of which are crimes).

86. I also have ideas for products, like using my computer technology knowledge to develop inexpensive robots for dangerous situations and countermeasures to confuse the programming logic of computer guided weapons. These are way, way beyond your intellectual ability.

87. I also do not trust you; you steal jobs from white men, so you are thieves, and are too dumb to think that far. I have learned that dumb thieves may try to steal my ideas. Also, if you treat me like this do not expect me to help defend you.

88. I also stand up to simpleton two-bit bureaucrats who want to remove my rights and steal from white men. Simpletons too dumb to understand limits and all the other points. The law and documents say "all individuals", I am an individual and have rights and do not accept you simpletons removing them. This also again brings up public interest.

SPECIFIC COMPLAINTS

89. I do not think the Commission's Report fully explains my position and I do not have sufficient room to cover all the details. I submitted multiple documents and suggest the review people read these documents (October 29, 2012, February 27, 2013, March 15, 2013 (complaint against Commission) and May 9, 2013). The cover letter of the Commission Report said the Review people will only read 10 pages and this exceeds this, but there are many issues here. The cover letter also said I was not to include evidence here, but there seems to an issue of inadequate evidence.

90. With this complaint I provided quotes from webpages that show they are discriminating against white men, have separate and lower standards and quotas. I will not repeat my points but will reply to the Respondent's Position (paragraph 14):

91. They do not understand the limits, which is explained throughout this document.

92. They say I am saying they are decreasing the quality of future members. I did not say that, I said I am questioning whether physical standards are being lowered and am concerned about the police being able to handle some mugger beating on me without having to pull out a gun. And I am questioning whether they "gender norm" which is lower standards for women, police have to handle criminals, there are gangs, bikers, thugs out there and they should be able to handle them. If they start shooting they could hit me. There are public interest and public endangerment issues here.

93. They say the XXXXXX continues to hire white males. This is not the point, this has to be looked at individually, they are supposed to hire the best. They have separate ranking lists and select from the ranking lists. Any staff person should know that separate lists means separate standards which mean lower standards. They also on their webpage say hiring is top down, this actually means they rank the people and then take the best from one list which is not what they are doing. Separate lists also pass over better qualified people from other lists. They are discriminating against **individuals** (and not necessarily all white men). Take the best, what is the problem?

94. The XXXXXX mentions "benchmarks", again they do not understand the limits. They have made the benchmarks quotas by selecting from separate lists and selecting their percent. Quotas are banned because they result in preferences, they should know that. Also see previous point. I have also recently read on one of their webpages that they are talking about

50% hiring quotas for women. They did not mention this.

95. The XXXXXX says "the XXXXXX would like to emphasize that its standards for recruitment apply equally to all applicants and are not lowered at any stage of the process". This is actually saying what they are supposed to do, but it is not what they are actually doing.

96. Years ago they had separate pass scores for women and minorities with their written exam. I believe, but am not sure that they have stopped this. If not, this is separate standards and their statement is wrong. Second, with the standards apply equally, again they have separate lists therefore different standards are being applied. And with the not lowered standards, again separate lists mean separate standards which is lowered standards for some (and not necessarily just white men). A competent staff level person should know this, it just the same thing as the separate pass scores but done in another way. Again, also see above points.

97. A quote from an XXXXXX webpage "The XXXXXX remains committed to merit-based promotion and rejects quotas. We have listened to our membership, especially those in employment equity groups, and they want no part of it." This is what they should do.

98. With me not applying, I addressed this above under heading NOT APPLYING. I would also add that with the XXXXXX I might approach them with ideas for using my knowledge of computer technology to develop inexpensive robots or devices that could be used in dangerous situations, like suspicious packages, or stand offs, etc. I also mention CHRA Section 25, the definition of Employment includes a contractual relationship.

CONCLUSION

99. The Commission Report should either be re-done or this should proceed to the next level. I have shown many errors and issues and facts that were ignored and wrongly applied.

100. The Commission Report is so simple minded that it is laughable. They do not understand the simple concept of a limit, nor do they have the intellect to understand the limits and properly apply the limits to varying situations.

101. I have clearly shown that the Respondent has a policy of discriminating based on race and sex (the Commission Report on the law is silly and absurd and does not include the LIMITS points) and provided reasonable grounds for such, and again mention this is a policy complaint, this is sufficient to proceed with this complaint.

102. I have raised many questions of law and questions of fact. As there are many questions (where the Commission is clearly wrong) it is not plain and obvious that the complaint cannot succeed. The Commission cannot decide questions of law (Herold case), nor should they, this requires skills they do not have. And, I have raised issues that clearly are in the public interest.

103. I also again raise the question of the Commission trying to cover up their misconduct by deleting their own webpages that show they are wrong. I would think this action alone disqualifies them from any involvement with this case.

104. Again, I object to the limit of 10 pages, there are so many points I cannot cover them all.

105. Should any of my points be inadequate the Review people should ask me to explain the points further. This is the fault of the Commission's presentation of my submissions. Also, people that make complaints are only expected to have the knowledge of the general public so if my points do not fully address the issues, again you should ask me to explain further before you make any decision against my complaints.

Date: August 26, 201

THIS IS A REPRINT.

REFERENCES TO THE RESPONDENT HAVE BEEN REPLACED WITH CAPITAL X's.

Barry Ceminchuk