

June 27, 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. This is in response to the letters of June 5, 2014 from the investigator and the attached documents from the Canadian Human Rights Commission (CHRC) of May 28, 2014.
2. I have covered both complaints in the following as the information applies to both. More information on each specific complaint was provided in my June 3, 2014 document. The complaints are against the same Respondent (the Canadian Human Rights Commission) and are related.
3. 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.
4. These people 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.

OUT OF SYNC

5. With these complaints the documents are out of sync. This document is replying to CHRC documents of May 28, 2014. My last submission was June 3, 2014 and was written before I received the May 28, 2014 documents. The May 28 documents were sent on June 5, 2014 and received by me on June 10.
6. I will respond to the May 28 documents below, but I reserve the right to respond to the next CHRC documents due July 4, 2014. There are many points to be addressed in my June 3, 2014 document.
7. I do understand that my documents raise many issues that are simply too complicated for the CHRC staff. This is your problem. If these points are too much for you then get better and smarter people. I tire of having to repeat simple points over and over and having my points and issues and questions ignored.

OBJECT TO REPORTS

8. I object to the reports by the investigator, they are incomplete and inadequate. I sent the investigator a lot of information including 36 pages with my letter of February 17, 2014 plus 10 pages in my June 3, 2014 document. These are not explained properly in the reports.
9. I answered the questions on the CHRC forms in detail, see my February 17, 2014 letter,

pages 4 to 6, heading "YOUR QUESTIONS:", with further explanations in my letter of June 3, 2014, pages 2 to 6, headings "STEALING COMPLAINT", "BLOCKING COMPLAINT" and "BOTH COMPLAINTS".

10. I also showed many violations of law using pages and pages of quotes from the CHRC's own documents, and showed the limits (merit, individual rights, no reverse discrimination, no preferences, no quotas, criminal code), raised multiple questions of law, and showed the unconstitutionality of the Employment Equity Act and preferences, and issues that only a Tribunal can decide. And I again point out that with the simpleton Employment Equity statement (see June 3 document heading CRUX), which involves the Employment Equity Act (and Bill of Rights, etc.) and any section, regulation or action, Section 49.5 requires a Tribunal member and a member of the bar. These were not mentioned in the Reports.

11. I also pointed out the CHRC complaint assessment procedures are incomplete in that they do not handle the CHRA Section 12 complaints and do not cover the many issues I raised.

12. I did ask the investigator by email to send me the CHRC complaint assessment procedures, or to ask the CHRC to send them to me, but was told to use the Access To Information process. The procedures are relevant as the reports do not include information asked for by the procedures (i.e. Questions), and because the CHRC's own documents contradict the reports. The procedures are also relevant because they are obviously incomplete in that they do not handle the many issues I raised.

13. I also provided extensive detailed information that showed the CHRC is not to do what they are doing, including pages and pages of quotes from the CHRC's own documents, along with many other points and issues.

14. I also point out that my detailed information shows the CHRC's own documents contradict the reports and show the CHRC is not to do what they are doing.

15. These points were not adequately covered in the Reports.

CHRC MAY 28, 2014 DOCUMENTS

16. I assume the writer is a woman. She should say that she is trying to steal jobs from better qualified men. I keep wondering if the CHRC people are thieves trying to steal jobs from people or too dumb to realize what they are doing.

CHRC HIDING WHAT THEY ARE DOING

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 people to do the actions (i.e. stealing) and a policy of blocking complaints about the actions (i.e. blocking).

18. The CHRC is the Respondent in these Complaints, this is a legal proceeding, they should be forthcoming and tell the truth. They cannot hide what they are doing. What is going on here? Say what you are doing.

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.

20. They are also not saying that they are telling people to steal jobs from better qualified

men, whites and white men, which is taking money from them and a denial of employment and in some situations a loss of opportunity.

21. I also repeat my points from my June 3, 2014 document:

19. I also thought the CHRC would admit what they are really doing and I accuse them of misleading the investigator by not admitting what they are doing. ... If the CHRC denies this I suggest the Investigator use his power under CHRA Section 43 to get the information. And if the Investigator will not do this I want time to issue interrogatories to the CHRC and get the evidence.

and

29. Again, the CHRC should say what they are really doing. If the CHRC denies this I suggest the Investigator use CHRA Section 43 to get the information. And if the Investigator will not do this I want time to issue interrogatories to the CHRC and get the evidence.

22. And, the CHRC has to be told that they work for the people of Canada, you tell the people what you are doing. You are just a bunch of civil servants. Smarten up.

23. I also point out that the CHRC is hiding what they do and ignoring the simple point that their own explanatory documents show they are not to do what they are doing.

REASONABLE GROUNDS

24. The CHRC May 28 documents mention reasonable grounds. I point out that if the CHRC would say what they are really doing it would show reasonable grounds (see previous heading).

25. Also, The CHRC complaint information has a question that mentions reasonable grounds and I addressed this in detail in my June 3 document (Page 4, near bottom of page, question 3) which repeats information from my February 17, 2014 document and explains further. These points show reasonable grounds.

26. The investigator should have explained my position in more detail, again the Reports are inadequate. If the information was inadequate he should have asked for more information.

27. I also point out that the CHRC mentioning reasonable grounds shows that the simpleton Employment Equity statement (see CRUX heading in my June 3 document) is a false issue. They are looking for reasonable grounds saying that if I provide reasonable grounds, which I did, the complaints will proceed.

