

July 29, 2014

Kathleen Fawcett
Legal Advisor Canadian Human Rights Commission
344 Slater Street, 7th Floor, Ottawa, Ontario K1A 0T8

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

1. This is in response to the Canadian Human Rights Commission (CHRC) documents of June 23, 2014. The CHRC documents for both complaints are virtually identical, they have just changed a few words to indicate which complaint is being discussed, so I have handled both complaints below. I have also been told by the investigator, by email, that the CHRC won't be commenting on my submission of June 27.

2. I use the words STEALING and BLOCKING to communicate what is really going on as the CHRC does not seem to realize what they are actually doing. In blunt words, simpleton thieves are twisting Employment Equity to steal jobs from better qualified people and block complaints. 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 AND RIG ELECTIONS.

3. You are taking jobs, which is money, from decent hardworking men, whites and white men. Who do you civil servant CHRC people think you are? You are simpleton thieves. In my documents I said you should give up your job. As you have not, I point out that you are the people who do something to someone but do not want it done to you.

WHAT THE COMMISSION HAS ALLEGEDLY DONE

4. With "what the Commission has allegedly done", I have to ask do you not know how to read? Do you not understand the words "promoting", "counselling", "telling" or "incite". If not please get people with sufficient intellectual ability to understand common words. And people who know how to use a dictionary.

5. Again, as I said in my submissions, the CHRC is counselling reverse discrimination, preferences, displacing and barring people from jobs, based on race and sex, and is blocking complaints against these actions. This is very simple, or in other words you are inciting, CHRA Section 12. I cannot make it any simpler.

6. I point out the Canadian Human Rights Act (CHRA) Section 12 says:

- (a) expresses or implies discrimination or an intention to discriminate, or
- (b) incites or is calculated to incite others to discriminate

7. Notice (b), telling is counselling and inciting and calculated to incite others.

8. I have repeatedly pointed out that you have tried to ignore Section 12 and that your procedures are inadequate.

9. There is more in my June 3 and 27 documents and there are more CHRA sections mentioned (STEALING - 12, 10 (policies), 8, and BLOCKING - 5, 12, 10, and the violations of many quotes from CHRC documents, and see paragraph 19 below) but since you can only understand a simple point that is enough.

10. My documents explain my points sufficiently for any one with basic reading and thinking skills. Please get better and smarter staff. I should not have to explain points over and over. I explained what my complaints are about many times in my documents. My June 3, 2014 document goes into great detail in paragraphs 12 through 31, and there are multiple paragraphs in my June 27, 2014 document. The CHRC should also know that "counselling" is defined in the Canada Criminal Code Section 22(3) as "For the purposes of this Act, "counsel" includes procure, solicit or incite."".

11. I also point out that the Commission saying that I have not explained my points is laughable. First, again I provided extensive detailed documents with evidence, but also, it is the role of the CHRC to clarify complaints. Complainants are only expected to have the knowledge of the general public and the CHRC is supposed to help people clarify complaints. The CHRC should be asking for further information, not trying to ignore my points and evidence trying to block my complaints against them.

12. Again, I repeat, the CHRC should be asking me for more information and they are not doing that.

13. I also point out that I have repeatedly said the issues the CHRC raise would not be issues if the CHRC would say what they are really doing. The CHRC is trying to hide their actions by ignoring points and evidence. I have asked for the CHRC to say what they are doing and they are not. A Respondent hiding their actions indicates guilt.

14. From my June 27, 2014 document, "17. I POINT OUT THAT THE CHRC IS HIDING WHAT THEY DO. The CHRC is not saying they are telling people to displace, pass over and bar men, whites and white men from jobs and that they are blocking complaints about these actions. They should say what they are really doing. The CHRC should say they have a policy of telling (i.e. inciting) people to do the actions (i.e. stealing) and a policy of blocking complaints about the actions (i.e. blocking)."

15. And again, say that you want to steal jobs from better qualified people. Say what you are really doing.

16. Again, you are counselling reverse discrimination, preferences, displacing and barring people from jobs, based on race and sex, and blocking complaints against this. This is very simple, or in other words you are inciting, CHRA Section 12. Do you want me to explain

this in simpler words?

