

October 11, 2013 DOCUMENT

COMMISSION REVIEW
XXXXXXXXX FILE #201XXXXX

1. I want to reply to the latest document from the respondent. They have raised issues that are new and clearly wrong and I get to respond to new points. And, I only received the XX document on October 2 (it was mailed, not using XPRESSPOST), and there is no time limit mentioned in the CHRC cover letter.
2. As I have said before, the documents have shown me that the real issue here is the intellectual ability of the people involved. This is ridiculous, laughable. Read paragraph 7 of my August document.
3. Most of the ridiculing points below are aimed at CHRC people.
4. I will say I have come to think that you people involved with stealing jobs from decent hardworking people do not realize what you are actually doing. You say you “**HIRE ON MERIT FREE FROM DISCRIMINATION**” which is what you are supposed to do, and then have silly drivel to steal jobs from better qualified people and bar men from jobs. You use words that you do not understand, and what you are really doing and the effect and consequences of your actions do not get through to your brain. You remind me of teenagers who get some idea in their head and charge ahead with no thought to consequences, limits, etc. Such conduct from children is understandable, from adults laughable, with consequences.
5. You are stealing jobs from better qualified white men and men, which means you are thieves, and are playing a silly made up drivel game trying to avoid compensating them. You clearly do not have the intellect and knowledge to understand concepts like limits, myths, INDIVIDUAL RIGHTS, no reverse discrimination, no preferences, no quotas, criminal code, etc. Therefore, what you are is simpleton thieves. **SMARTEN UP**, you affect people and seem to be too dumb to think that far, or even understand it when I explain it you (with blunt words).
6. You should be saying sorry and trying to fix this and compensating the victims. That you are not doing that shows that you really want to steal jobs and do not care about your victims.
7. How dare you bar white men and men from jobs, anyone with a brain knows you do not bar people. As you want to bar people from jobs, I say you should be barred from your job so we will see how you like what you want being done to you. Go away, resign, simpleton thief.
8. Now, I tire of explaining simple concepts and points, many points of which are from the Canadian Human Rights Commission’s own documents, to dummies who are stealing jobs from decent hardworking people. As I said “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 IS A CORRUPTION SCAM BEING PERPETRATED ON THE CANADIAN PEOPLE TO DEFRAUD THE PEOPLE OF AN HONEST, MERITORIOUS CIVIL SERVICE AND A SCHEME TO INFLUENCE PUBLIC OFFICES.** You want to steal jobs, I, Barry Ceminchuk, as a Canadian citizen, want all you politicians and civil servants involved with this to be removed from office, barred from office and to pay restitution. I will also look at prosecution. You want to play silly drivel games, this is my game and my points are not a game.
9. You also get the same due process you give to the people you steal jobs from, which means any politician or civil servant can do such to you.
10. You are stealing jobs from decent hardworking people, which is money, and I want you treated as thieves and corrupt politicians and civil servants. And again, compensate people,

Canada is not some third world country where two-bit politicians and bureaucrats can steal from people and not compensate them.

11. If you manipulate merit and steal from people, then any one can manipulate the merit system to give away anyone's job and steal from people, which includes your job. What, do you people think you can do something and no one else can? Anyone can have any scheme.

12. That you simpleton low level flunkies did not think of this or are too dumb to understand this is your problem. Smarten up, you have gone too far.

13. I again remind you of the Ethics quote: "Commissioners and staff shall act in a manner that complies with the provision of the Criminal Code and the Rules of Conduct for Public Servants which make it an offence for government officials to demand, accept, or offer to accept for themselves or any other person any advantage or benefit, whether direct or indirect, for any act or omission which is connected with or related to the business of government."

14. Now, to address the issues in your game:

CANADIAN HUMAN RIGHTS COMMISSION

15. I raised the issue of CHRC people being involved with the actions and/or counselling the actions. The respondent mentions involvement with the Commission in their submission therefore the Commission is involved. The Commission cannot judge their own actions. Therefore this should go to a Tribunal.

16. Also, the CHRC should clearly divulge any involvement and any area or potential area of a conflict of interest. They are supposed to follow the rules of "natural justice" and "procedural fairness", but I doubt they even know what these are. This shows the CHRC people do not have the required skills and knowledge. That they did not do that shows this should go to a Tribunal.

