

February 17, 2014

Name removed

A third party is looking at this

File: #20130165 (PROMOTING STEALING JOBS FROM WHITE GUYS) and
#20130386 (BLOCKING REVERSE DISCRIMINATION COMPLAINTS)

1. I have covered both complaints in the following and have indicated the appropriate information for each complaint. "STEALING" indicates the first complaint (#20130165) and "BLOCKING" indicates the second complaint (#20130386).

2. As you have sent me the same forms I received with my previous reverse discrimination complaints that were blocked by the Canadian Human Rights Commission (CHRC) with simpleton drivel (see BACKGROUND below) the CHRC is obviously trying the same drivel they tried before. I address the issues below but point out that I sent the CHRC many documents that show the CHRC actions violate many points in their own documents and many laws, raised issues of CHRC misconduct and incompetence and evidence tampering, raised many questions of law and interpretation (which the CHRC cannot decide (Hérolt v. Canada Revenue Agency, 2011 FC 544), only a Tribunal can) and want to question and showed the unconstitutionality of the Employment Equity Act and preferences (again, which the CHRC cannot decide).

3. I have attached some of my documents sent to the CHRC, Documents A, B and C. These explain my points in detail. I have also attached a page from the paper document of the CHRC document GUIDE TO SCREENING AND SELECTION IN EMPLOYMENT, heading "SPECIAL PROGRAMS AND EMPLOYMENT EQUITY" as Document D. The indicated quote directly contradicts what the CHRC people say and is discussed in my attached documents.

4. With my attached documents I have used blunt ridiculing words. These are only a few of many documents I sent to the CHRC and I tire of trying to explain simple points to people who seem incapable of understanding the basic simple concepts (like limits, merit, individual rights, no preferences, no quotas, no reverse discrimination, criminal code), or what the limits are, or how to apply the limits in varying situations, and obviously do not understand the legal concepts involved. There is also some repetition in the documents; I keep trying to explain these points over and over, as I know with some people points have to be repeated.

VERY EASY

5. I point out that the handling of these complaints is actually very easy; they should be referred to the RCMP (the area that handles Public Official Corruption) or a Tribunal. There are corruption issues here (conspiracy of rigging government jobs, twisting the merit system, influencing offices), and, at the least I raise many questions of law and want to question the unconstitutionality of the Employment Equity Act and preferences. Questions of law and unconstitutionality cannot be decided by the CHRC (Herold case) or anyone at this level, this is

a Tribunal issue. Therefore, these complaints should be referred.

6. I also point out that if the CHRC cannot decide a question of law, or the constitutionality issue, then neither can this investigator. Which again shows the complaints should be referred.

7. All I require is someone with the intellectual ability and knowledge to understand the many points in my documents. These clearly are too complicated for CHRC people.

WHAT IS REALLY GOING ON

8. What is really going on here is a scheme to manipulate the merit system, influence public offices and rig government jobs. And a scheme to get votes and kickbacks from the beneficiaries and funnel government money. And, a scheme to protect the schemes. I suggest you read paragraphs 4 and 48 of my November 14, 2013 (attached Document C) as many times as it takes to get through to you.

9. And, a scheme to steal jobs, which is money, from better qualified people. I point out that the reaction of the Canadian Human Rights Commission (CHRC) to these complaints shows they really are thieves who want to steal from people. I used to wonder if they were thieves or too dumb to think that far, now I know they are thieves. And they obviously do not care about their victims. And, they are trying some silly nonsense to avoid compensating people. This is ridiculous. Who do these thieves think they are? And, this is Canada, not some third world country, you do not steal from people. And if you take something from someone, or infringe on their rights, you compensate people.

10. As I said in my documents "THIS IS A CORRUPTION SCAM BEING PERPETRATED ON THE CANADIAN PEOPLE TO DEFRAUD THE PEOPLE OF AN HONEST, MERITORIOUS CIVIL SERVICE.". This is corruption and election rigging. There are criminal laws to protect the Canadian people from politicians and civil servants who try to manipulate the merit system. Laws with severe penalties, like 14 years in jail and removal from office and barred from office. I point out an 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."

11. Again, all I require is someone with the intellectual ability and knowledge to understand my points. Hello, hello, is there any one with a brain out there?

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

BACKGROUND

13. I recently made multiple reverse discrimination complaints and these were blocked with simpleton level, ridiculous, laughable drivel. The file numbers are in my attached November 14, 2013 document (Document C).

14. With these complaints, the CHRC first said I was complaining about Special Programs and Employment Equity and this did not violate the CHR Act. My response was to point out the section of CHRC documents that has the heading of “Special Programs and Employment Equity” (attached Document D and also on a webpage) which clearly shows the simple point of limits, and many quotes from their own documents and webpages (Guide, Myths, merit, etc.), and laws. These are explained in my attached Document A (August 26, 2013) and Document B (October 11, 2013). I have removed the respondent name from these documents. **These points directly contradict the CHRC blocking drive!** The CHRC people do not seem intellectually capable of understanding the simple concept of limits.