17. And, again, you are supposed to ask for further information if you do not understand.

18. I also point out that I covered similar issues in my previous complaints, for example I showed the RCMP had quotas and preferences and my detailed explanations were clear enough for that complaint.

19. And, the prima facie case is explained in my June 3, 2014 document:

For the STEALING Complaint, paragraphs 12 to 14, and
For the BLOCKING Complaint, paragraphs 23 to 28.

20. And, if you are going to try your laughable simpleton Employment Equity statement or Tribunal statements (see June 3, 2014 document, headings BACKGROUND and CRUX, paragraphs 32 through 54), I again point out CHRA Section 49.5 says this is beyond the CHRC, it requires a Tribunal and a member of a bar. And the many other points.

21. And, if you are going to try your simpleton "Tribunal cannot ..." statement (see June 3, 2014 document, paragraphs 34 to 35), besides the points in the paragraphs, I point out that this is the CHRC deciding the results of a Tribunal Inquiry, which is assuming the results of a hearing and a determination of multiple questions of law, including unconstitutionality, that are clearly beyond the CHRC. This is also absurd

22. Again, you are trying to hide what you are doing. Hiding what you are doing is at least misleading with a legal proceeding. It also indicates guilt, what are you hiding? Why not refer this to a Tribunal if you think you are so smart.

EVIDENCE TAMPERING

23. With evidence tampering, the CHRC has deleted webpages that I quoted from and used as evidence in my submissions. These web pages were deleted after I made my complaints and I have repeatedly asked for an explanation and the CHRC has ignored my questions. My research says evidence tampering includes "alters, conceals, falsifies, or destroys any record, document, or tangible object with the intent to interfere with an investigation, possible investigation, or other proceeding."

24. The CHRC might deny this but the CHRC deleted the web pages. At the least the CHRC concealed the webpages.

25. This is serious.

26. Irregularities with a complaint, especially when the actions are by the Respondent and when the Respondent is the Canadian Human Rights Commission itself, is alone, enough to refer the complaints to a Tribunal.

27. Blocking my complaints also looks like an attempt to cover up the irregularities.

28. I also point out that deleting evidence and webpages I quoted from that clearly contradict the reports and show the limits, etc. shows the CHRC admitting guilt that either their webpages were wrong or their blocking my complaints are wrong. Either way, the CHRC is guilty of one or the other.

29. Any person with thinking skills would infer that when a party deletes evidence, or conceals or destroys such that they are doing so to hide something. Trying to hide something infers guilt.

CHRC ADMISSION

30. With the CHRC admission, the CHRC has admitted the actions by both words and actions. The evidence I provided quoting the WORDS from the CHRC staff member, and the WORDS used by the CHRC in the ACTIONS on my previous complaints, shows what is really going on, which shows the CHRC is actually DOING THE ACTIONS, which is an admission by the words and actions of CHRC staff.

31. The CHRC may be trying to ignore the evidence but anyone with basic thinking skills sees the words and actions showing what the CHRC is really doing, which is an admission.

32. To explain further, I provided evidence of the CHRC counselling (telling, inciting), including what was said to me ("won't get anywhere" is saying actions are acceptable) and information from my previous complaints (June 3, 2014 document, paragraphs 19 and 26) that showed a job title and that the CHRC is saying the actions are acceptable by blocking my complaints. The CHRC is trying to ignore this evidence.

33. My previous complaints that were blocked (see June 27, 2014 document paragraph 30) shows that the CHRC is saying the preference and quota actions in the previous complaints are acceptable, and therefore this is proof that the CHRC is saying these actions are acceptable, which is the CHRC promoting, telling, counselling and inciting the actions. This requires the intellectual ability to understand logic and put multiple thoughts together. In mathematical terms, this is indicated by $A=B=C$. My previous complaints also are proof that the CHRC is blocking complaints regardless of facts and that the CHRC ignores the limits (merit, individual rights, no reverse discrimination, no preferences, no quotas, criminal code, corruption, election rigging, public endangerment), explained in the CHRC's own documents and the many other points.

34. Again, this is the CHRC admitting that they are counselling the actions by their actions with my previous complaints. They have explicitly approved the actions by blocking my cases, this is the same as saying the actions are okay, which is counselling the actions.