17. I have raised the issue of violations of the limits described in the Canadian Human Rights Commission's OWN DOCUMENTS and the proper implementation of Employment Equity and Special Programs and the Report does not address these points. That they ignored the points indicates a predetermined outcome, which is a bias. It also is obviously too complicated for them but that is their problem.

18. I also want an explanation as to why the CHRC webpages that I quoted from (that show their Report is wrong) and contained evidence, were deleted.

XXXXXXXXX DOCUMENT

19. With your document, what is this? It reads like the silly drivel that comes from the morons trying to get preferences for themselves, those trying to steal jobs from better people. It clearly was not written by people with basic reading and thinking skills or the basic knowledge that politicians and civil servants are to keep their hands off government jobs. Trying to manipulate the hiring process is corruption and brings up the criminal code. Again, government jobs belong to the Canadian people, not politicians or civil servants.

20. You say you hire on merit free of discrimination and then try silly drivel that would only fool a simpleton too dumb to understand limits, etc. to avoid merit and to discriminate against men and white men.

21. To speak at your level, get a brain, learn to read and think, you are silly simpleton thieves trying to steal from people. Again, this is all too complicated for you.

POLICY OF BARRING WHITE MEN FROM JOBS – WHAT YOU ARE ACTUALLY DOING

22. In point 4 of your document you say you have not admitted to a policy of barring white men from jobs. Please read this very slowly and as many times as it takes to get through your brain. What a joke, two paragraphs before this you say you restrict jobs to women (which is what I mentioned originally). If you say you restrict jobs to women you are saying you bar men from jobs (which includes white men). If you say you bar men from jobs you are saying you have a policy of barring men (which includes white men) from jobs. Therefore you have admitted you have a policy of barring white men from jobs.

23. And actually you are barring all men from jobs which is barring not only white men but minority and Aboriginal men as well. You did not think this far and really are simpleton thieves who steal jobs from men and minority and Aboriginal men.

24. To explain in general principle terms, if you say you are doing something, you are saying you have a policy of doing something, and you are admitting having a policy of doing that something. As a mathematical model this would be $Ax=Bx=Cx$ where $x =$ the something.

25. You cannot intellectually connect the thoughts that restricting jobs to women is barring men (and white men) from jobs, together. Can you not put two thoughts together are you too dumb to realize what you are saying? How did people like you ever get a job at a level above low level flunky? The funny thing is I actually believe that your brain does not believe you bar men from jobs, you have some self-deluding drivel (whatever you try) to convince yourself you are not barring white men from jobs, but this is only a thought that occurs to me and I neither know what you think or care. I am too busy laughing at you.

26. You say I have provided no evidence of barring white men from jobs. You have provided documented evidence that you bar men (including white men) in you own words by saying you restrict jobs to women which is barring non-women (i.e. men including white men) from jobs.

27. You also mention barriers (discussed below), you did not think far enough to realize that when you restrict jobs to women, again you are barring all men and minority and Aboriginal men from jobs. This is A HUGE BARRIER TO MINORITY AND ABORIGINAL AND WHITE MEN EMPLOYMENT. You say you are for eliminating barriers and then erect a huge barrier to minority and Aboriginal and white men and are too dumb to think far. Again laughable. And you should tell the Aboriginal men you want to bar them from jobs and give their jobs to women.

28. If you read the above and are not laughing at the intellect of these people and disgusted at their actions, you are as dumb as they are. If you are laughing at them and disgusted with them, then help me clean these people out.

29. You also mention the EEA and the PSEA, these obviously should not infringe on the LIMITS, as explained many times in my August document. I provided many points that show what the LIMITS are, including many points from Canadian Human Rights Commission documents that show how to **properly apply the EEA and PSEA**. AGAIN THE CANADIAN HUMAN RIGHTS DOCUMENTS AND WEBPAGES AND MY MANY POINTS SHOW WHAT THE LIMITS OF THE EEA AND PSEA ARE.

30. People that can think at a staff level (above low level flunky) should understand this. There are principles and limits that show how to do something properly.

31. The real issue here is you simpleton thieves are trying to twist the CHRA, EEA and PSEA to steal jobs from better qualified white men. You are supposed to know that things like expanding advertising and encouraging people to apply to get the widest possible pool of candidates are allowed, but then you then choose the best qualified candidate regardless of race or gender.

which is what merit really means. Again limits. IT OBVIOUSLY SHOULD NOT MEAN DISPLACE, PASS OVER AND BAR CANDIDATES FROM JOBS WHICH IS STEAL JOBS FROM BETTER QUALIFIED PEOPLE. Most people with an IQ above moron understand you do not steal jobs from people.

