

November 14, 2013

David Langtry
Acting Chief Commissioner
Canadian Human Rights Commission
344 Slater Street, 8th Floor
Ottawa, Ontario K1A 1E1

RE: Complaints: FILE #20130100, #20130101, #20130102, #20130103, #20130104

1. With your documents of October 16, 2013, which I did not receive until November 5, 2013, this is also ridiculous, YOUR DECISIONS ARE INVALID, VOID, YOU CANNOT JUDGE YOURSELF (see heading **Breach of Natural Justice** below), and, you do not understand COMPLYING PROPERLY (see heading **Properly** below), you have decided questions of law and fact and I have other points. That you do not know these points, despite my pointing them out many times, is laughable. You people get everything wrong, too dumb to understand limits and principles and too dumb to understand concepts like Natural Justice, etc. Again, your documents have shown me that the real issue here is the quality of the Canadian Human Rights Commission people.
2. YOU SHOULD VACATE, RESCIND OR RECALL (OR WHATEVER TERM YOU USE) THE DECISIONS AND SEND THE COMPLAINTS TO A TRIBUNAL.
3. Or refer it to the RCMP, Canadian Human Rights Act Section 44 (2) (b) (handle completely). I mentioned the criminal code in my submissions, you cannot commit crimes.
4. Your actions could be seen as you, the holder of a judicial office, attempting to obtain and obtaining employment and offices for many persons, and feminist special interest groups (which are also a "person"), by omission. See criminal code Section 119 (and 122). Or aiding and abetting such for members of Parliament. Also see Elections Acts (Canada Section 481, Alberta Section 172(1)(b), Ontario Section 96.1(c)), which are government jobs for votes. The penalties for these are very severe, 14 years in jail per count, removal from office, and barred from office. I also mention Criminal Code Section 139(2) Obstructing Justice, and 10 years in jail.

INVALID, VOID DECISIONS

5. The decisions are invalid because:

Properly

6. With your point that the Canadian Human Rights Tribunal cannot order the cessation of complying with the Employment Equity Act, this is laughable, simpleton level and **WRONG**. THEY CAN ORDER THE CESSATION OF ACTIONS THAT ARE NOT COMPLYING **PROPERLY**. AND, THEY CAN ORDER DAMAGES FOR THE **IMPROPER ACTIONS**. Do you not understand that? Very simple to me. YOU REALLY DO NOT UNDERSTAND THE CONCEPT OF LIMITS DO YOU? AND, YOU OBVIOUSLY DO NOT UNDERSTAND THE CONCEPTS OF HOW THE LEGAL SYSTEM IS SUPPOSED TO WORK.
7. And, the cessation of complying with the Employment Equity Act can be ordered by

a Tribunal as **I SHOWED THE UNCONSTITUTIONALITY OF THE EMPLOYMENT EQUITY ACT, AND THE UNCONSTITUTIONALITY OF PREFERENCES AND OBVIOUSLY ANY ACT OR SECTION OR REGULATION OR ACTION THAT MAY EVEN IMPLY PREFERENCES** (see my October 11, 2013 submission, paragraph 85). This raises multiple questions of interpretation and questions of law and shows how the Employment Equity Act should be implemented PROPERLY. **YOU CANNOT DECIDE THIS, IT IS A TRIBUNAL ISSUE. This point alone shows the Complaints should go to a Tribunal.**

8. Do you not understand that people can question the actions of government, the twisting of laws or regulations and the manipulation of merit or whatever action is done, and raise questions of law like interpretation and unconstitutionality and gross incompetence (see CHRA Section 49(5))? And that your own documents (Guide and Myths discussed in my August 26 submission, paragraph 68) say people can make CHRC reverse discrimination complaints?

9. My submissions repeatedly point out how to comply PROPERLY. Read them as many times as it takes to get through to you. I again point out I included many quotes from the CHRC's OWN DOCUMENTS.