35. The above is sufficient to show that the CHRC might be doing what I am alleging (actually I am accusing). Have I explained it enough times?

36. I again also point out that the CHRC is hiding what they are really doing obviously trying to avoid saying that they really are thieves who want to steal jobs and money from decent hardworking Canadians.

37. Also, I accuse the Canadian Human Rights Commission of at the least misleading conduct and at the most making false statements in this legal proceeding by hiding what they are doing. Also, see misleading, June 3 document, paragraph 19 and June 27 document, paragraph 19. This is serious.

38. Also, that there are direct contradictions between what the CHRC does and their own documents (deleted webpages and current webpages) **SHOWS AT THE LEAST THAT THE CHRC DOES NOT KNOW WHAT THEY ARE DOING**. This shows these complaints should go to a Tribunal. If the CHRC does not know and contradicts themselves, then there at least is a question that either way the CHRC is at least wrong in one way.

BREACH OF NATURAL JUSTICE

39. The CHRC can say whatever they want, however the CHRC should know they cannot judge themselves. Again, from my June 3, 2014 document, paragraph 61, “In the same area, I question whether the Commission can act on these complaints as they are the Respondent. This brings up a Breach of Natural Justice (CHR Act, Section 48.9 (1) mentions “natural justice and the rules of procedure.”). Natural justice means a party is not to be involved with actions that are against them, they cannot judge themselves or take actions to protect themselves. Again, this should go directly to a Tribunal, the Tribunal is supposed to be a separate neutral body. This is a big point that I want addressed. Again, what is the problem?”

40. Also see my Document C, on my webpage, heading Breach of Natural Justice, paragraphs 13 to 26.

41. Also, “One form of imputed bias is based on the decision-maker being a party to a suit, or having a pecuniary or proprietary interest in the outcome of the decision. Once this fact has been established, the bias is irrebuttable and disqualification is automatic – the decision-maker will be barred from adjudicating the matter without the need for any investigation into the likelihood or suspicion of bias.” From:

http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Natural_justice#In_general_2

42. As mentioned in my documents, the document sent to me by the CHRC, dated Apr 15, 2013, by Jamie Masters, says “the Commission should not review complaints filed against it”. This shows a Breach of Natural Justice. Therefore, these complaints should be referred to a Tribunal.

43. That the CHRC does not know this is ridiculous. The CHRC cannot judge their own actions.

RAISING QUESTIONS OF LAW AND UNCONSTITUTIONALITY OF EMPLOYMENT EQUITY ACT

44. Both these points are beyond the CHRC and show the complaints should be referred to a Tribunal. That the CHRC does not understand the points and is saying I did not give enough information are actually a question of law and a question of fact, that is whether the information I provided shows a violation of law, and a question of fact, whether the information I provided is sufficient.

45. The many questions of law I raised also are beyond the CHRC in that the CHRC cannot decide the issues, see June 3, 2014 document, paragraph 63 and Herod case. I also raised the question of wilful and reckless conduct by the CHRC (June 3, document paragraph 64) which is a Tribunal issue.

46. Also see my Document C, on my webpage, heading Question of Law and Fact, paragraphs 27 to 39.

47. Again, with the complainant explaining the complaint, see heading WHAT THE COMMISSION HAS ALLEGEDLY DONE above and this is just really the CHRC trying to avoid their actions being investigated by a Tribunal. Again, what are you afraid of (see June 3, 2014 document, paragraph 58)? And, trying to avoid being investigated and hiding what you do and not saying what you are really doing leads to the inference, by people with basic thinking skills, of guilt.

48. With the unconstitutionality point, this is explained in detail in my June 27, 2014 document, paragraph 49. If you had any honour and cared about the rule of law, and obviously were not trying to steal jobs from people, you would agree with me and stop your stealing actions. That you are trying to avoid the issue shows what you really are, thieves trying to steal jobs and money from better qualified people. And, again, the CHRC cannot decide this. Again, this shows the complaints should go to a Tribunal, this is sufficient, I provided extensive information, and it is beyond the CHRC to decide these issues.