32. You should also know what a TEAR AWAY SHEET is, which is a sheet that has the race and gender of the candidate and is used for general statistical purposes. It is called TEAR AWAY because it is torn away to ensure race and gender are not used in deciding the position.

33. I have shown clear violations and what the proper procedures should be. And again, politicians or civil servants who try to twist merit brings up the criminal code. Civil servants and politicians cannot commit crimes; they can try their drivel games with their jail cell mates.

34. You may notice that I have repeated some points, I do this because I know that when dealing with some people you have to repeat points, hoping to get through to them.

FREE FROM DISCRIMINATION

35. I explained this in my August document paragraph 95. You say your hiring is "free from discrimination". To be free from discrimination you would have to allow all to apply and take the best qualified regardless of race or gender. Is this too complicated for you? You are supposed to know this. Your drivel is drivel that would only fool someone who is too dumb to understand limits, myths, individual rights, no reverse discrimination, quotas, criminal code, etc.

36. **The simple test is we bar you from your job, or restrict your job to anyone but you and see how you like it. We will see how fair you think this is. Cannot think that far? And what, are you the simpletons who want to do something to others but not have it done to you? Or, how about we bar you and we jerk you around with drivel.**

37. This is really you steal from better white guys crowd making up drivel trying to con people and jerk them around while you steal from them.

38. **Besides, what is the problem here, take the best, merit (best regardless). Oh yeah, you thieves want to steal jobs from better people.** And no wonder you do not like take the best, simpletons like you would be flushed.

39. Also, from my August document "53. "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.** Also "68. Employment Equity - Myths and Realities. Myth: Employment Equity results in "reverse discrimination". (No reverse discrimination.) and 69."not about putting someone in a job solely because he or she is a member of a designated group".

40. I had assumed I was dealing with people that had basic industry knowledge. I doubt you know that with "loss of opportunity" **you are disqualifying people before they are being considered** which is a "Loss of Opportunity" (Gravel v Air Canada 91 CLLC 16,388, at 16,393).

41. Also "it is well established that discrimination need only be one factor among others for a **contravention of law to be found.**" (Holden v. CNR, FCA, 14 C.H.R.R., D/12 @ D/13).

42. And again, you are violating INDIVIDUAL RIGHTS, CHRA Section 2, "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".

MERIT

43. In point 3 you say “Contrary to the complaint's submissions the merit principle is at the core of Employment Equity”. I explained this in great detail in my August document and I agree. I mentioned the word “merit” in my August documents roughly 25 times. Please reread the complete document, you clearly do not understand what I was saying. I even said “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.” And read paragraph 7. This is again laughable.

44. The real problem here is you are actually trying to twist merit to steal jobs from white men and men and influence offices. You might fool simpletons like you but you do not fool me. Read my August document paragraphs 57 through 64 as many times as it takes to get through to you.

45. You say merit is at the core of employment equity, the paragraphs above show how to properly apply merit. Notice paragraphs 61 to 63, they clearly say MERIT 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 and men from jobs. And “violates the Canadian Human Rights Act”.

46. And again, for the zillionth time, government hiring is on merit, take the best. Every politician and every civil servant from the lowest to highest level is supposed to know this. That you do not shows what ignorant dumb people you are.

ADMISSION – ACT AGAINST ME

47. With point 1 of your document, again please read my August document and the points above. I am looking at this at a level above simpleton low level flunky, this is a policy complaint and Section 12 complaint (saying will discriminate and inciting discrimination, to the public, I am part of the public) and public interest, which is too complicated for you.

48. Also, in my February 27, 2013 document I said “This affects my job opportunities. This also affects whether I will start a political party (to be called Looter Party) and use the jobs of those involved and government jobs for votes and support. This is also in the public interest.

49. I said I do not intend to apply, I will point out that I would never work with people like you. It is very frustrating working with people who cannot read and have no thinking skills. Like with these complaints I keep having to try to explain simple points to you over and over. To be blunt you are too dumb for me. And do you actually think I would have anything to do with anyone that wants to bar me from jobs because of what I am? I do not take crap like this from anyone, I do not care who or what you are. I have rights and do not accept you two-bit simpleton thieving bureaucrats or politicians trampling on them. I am not a second class citizen. There are phrases that express my feeling for people like you, Kiss My Butt and scat you scat. I want you people cleaned out of the civil service. And if you give away my job I give away yours. I am not some simpleton pansy flunky who lets people trample on his rights.