10. You are ignoring the points in CHRC paper documents and webpages that I pointed out that say people can make CHRC reverse discrimination complaints (GUIDE TO SCREENING AND SELECTION IN EMPLOYMENT, heading "SPECIAL PROGRAMS AND EMPLOYMENT EQUITY" (August 26 document paragraphs 49 to 55) and Myths (August 26 submission, paragraph 68) and MERIT (TAKE THE BEST REGARDLESS). I also mention I have multiple paper copies of the Guide that I obtained from multiple CHRC offices. The Guide 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." This is a major question, the Guide under heading "SPECIAL PROGRAMS AND EMPLOYMENT EQUITY" specifically addresses one of the issues at hand. **THIS DIRECTLY CONTRADICTS YOUR POINTS AND THE REPORT.** Again, absurd.

11. You also seem to think that you and your "steal jobs crowd" pals can make up anything and do anything and not be questioned. Again, absurd, laughable.

12. At least have the intellectual integrity to admit that you are either lying in your documents or are too dumb to understand you own documents, or you are lying with your Report and points. Which is it?

Breach of Natural Justice

13. There is a Breach of Natural Justice (this phrase is mentioned in CHRA Section 48.9(1)). I should not have to tell you Natural Justice means you cannot judge yourself, or your actions, or actions that you are responsible for, or issues where you are involved or have a conflict of interest and also means that you cannot decide issues where there is even a hint of bias.

14. From the Respondent submissions and my research it has become apparent that the Canadian Human Rights Commission (CHRC) has been counselling the actions in question. This means the CHRC is involved with the actions and a party to the actions.

15. The decision maker is David Langtry (referred to as "he" following, a.k.a. simpleton thief). He is Acting Chief Commissioner of the Canadian Human Rights Commission.

Therefore he is the senior manager in the Commission and responsible for the actions of all Commission staff. As he is responsible for actions he is doing the actions. Therefore, any decisions he makes are him judging the actions he is responsible for and him judging himself.

16. The decision maker has committed a BREACH OF NATURAL JUSTICE, the principle being no man can judge himself.

17. It is laughable that he does not know this.

18. Also, my complaints reflect on the competency of the Acting Chief Commissioner and the proper management of his area of responsibility. He has a clear conflict of interest as the resolution of the complaints reflects on his managerial competence. As a senior manager with the Commission he is responsible for the conduct and actions of the staff. Gross incompetence and other issues could get him fired. Therefore he has a pecuniary interest. He cannot decide questions where competence and the question of him doing the actions PROPERLY have been raised. He cannot decide the question of whether he has committed misconduct.

19. I also point out that the CHRC has admitted that complaints against them cannot be handled **by the Commission. See CHRC letter of April 15, 2013 (Document A, copy attached). THEREFORE, HE HAS DECIDED COMPLAINTS THAT HE SHOULD HAVE KNOWN HE CANNOT DECIDE.**

20. I also do not want another Human Rights Commission or federal department to look at this, they have been corrupted. This should go to a Tribunal.

21. And, as I mentioned in my submissions many times, I again mention the actions violate the CHRC's OWN DOCUMENTS, including explanations and quotes from the Canadian Human Rights Act. THE CHRC'S OWN DOCUMENTS CONTRADICT THE REPORT. Therefore, either the Report is wrong or the CHRC's own documents that I quoted from are wrong. Either way the decision maker is misleading the people (or lying) in the Report or the CHRC documents. Therefore, there are the issues of the decision maker contradicting himself and a cover up and he cannot judge his actions.

22. Again, I also point out that he is ignoring the many points in his own documents that show the Report is wrong. Natural Justice also includes the issue of bias, he could be seen as trying to cover up his misconduct and trying to push his agenda.

23. He also cannot decide issues when the CHRC deleted the webpages after I made some of my submissions quoting from many of them. This does not change the points and as I pointed out in my October 11, 2013 submission the current webpages say the same thing (Guide and Myths in my submissions). No explanation has been provided about the web pages being deleted, despite my asking, and this could be seen as him trying to block cases where evidence has been tampered with and trying to cover up his misconduct. This means his conduct is an issue which again brings up Natural Justice. This also brings up an attempt to obstruct my complaints.