15. They are also trying to twist the law to steal from people. I point out if they twist the law, anyone can twist the law to do anything, very dangerous.

16. Then the CHRC said the Canadian Human Rights Tribunal cannot order the cessation of complying with the Employment Equity Act and mentioned abiding by the Employment Equity Act. My response was, from my November 14, 2013 document (Document C): “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. 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.”

17. Document C also shows that the CHRC has committed a Breach of Natural Justice with the previous complaints, despite my pointing this out in my documents and their letter of April 15, 2013, attached. This shows their incompetence and lack of even basic knowledge and poor reading skills.

18. And, in my documents I pointed out the CHRC documents say “without regard to race ... sex”. And, the Auditor-General has said government jobs go to the best qualified, merit (true untwisted merit).

19. Again, I point out that manipulation of the merit system brings up the criminal code and election rigging laws. This brings up an issue of interpretation. And, if these people can manipulate merit and have their scheme anyone can have any scheme.

20. And, the simple point here is what suddenly Employment Equity means preferences and barring people from jobs and quotas, and twisting merit, when the CHRC documents say the

opposite? What are these people trying to pull here and who are they trying to fool? It is obvious that there is a conspiracy going on trying to twist laws to steal from people.

21. I point out that when you displace, pass over or bar people from jobs you have cost the victims at the least a loss of opportunity, and some a job. And quotas result in lower standards and stealing jobs from better qualified people, which is why quotas are banned.

22. I also point out that using representative numbers, which are wrong and low (as they are self-identified), to displace, pass over and bar people from jobs is absurd and violates the CHRC document indicated quote at the bottom of the page in the attached Document D. It is also a violation of U.S. civil rights law, 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.

23. I also point out that preferences have to be very explicit and specific, not what is going on here, some thieves trying to twist laws to steal from people.

24. I also point out it is the modus operandi of corrupt politicians to appoint simpletons and advocates to promote and protect their election rigging and criminal conspiracy schemes.

25. I also point out that it is the modus operandi of people caught with misconduct to try to find malleable people to help cover up their misconduct. Just a comment, this may be you, the investigator?

YOUR QUESTIONS:

1. Are there facts that suggest that the alleged conduct is covered by one or more of the discriminatory practices described in sections 5 to 14.1 of the Act? If so, what are these facts?

26. With STEALING, the CHRC is counselling the actions, this is a violation of Section 12 (incites or is calculated to incite others to discriminate), and with BLOCKING, the CHRC is blocking reverse discrimination complaints, Section 5.

27. The issue is that better qualified people are displaced, passed over and/or barred from jobs, in other words preferences, reverse discrimination, race and gender quotas and stealing jobs from people. The actions of the CHRC clearly violate their own documents, which shows alleged conduct covered.

28. The CHRC has admitted they are counselling such in my reverse discrimination complaints above and their blocking my complaints shows they are blocking complaints. These are facts that show they are doing the actions.

29. I also provided a webpage as evidence, but point out this was deleted. This is an admission of guilt.

30. With BLOCKING, their blocking my complaints by saying this is Employment Equity and Special Programs is also an admission that they are using race and sex in employment in violation of sections 7, 8, 10 and 12. They are trying to say this is Employment Equity and Special Programs but they have admitted such. My documents show this wrong, but again they have admitted such. And, this brings up a question of law, which the CHRC cannot decide.

2. Are there facts that link the alleged conduct to one or more of the grounds of discrimination listed in section 3 the Act? If so, what are those facts?

31. With STEALING, the counselling is based on race and sex and with BLOCKING, the blocking is based on race and sex. This affects men (including Aboriginal and minority men), whites and white men.

3. Does the complainant have reasonable grounds to believe that the respondent's conduct is discriminatory under the Act? If so, what are these reasonable grounds? Note that "reasonable grounds" require more than just a statement (a bald assertion) that the conduct is discriminatory.

32. We all know what is going on here, they have preferences for women and minorities.

33. Again, the CHRC has admitted the actions in my previous reverse discrimination complaints. This is reasonable grounds.

34. With "discriminatory under the Act", the CHRC is wrong and I have raised many questions of law in my attached documents. This is too complicated for the CHRC people but that is their problem.

35. They are violating their OWN DOCUMENTS and many, many, many points, see the attached documents. This is laughable. These documents also show the proper implementation of Employment Equity and Special Programs, they show the limits. They also show the limits of CHRA Section 16 and any other law (Public Service Act, etc.) the thieves might twist.

36. Also, their own documents say "violates the Canadian Human Rights Act", see Document A, paragraphs 61 – 63. This means these actions violate the Canadian Human Rights Act, which shows the CHRC is wrong.

37. I have also shown the unconstitutionality of the Employment Equity Act and the unconstitutionality of preferences and want to question the unconstitutionality of such. Again, this shows the complaints should be referred to a Tribunal.

38. I pointed out many times that government hiring is to be on merit (the "without regard" to race, sex) and any civil servant or politician that does not know that is incompetent. The actions violate the merit system, the basic premise with rights, the thieves are trying to twist merit to steal from people.