XXXXXXXXX RESTRICTED

50. With the news article I originally mentioned, I addressed this in my August document paragraph 94. As I said perhaps a mistake has been made. However with the XX submissions this has become irrelevant, they have now admitted they have a policy as I explained above under heading POLICY OF BARRING WHITE MEN FROM JOBS – WHAT YOU ARE ACTUALLY DOING which at the least is a violation of CHRA Section 12, which does not require

me to apply, etc. And, whether the job is external or internal is irrelevant, you still have the policy and are displaying such, you own submission does so.

51. With your points about Employment Equity, for the zillionth time, you clearly do not have the brains to understand the limits. This is addressed in many points, but at the least again read the quote from the Canadian Human Rights Commission document GUIDE TO SCREENING AND SELECTION IN EMPLOYMENT, heading "SPECIAL PROGRAMS AND EMPLOYMENT EQUITY", paragraphs 49 to 52. This among many points shows what the limits are.

52. I now realize you people do not understand the concept of a limit and do not have the intellectual ability to understand the concept of a limit.

53. You mention "barriers", this actually means things like unnecessary job requirements (things like requiring lifting strength when a fork lift is used, and if the job still requires a certain weight to be repeatedly lifted (strength and stamina) then the requirement is valid), or with piano movers, which is all too complicated for you people. You are creating barriers for the people you bar from jobs. Again, you do not understand the concepts, or have the basic knowledge.

54. And, you are creating huge barriers for minority and Aboriginal and white men. You say you are to eliminate barriers and then erect barriers. You obviously did not think of this.

55. And, again to do this properly you should follow the limits. I have said this enough times, I want you people removed from office and barred from office.

56. And reasonable progress means make an effort but do not exceed the limits like merit, no reverse discrimination, no quotas, individual rights, criminal code. etc. It does not say displace, pass over and bar people, nor does it say steal from people. This is a principle, stay within the limits.

57. I mention the following so the reader can see what a joke these people are.

58. Quotas are banned because they result in preferences and lower standards being applied and passing over better qualified people. You should know this, so do not do actions that pass over better qualified people.

59. By the way, this representative is a joke. You people seem to think it matters and you should steal jobs from people based on these numbers. This again shows what a simpleton you are and I question the intellectual ability of anyone that thinks this way.

60. YOU ARE TOO DUMB TO UNDERSTAND THE LIMITS THAT SHOULD BE USED WHEN TRYING TO ACHIEVE REPRESENTATIVENESS. And you are violating the many limits pointed out in my August document.

61. Again, the Canadian Human Rights Commission document GUIDE TO SCREENING AND SELECTION IN EMPLOYMENT, heading "SPECIAL PROGRAMS AND EMPLOYMENT EQUITY" document (paragraph 49 of my August document) specifically addresses this issue. It also mentions individual rights. This states clearly that using the representative numbers to discriminate is a violation of the (and any) act and that victims are entitled to compensation for a violation of the act. The current webpage "Myths" points (paragraph 68) also says the same.

62. Also CHRA Section 40.1 says underrepresentation does not matter and it is not proof of discrimination and Section 54.1(2) which says 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. And obviously, assuming you are as dumb as you seem, underrepresentation is not a barrier and does not indicate a barrier (40.1).

63. It is also ridiculous to displace white guys based on these silly numbers. Any one that can think knows that variances are normal. There are many valid reasons for variances; there are high concentrations of women in health care, education, etc. and not many in construction.

Occupations are normally gender and race skewed. There are stay at home Moms, many women only work part time or do not want long hours or to travel, strength and stamina, people qualified, job requirements, merit, the ability to speak, read and write the appropriate language, age (children and elderly people), foreign credentials (some good, some not), and what if no one from a gender or race applies, people may not want to work for the government, or locations, or interests, many points. I do not see 50% women in some occupations ever, just like men. Or by race, silly, what is a race, what percentage, there are more than 100 ethnicities, etc. What you want 50% women plumbers? Only a moron would think like that. It is also to be blunt, stupid to think the race or gender of an accountant or engineer matters, the issue is their competence, knowledge, skills and ability to do the job, not what they are.