49. The CHRC is also trying to ignore the “public” (CHRA Section 12), and the public interest (government hiring) and public endangerment issues.

50. Quit trying to avoid the issues so you can block my complaints and continue to steal jobs from decent hardworking Canadians.

RCMP REFERRAL

51. With the CHRC saying there is no section of the Act that would allow referring a complaint of this type to the RCMP, see CHRA Section 44(2)(b):

44. (2) (b) that the complaint could more appropriately be dealt with, initially or completely, by means of a procedure provided for under an Act of Parliament other than this Act, it shall refer the complainant to the appropriate authority.

52. Notice “it shall refer the complaint to the appropriate authority”, “it” is the Commission.

53. You are wrong. Please have the intellectual integrity to admit when you are wrong.

ENOUGH INFORMATION

54. Again this is covered above and you should be asking for more information, not trying silly drivel to avoid the issues and hide what you are really doing.

INFORMATION FOR COMPLAINANT

55. As you are playing this silly game trying to hide what you are doing and as I said in my documents I want to issue interrogatories, I want you to send me the CHRC complaint processing procedures and the procedures explaining what the CHRC tells government departments etc. regarding Special Programs and Employment Equity, especially but not limited to screening and selection in employment. And not only the procedures but the staff training documents. This information should include and indicate additions and deletions and changes by dates.

56. Treat this as evidence for a legal proceeding, existing or proposed.

57. Depending on what is in these documents I may have detailed questions.

58. If you are going to hide what you are really doing, then send me your procedures and training information as evidence.

59. I also mention I do not trust the CHRC. They have previously deleted web pages and evidence and I am concerned they will delete sections of their procedures that make my case. If I get the information and they know it is “evidence” they may be more careful and send me the proper, complete information.

MISLEADING STATEMENTS IN THIS LEGAL PROCEEDING

60. I accuse (not allege) the Canadian Human Rights Commission of at the least making misleading statements in this legal proceeding. This is serious.

61. I again point out that CHRC is hiding what they are doing; they are playing some silly word game to avoid saying what they are doing. This is a LEGAL PROCEEDING and as I said in my June 3 2014 document, paragraph 19, “I accuse them of misleading the investigator by not admitting what they are doing.” The “them” is the CHRC. And in my June 27, 2014 document “19. I accuse the CHRC of intentionally omitting information from their submission and thereby causing the submission to be misleading, and intentionally concealing a material fact, thereby creating a false impression.” I also discussed this in my June 27, 2014 document heading “CHRC HIDING WHAT THEY ARE DOING”. Misleading statements could bring up obstruction of justice, criminal code section 139(2).

62. Say what you are doing, you are just a bunch of civil servants that work for the Canadian people, you do not get to hide what you do. Smarten up. And, what are you really hiding? Some arrangement to funnel government jobs to your politician pals and special interest group pals?

63. You are ignoring the many points in my documents (February 17, 2014 (36 pages) plus June 3, 2014 (10 pages) plus June 27, 2014 (7 pages)) that shows many violations of law and includes quotes from the CHRC's own documents. This again is misleading.

64. Also, again does the CHRC not understand that their role is to deal with the public and clarify complaints and handle the legal technicalities? A complainant is only expected to have the knowledge of the general public and if the complaints are not properly explained then the CHRC is supposed to help clarify the issues. The CHRC is not to try to ignore simple, clear information and evidence and then try to block complaints. Again, I have to tell you people how to do your job. This is laughable, if my information is deficient then you should be asking for clarification, again not just trying to ignore simple points to block the complaints.

65. Not asking me for more information and ignoring the evidence I provided is misleading and raising a false issue, which at the least is misleading.

66. I get the impression that as I have covered all the points in detail and shown the CHRC that they should not to do what they are doing, that they are just trying to ignore my points to continue stealing jobs from better qualified people.

QUESTIONS

67. As mentioned in my June 27, 2014 document, paragraph 56, I want to know which special interest groups and "Equity seeking groups" the CHRC is involved with and friendly with, so I can see which groups the CHRC is trying to funnel government jobs to.