24. Again, 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 he ignored the points indicates a predetermined outcome, which is a bias. And, this shows again, competence is an issue.

25. He also cannot be involved in any decision where he may be a party to criminal

code violations or aiding and abetting such.

26. The principle here is that if a person can judge themselves then I can judge myself. Therefore, I can tell people to do something (including crimes) and then block any complaints against me. Absurd, and dangerous.

Question of Law and Fact.

27. The Decisions are the Commission deciding questions of law and fact. They cannot do that (Herold case, see my submissions of August 26, 2013, paragraphs 13 and 102, and October 11, 2013 paragraphs 83 and 92) as I clearly pointed out.

28. I raised many questions of law in my submissions, including Canadian Human Rights Commission own documents explanations and the Bill Of Rights issue which is relevant to the interpretation of laws (“construed”) and the criminal code and election act violations, which are multiple questions of law.

29. I also 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, which is a question of law.

30. He is also saying anyone can manipulate merit, which is a question of law.

31. He is also essentially saying anyone can steal jobs from people and not compensate people. Third world thinking and a question of law.

32. He is also essentially saying individuals have no rights, despite the principle articulated in CHRA Section 2, and his own documents, which is a question of law (and absurd, laughable).

33. **I ALSO SHOWED THE UNCONSTITUTIONALITY OF THE EMPLOYMENT EQUITY ACT, AND THE UNCONSTITUTIONALITY OF PREFERENCES AND OBVIOUSLY ANY ACT OR SECTION OR REGULATION OR ACTION THAT MAY EVEN IMPLY PREFERENCES** (see my October 11, 2013 submission, paragraph 85. This raises multiple questions of interpretation and questions of law. **HE CANNOT DECIDE THIS, IT IS A TRIBUNAL ISSUE. This point alone shows the Complaints should go to a Tribunal.**

34. The Report is also wrong with my points about CHRA Section 12, he is inciting discrimination. If he understood how the law is to be implemented properly he would understand that. This is a question of law.

35. He is also supposed to warn people and allow them to object.

36. I also point out that the actions are a permanent policy (not a special program) which brings up a question of law.

37. The decision maker has decided that I cannot question any interpretation of any sections of the CHRA or any regulations. This is wrong, interpretation is a question of law, and I did so in my submissions.

38. The decision maker has also decided questions of fact, as I mentioned in my submissions, what the Respondent is really doing.

39. He is deciding questions of law and fact, again he cannot do that. The decisions are INVALID, VOID.

Absurd Decision

40. The decisions are also absurd, it is like these Commission people cannot even

understand the simple concept of a limit, let alone what the limits are and how to apply limits to varying situations. This is too complicated for these people. As I said many times in my submissions, the real issue is the quality, knowledge and skills of the CHRC staff.

41. 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. He also is trying to ignore the merit principle, which I pointed out many times in my submissions, and which means take the best regardless of race or sex. This looks to me to be one of the "steal jobs from better qualified men and white men crowd" (i.e. the decision maker) trying to protect the corruption conspiracy of influencing offices and defrauding the Canadian people of a meritorious civil service, and stealing and misconduct.

42. And, there clearly is a public interest here, the Canadian people have a right to know and question government hiring and hiring rigging schemes.

43. He is also drawing legal conclusions which is beyond his authority (Herold case mentioned above) and obviously his skills. He says "abiding by the Employment Equity Act ...", he is drawing legal conclusions as to what that legally means. This is absurd, simpleton level, laughable, as I explained many times in my submissions there are limits and a proper way to implement it. He obviously does not understand this, which is shocking as he is a lawyer. This depends on what the words legally mean, it is an oversimplification, and considering the other points it indicates that the decider seems to think that statement covers everything (anyone can do anything with no limits, etc.). This is like a child who uses words with no thought as to what the words mean (limits, proper implementation, etc.). Is there anyone with a brain out there that understands what I am saying? I do understand that some people use words and do not think beyond a simple idea but this is ridiculous. If you take his lack of logic further, any one could do anything and call it Employment Equity. And again, I tried to explain this many times. I CANNOT MAKE IT ANY SIMPLER. Anyone who does not understand this is incompetent and dumb.