64. When you think about it, who cares how many of a certain kind of people you have, you should care about public safety, serious life threatening issues, and getting the job done safely, competently and efficiently. It seems to me the only people that care about this are those trying to get special treatment for themselves, those trying to displace white guys, and those who get some idea in their head and charge ahead without thinking of consequences. And certainly no preferences because of race and gender make up of the workforce. As the quotes clearly say.

65. I am used to working with people that do useful things in the real world, that want the best people, competency, skills, knowledge, productivity, efficiency, ability to do multiple jobs to cover for absenteeism, etc. are the issues, we do not care what race or gender you are. Which is what civil rights is supposed to be, take the best without regard to race or gender.

66. You did not think of these points and do not have the knowledge and thinking skills to understand competency etc. and like simpletons focus on silly numbers.

67. Besides the world got along fine with variances and it still does and it is silly to think that some silly number matters.

68. Also, this is actually a misapplying of the concepts. If you understood the history of rights, the numbers were only supposed to be general indicators for what could possibly be achieved over many years with no preferences, no reverse discrimination, no quotas, etc.

69. And have you not realized that the numbers are self-identified which means they are inaccurate and wrong. I point out that they are self-identified because you cannot force people to tell you their race or gender. To bar people from jobs based on numbers that are wrong is laughable and absurd. **And, as your representative numbers are self identified they are low, so you are over representing people. Which again is stealing jobs based on your wrong numbers. That you did not think of this shows what a simpleton you are. Smarten up. And, did you not think that people might lie? They have a financial incentive to do so.**

70. **And again, as you want to bar men and white men, have you not realized you are barring minority and Aboriginal men? Again simpletons, you have not thought that far.**

71. And tell the men they cannot have some job because you want to give their job to a woman, that they are the wrong kind. Some unemployed guy with a wife and kids (you are stealing from the Moms and children also, again you simpletons did not think of this).

72. Also, as you want to bar unemployed men from jobs, set up a fund so unemployed men can send their bills to you. You bar them from jobs, you pay their bills.

73. And, "It rests upon the "completely unrealistic" assumption that minorities will choose a particular trade in lockstep proportion to their representation in the population." City of Richmond v. Croson (488 U.S. 469, 507). "Completely unrealistic" is a polite phrase for silly, simple, laughable, stupid. And US Federal Civil Rights law says the same thing, see 42 USC Section 2000e-2(j), "Preferential treatment not to be granted on account of existing number or

percentage imbalance”, which is no preferences based on numbers.

74. Again, you are ignoring “the principle that all individuals should have an opportunity equal with other individuals” CHRA Section 2, which is a principle that is to be applied to all sections of the Act. This means “INDIVIDUALS”.

75. You are actually like the people that wanted to bar people from jobs based on race years ago, and can’t think that far. You have the same mentality as the Apartheid people, you are doing the same thing to people, you just seem to think that it is acceptable to discriminate and displace people as long as you are doing it, or it is against white men and men, or that it does not affect you. They had their drivel you have your drivel. This is actually shocking, you are supposed to have learned from past actions, they barred people from jobs and you are barring people from jobs. Just like the Chinese and Blacks need not apply, you are the white men and men need not apply. You are disgusting simpleton thieves and again too dumb to think that far.

76. This is also stereotypical thinking. See people as individuals, everyone is unique, not all of a race or gender are different than all of another race, or gender. Again simpleton thinking.

77. This is the kind of thinking that I would think comes from the morons trying to get preferences for themselves, trying to steal from smarter and better people. Laughable. And, the kind of thinking of corrupt politicians running their scheme of trying to use the promise of government jobs to get votes and kickbacks, an election rigging scheme.

78. I say this as a joke to show what a joke you people are. Just to show you the type of thinking you have, and I know you cannot do this, but how about the Ottawa Senators have 50% women hockey players. This is the type of thinking you have. If you do this I will take all bets where I say the Edmonton Oilers will beat them every time. Come on, do this and bet on the Senators, so I can not only laugh at you but take your money. And there are reasons for women not competing against men in sports. Is anyone that reads this not laughing at these simpletons?

79. And with police, think of thugs who are big guys, if they see women police officers as weaklings they could beat up the officer and run away. Or, take their gun and shoot someone. You did not think that far. Or firefighters, they have to carry people out of burning buildings dressed in a very heavy suit, and make decisions in complex serious life and death situations considering things like structural integrity, hazardous materials, risk to other structures and people, etc. You want not the best or minimally qualified (passing over better qualified) doing these things? Again, is anyone not laughing at these simpletons?