68. And, tell me all politicians involved with this funnel government jobs scheme?

69. I also ask if you, and any CHRC staff involved with these complaints, or any of your friends or relatives benefit from the preferences and job stealing actions, or if you are involved with any political party (other than small donations), or interest groups trying to steal jobs for themselves, or any other situation that could be considered a conflict of interest?

CONCLUSION

70. I again mention I explained my complaints at a level that any one with basic reading and thinking skills should understand. And, if there is not enough information, the CHRC should ask for more information, not try to block the complaints. The CHRC is supposed to be used to dealing with the general public and should know this.

71. I again mention the many points in my many documents, especially the June 3, and June 27, 2014 documents. I should not have to go this effort and have to explain my points over and over.

72. I again point out that the CHRC should say what they are really doing, this would show their policies and would cover many of the points in their documents. They should not be trying to hide their actions in a legal proceeding where they are the Respondent.

73. From both my June documents, paragraphs 52 and 59:

I provided many quotes from the CHRC's own documents (merit, limits, individual rights, no reverse discrimination, no preferences, no quotas), raised many questions of law and issues (criminal code, public endangerment), and showed the unconstitutionality of preferences and the Employment Equity Act and the CHRC has blocked my previous complaints saying I am complaining about Employment Equity. I have repeatedly pointed out, with lengthy, detailed explanations, that this is simpleton level and ridiculous. I also point out that the documents sent to me from the CHRC discuss the parameters for complaints and no where mention that complaints will be blocked in the way they are blocking them (this is a big point and shows there is something funny going on here). Nor does it say that on the CHRC webpages that were deleted after I made my complaints, and in fact the webpages, deleted and current, say the exact opposite (do not discriminate against anyone, limits, etc.). Such contradictions show this should go to a Tribunal. Again, what is the problem?

74. This again shows the contradictions, which shows the CHRC incompetence and THAT THE CHRC DOES NOT KNOW WHAT IT IS DOING. These contradictions alone show the complaints should be referred to a Tribunal.

75. Also, I showed the unconstitutionality of preferences and the Employment Equity Act and this is beyond the CHRC, they cannot decide this, and again shows the complaints should be referred to a Tribunal.

76. I also point out that politicians and civil servants are to keep their hands off government jobs, this brings up corruption crimes and election rigging crimes which have severe penalties (removed from office, barred from office and thrown in jail). From a document of mine, "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."

77. The complaints should be referred to the RCMP or a Tribunal for the many reasons above.

78. And again, the CHRC cannot judge their own actions. That this is a question is absurd.

79. I also remind you that you work for the people of Canada. Not special interest groups

trying to steal jobs for themselves or politicians trying to funnel government jobs.

80. I also remind you that all Canadians have rights and you are not protecting individual rights and the rights of men, whites and white men. A quote from a CHRC document "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.

81. I also point out I have rights and do not accept two-bit civil servants and/or politicians trampling on them and giving them away. I want these people prosecuted.

82. I also again point out that you are stealing jobs and money from decent hardworking Canadians. If you take jobs and opportunities you should compensate people. Canada is not some third world country.

83. Based on the many points above, these complaints are not frivolous. At the least there are questions and a chance that the respondent is doing what I accuse them of. I have also shown a violation of the act using the quotes from the CHRC own documents (if they violate the quotes, they violate the act), and many other points.

84. As the CHRC will not say what they are really doing I have asked to get the CHRC procedures and staff training information.

85. I also raised many issues that show the complaints should be referred to a Tribunal, and I want to question the unconstitutionality of preferences and the Employment Equity Act, which again means they are not frivolous.

86. The simpleton thieves are twisting Employment Equity to steal jobs from better qualified people (the quotes from their own documents show this) and I am also calling them on this. There is a public interest issue here.

87. I also point out that the CHRC obviously wants to steal jobs from decent hard working Canadians, men, whites and white men, therefore they really are thieves. If they were not thieves they would say they are sorry and try to fix this. They are not doing that, therefore they are willful thieves and do not care about their victims.

88. I also point out that if these people can steal jobs from people, any one can steal jobs, including their jobs.

89. For the zillionth time, I point out that the CHRC's own documents contradict the Reports and show the CHRC is not to do what they are doing. Either way, the CHRC has got at least one thing wrong.

Barry Ceminchuk