44. He is also ignoring the points in his webpages that I pointed out that say people can make CHRC reverse discrimination complaints (Guide and Myths discussed in my August 26 submission, paragraph 68). **THIS DIRECTLY CONTRADICTS HIS POINTS AND THE REPORT.** Again, absurd.

45. Again, I showed **THE UNCONSTITUTIONALITY OF THE EMPLOYMENT EQUITY ACT, AND THE UNCONSTITUTIONALITY OF PREFERENCES AND OBVIOUSLY ANY ACT OR SECTION OR REGULATION OR ACTION THAT MAY EVEN IMPLY PREFERENCES. HE CANNOT DECIDE THIS, IT IS A TRIBUNAL ISSUE. This point alone shows the Complaints should go to a Tribunal.**

46. He also seems to think that he and his "steal jobs crowd" pals can make up anything and do anything and not be questioned. Again, absurd, laughable.

47. That the decision is absurd in so many ways also makes the decision INVALID, VOID.

48. Just so you know, this is really all a corruption and election rigging scam. Sleazy politicians use government jobs to get votes, contributions and to funnel government money to their pals and interest groups. That these job rigging actions are occurring shows the scheme to do such and is promising preferences which is promising jobs to multiple people and special interest groups.

CONCLUSION

49. For the many reasons discussed above, THE DECISIONS ARE INVALID, VOID, AND YOU SHOULD VACATE, RESCIND OR RECALL (OR WHATEVER TERM YOU USE) THE DECISIONS AND SEND THE COMPLAINTS TO A TRIBUNAL. Or refer to the RCMP.
50. The reaction to my points shows me that these people really are racist and sexist thieves who really want to steal jobs from people. They are what they are supposed to be against. They should be ashamed of themselves and embarrassed that they are like the old Chinese or blacks need not apply and too dumb to think that far.
51. And, they are thieves and do not care about their victims.
52. I again point out that they should be apologizing to their victims and compensating them, Canada is not some third world country.
53. Treat the following as interrogatories:
1. I want an explanation as to why the CHRC webpages that I quoted from (that show the Report is wrong) and contained evidence, were deleted.
 2. And, send me any public consultation reports you have and any warnings to the public that you will be stealing jobs.
 3. I also want to know who is responsible for the policy of stealing jobs and manipulating merit. Which civil servants and politicians are responsible for pushing preferences and barring men and whites from jobs, provide me with the names.
 4. I also want to know which politicians any of my complaints have been discussed with and whether they were discussed with the Minister of Justice.
54. And read my October 11, 2013 submission paragraphs 5 through 10. Thieves.
55. I also point out it is customary to inform the Complainant of the Appeal process.

Barry Ceminchuk



CANADIAN
HUMAN RIGHTS
COMMISSION

COMMISSION
CANADIENNE DES
DROITS DE LA PERSONNE

Resolution Services Division / Division des services de règlement

PROTECTED

APR 15 2013

File numbers: 20130165 & 20130386

Mr. Barry Ceminchuk
Box 51047 RPO Highlands
Edmonton Alberta T5W 5G5

Dear Mr. Ceminchuk:

This is further to your two complaints against the Canadian Human Rights Commission.

As you can appreciate, the Commission should not review complaints filed against it. That said, the options for having an outside party review the complaint are limited to:

- another human rights commission dealing with your two complaints; or,
- another Federal department, not involved in human rights issues, dealing with your two complaints.

Please advise me which option you wish to pursue by **May 6, 2013**. You can do by writing to me at the address below. Should you not respond by this date, the Commission will assume you do not wish to pursue your two complaints and will close both files.

Yours sincerely,

Jamie Masters
A/Early Resolution Team Leader