80. Go away you are absurd simpletons who cannot even think of simple things. Laughable.

81. As people like you may take these comments the wrong way, although I do laugh at you, I will say I have worked in multiple countries with many women and people of all races from all over the world that can think logically, and intellectually handle multiple variable problems and complex issues. These people got their jobs because of their competency, skills and knowledge (that they worked very hard for many years to obtain) not because of their race or gender.

82. If you read the above and are not laughing at the intellect of these people and disgusted at their actions, you are as dumb as they are. If you are laughing at them and disgusted with them, then help me clean these people out.

REVIEW

83. I raised a Canadian Bill of Rights issue, August document, paragraph 72. The complete sentence of the construed quote is “2. Every law of Canada shall, unless it is expressly declared

by an Act of the Parliament of Canada that it shall operate notwithstanding the Canadian Bill of Rights, be so 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" which means that if you infringe rights you have to explicitly declare that it will operate notwithstanding the Canadian Bill of Rights. The right is "1. (b) the right of the **individual** to equality before the law and the protection of the law;". **This raises a question of law and interpretation of law which the Commission cannot decide (only a Tribunal can). There is also the general right not to be stolen from by government simpletons.**

84. I also mention the Charter says "28. Notwithstanding anything in this Charter, the rights and freedoms referred to in it are guaranteed equally to male and female persons."

85. With unconstitutionality, with the Employment Equity Act and obviously any act: In the House of Commons Debates, for October 5, 1995 page 15308, Mr. Rey D, Pagtakhan, right column, 5th paragraph, "Hence the addition of paragraph 2 to section 15 [discussing the Charter]. ... It gives parliament the authority to enact laws aimed at achieving equality, not preference, not superiority, in employment for the disadvantaged groups, laws that will withstand constitutional scrutiny." Mr. Pagtakhan was the Chairman of the Standing Committee on Human Rights and the Status of Disabled Persons.

There are two points here:

A. He says the Act is because of the Charter, Section 31 of the Charter says: Nothing in this Charter extends the legislative powers of any body or authority. Therefore, as they say it is because of the Charter, and the Charter does not add legislative authority, the Act is unconstitutional.

B. Notice he says the Charter is supposed to be "not preference, not superiority". This complaint is proof that people try to use it to have preferences and therefore the EEA and any other act or section, is unconstitutional.

[The page numbers are from my notes, there might be an occasional error.]

CONCLUSION

86. Although I doubt you have the intellectual ability to understand this, what your document really says is that there is a conspiracy by politicians and civil servants to twist the merit system to steal jobs from better qualified white men, men and whites and influence public offices. It also says any politician and any civil servant can displace, pass over and bar people with government jobs, which is steal jobs, which is steal money.

87. Many points in my August 26, 2013 document, show politicians and civil servants are not to do such. This brings up election rigging (bribery, corrupt practice) and the criminal code.

88. I will again say, who do you people think you are? You are stealing jobs (which is money) from decent hardworking people and are too dumb to think that far. Smarten up, you are thieves.

89. And, if you take something from people you apologize to them and compensate them, Canada is not some third world country.

90. And, learn the lesson that most children learn, have consideration for others.

91. And, as you are really saying give away someone's job, I say you give away your job. So resign, immediately. Or, I give away your job.

92. I refer to the points in the CONCLUSION heading in my August document, paragraphs 99 to 105 and also add:

93. **I raised a Canadian Bill of Rights issue in my August document, paragraph 72. I**

explained this further above. This raises a question of law and interpretation of law which the Commission cannot decide. There is also the general right not to be stolen from by government simpletons. And I mentioned the Charter (Section 28) and showed the unconstitutionality of preference (stealing) actions and the Employment Equity Act.

94. I raised further issues with the CHRC under heading CANADIAN HUMAN RIGHTS COMMISSION above.

95. I want to know which politicians have been involved pushing preferences and stealing jobs from men and white men.

96. Again, with the Review, I want people that have the intellectual ability to understand the concept of a limit, understand what the limits are and have the intellectual ability to properly apply the limits in varying situations.

Date: October 11, 2013

THIS IS A REPRINT.
REFERENCES TO THE RESPONDENT
HAVE BEEN REPLACED WITH
CAPITAL X's.

Barry Ceminchuk