39. Even if you accept the position of the CHRC with the complaints:

- a. I have raised the issue of the CHRC doing their actions properly and misconduct, they violate their own documents, webpages and other laws, and this raises a question of law,
- b. I have also raised multiple questions of interpretation (Bill of rights, merit, individual rights, no preferences, no quotas, no reverse discrimination, no passing over better qualified people, no barring from jobs, criminal code), which raises multiple questions of law,
- c. CHRA Section 49(5) mentions "If the complaint involves a question about ... a regulation made under another Act" which these complaints bring up, this raises a question of law, and the Tribunal member must be a member of a bar, and
- d. If those are not enough I have shown the unconstitutionality of the Employment Equity Act and the unconstitutionality of preferences, which means I want to question the unconstitutionality of the Employment Equity Act and any law, regulation or action that includes or even implies preferences.

40. The CHRC, or any investigator, cannot decide these issues (Herold case), and these complaints should be referred. The Herold case quote is "[34] Second, the Commission is not an adjudicative body and does not draw any legal conclusions."

41. I also want to raise the issue of public endangerment with lowered standards and with race and gender quotas with jobs that require strength and stamina and jobs where people are given guns.

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. And, I want to protect the merit system with government hiring from corrupt and election rigging crimes by politicians and civil servants.

44. Again, these complaints should be referred beyond the CHRC.

45. 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 they are doing, stealing jobs from better qualified white men. That they do not seem to have the intellect to understand that is their problem. The CHRC is promoting denying jobs to white able bodied males with superior qualifications and men and this quote shows this action is not Employment Equity and Special Programs, it is beyond the limits.

46. I point out that the respondent should be identifying victims and compensating them, this is Canada not some third world country, if you take jobs from people you compensate them. And, ALL CANADIANS HAVE RIGHTS, no special rights for some and no, no rights for some.

LYING, MISREPRESENTATION

47. I also point out that I have caught the Canadian Human Rights Commission lying. They have either lied in their documents and webpages (see my documents where there are many quotes from their own documents and webpages showing the CHRC is not to do what they are doing) or they are lying in their blocking complaints documents. Either way there at the least is misrepresentation. The points I mentioned (again from their own documents and webpages) directly contradict what they say in their blocking documents, therefore they are either lying in their explanatory documents or in their blocking documents.

DELETED EVIDENCE

48. After I made my complaints the CHRC deleted the webpages I quoted from that show they are not to do what they are doing. These webpages were deleted around May 2013.

49. I point out this is destroying evidence and shows I am right and they know they are wrong and are just trying to block my complaints.

50. Deleting evidence is a serious issue.

51. And they will not answer my repeated questions for an explanation. This raises the issue of a cover up and that they know they are wrong. This also raises the points of evidence tampering and trying to influence a complaint.

INVESTIGATION

52. I point out, from the CODE OF CONDUCT FOR MEMBERS OF THE CANADIAN HUMAN RIGHTS TRIBUNAL (the same principles should apply to the investigator):

7. Preferential Treatment

Members shall not use their position of office to assist private entities or persons where this would result in preferential treatment to any persons by the Tribunal. In particular, Members shall not assist private entities or persons in their dealings on human rights or employment equity issues where this would result in preferential treatment to any person by the Tribunal, the Commission or the Minister.

19. Independence and Impartiality

A Member:

- a) shall be independent and impartial, shall act in a fair manner and shall avoid creating an appearance or an apprehension of bias;
- b) shall not be influenced by self-interest, outside pressure, political consideration, public clamour, loyalty to a political party or fear of criticism;
- c) shall not use Member's position on the Tribunal to advance any personal or private interests. A Member shall avoid actions that may create the impression that others are in a special position to influence the Member;

MY QUESTIONS

53. I have asked these questions in my documents and they have not been answered. I want answers from the CHRC to the following:

1. I want an explanation as to why the CHRC webpages that I quoted from (that show their blocking 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 (summary).
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.
5. I also want to know the people that have had reverse discrimination complaints blocked by the CHRC. Either send me their contact information or send my contact information to them (email: bceminchuk@yahoo.com).

CONCLUSION

54. I remind all of you that you work for the people of Canada, not two-bit politicians or civil servants trying to steal and influence offices. Government hiring is to be based on merit (best without regard to race, sex) and any politician or civil servant that tries to manipulate the merit system should be prosecuted.

55. And, whites, men and white men have rights, the CHRA in Section 2 says "individuals". They are trying to remove rights.

56. With the politicians that think they are smart with this scheme; that some politician will use government jobs to be a hero to special interest groups trying to get special treatment and steal jobs for themselves is inexcusable. I also point out that the people involved with this job rigging scheme are aiding and abetting the actions and have made themselves political operatives. If government jobs are pawns that can be manipulated by politicians and civil servants then anyone or any political party can manipulate and use them, including using your job. Absurd.

57. Again, this is very easy, my complaints should be referred to the RCMP or a Tribunal, I have raised many issues that cannot be decided at the CHRC level.

Date: February 17, 2014

Barry Ceminchuk