BALD ASSERTIONS

28. The CHRC mentions bald assertions. My points in my March 15, 2014 document should be understood by some one with basic reading and thinking skills. They show what the complaints are about. I also explained my points further in my documents of February 17, 2014 and June 3, 2014, they provided further supporting information and evidence, including evidence from previous complaints. Again, the CHRC should say what they are really doing (see heading CHRC HIDING WHAT THEY ARE DOING above). If they say what they are doing this would not be an issue. Also see paragraph 31 below.

ISSUES NOT IN COMPLAINT FORM

29. The CHRC mentions that my documents written after the March 15, 2013 documents

have more points and information. The March document was written more than a year ago and as I said in my June 3 document paragraph 7, I have more information.

30. I now have information from my previous complaints. These show the policies and the actions of blocking. The file numbers have been mentioned in multiple documents but again are #20130100, #20130101, #20130102, #20130103, and #20130104. There are dates with these and these again, show the actions and policies. They also show the actions being done to me.

31. I also point out that this is also a false issue, a complainant is only expected to have the knowledge of the general public, and it is the job of Commission people to understand the sections of the CHRA and how to apply them to the complaint.

32. I also point out that I can add new information and respond to new information as I get the information. This is part of the normal course of proceedings. The CHRC should know this and this is actually laughable. When the CHRC handles complaints do they not get new information and respond to that? And, complaints can be amended.

33. And why was I not asked to add these points to the form?

34. I also ask where on the CHRC Form does someone indicate the other issues (unconstitutionality, Tribunal issues, etc.) and where is this explained? You cannot make up issues as you go along. Your procedures are inadequate as I explained in my documents (also see paragraphs 11 and 12 above). This is the fault of the CHRC.

35. And, if the CHRC would have been honest and forthcoming and said what they are really doing back then I would have responded then. So, if this is an issue, again the fault is with the CHRC.

36. And, CHRA Section 50 (1) mentions a full and ample opportunity to present evidence and make representations.

37. And, if the CHRC wants to play that game, all I would have to do is just make another complaint (did not think of that did you?).

38. The CHRC mentioning points in the March 15, 2013 Complaint form is just a trick trying to avoid the issues.

39. I also point out that CHRA Section 40(5)(b) mentions no particular individual.

40. I also assumed that I was dealing with honourable people that would follow their own documents. Again, I provided pages and pages of quotes from the CHRC's own documents that show they are not to do what they are doing.

41. I also assumed that I was dealing with honourable people that would admit what they are really doing. The CHRC is hiding what they are really doing and trying to divert the issues and ignoring their own documents.

42. I also assumed that I was dealing with honourable people that had the intellectual ability to understand the simple concept of limits as explained in their own documents.

43. I also assumed that I was dealing with honourable people that had the intellectual ability to understand you do not steal jobs from better qualified men, whites and white men. I was expecting the CHRC to say they are sorry and fix this.

44. I also assumed that I was dealing with honourable people that had the intellectual ability to understand corruption, influencing offices and criminal code issues.

45. I also assumed that I was dealing with honourable people that had the intellectual ability to understand endangering public safety issues.

46. I also assumed that I was dealing with honourable people that had the intellectual ability to understand the complaints are about the policies, not a single act of discrimination.

47. Again, I have to tell the CHRC people how to do their job properly. And, I tire of having to

explain these simple points to CHRC people, who are hiding what they are doing, and ignoring the simple point that their own documents contradict the reports and say they are not to do what they are doing.

48. As I said many times in my documents the real big picture issue here is the quality, intellect, knowledge and skill set of the CHRC people. Smarten up, you are stealing jobs from better qualified men, whites and white men and seem to be unable to think that far and understand that simple point.

UNCONSTITUTIONALITY

49. The document mentions unconstitutionality. As I said in my documents, to show the unconstitutionality:

With unconstitutionality, with the Employment Equity Act (EEA) and obviously any act, section, regulation or action:

1. 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.

2. Also, all Canadians have rights, no special rights for some, and no, no rights for some. The CHRC people are supposed to know this and protect the rights of all individuals.

3. Also, Canada is not some third world country; if civil servants or politicians take something from people they compensate people.

4. You are also supposed to warn people and allow them to object. Due process.

Other points:

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

6. Also, civil servants and politicians are to keep their hands off government jobs, government hiring is to be on the merit system. There are criminal code provisions to protect the Canadian people from people like you. This is in the public interest. And, any civil servant or politician that does not know this is incompetent and stupid or a thief and corrupt.

7. Also, influencing offices and the hiring brings up corruption and nuisance (again the criminal code) and election rigging. These have severe penalties.

8. And there is a public endangerment issue here with quotas and lowered standards.

TYPO

50. There is a typo in my document of June 3, 2014; paragraph 59, 8th line, "complaints with be blocked", "with" should be "will".

CONCLUSION

51. I again point out that the CHRC should say what they are really doing, this would show their policies and would cover the points in their documents and it would show reasonable grounds, etc. They should not be trying to hide their actions.

52. The point with the typo is worth repeating:

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?

53. I also point out that all Canadians have rights.

54. I also point out CHRA Section 65(1) says the CHRC is responsible for the actions of staff.

55. I also add to my June 3, document, with the TRIBUNAL heading, 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". A scan of this document is included in Document C (page C7) which was attached to my letter to the investigator of February 17, 2014 and is on my webpage. This shows a Breach of Natural Justice. Therefore, these complaints should be referred to a Tribunal.

56. I also 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.

57. I repeat, from my June 3 document:

69. 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.

70. If the CHRC will not say what they are really doing and if the Investigator will not get the information, I want time to issue interrogatories to the CHRC and get the evidence.

71. I also showed the CHRC complaint assessment procedures are incomplete and do not cover many issues.

72. 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.

73. 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.

58. Also, if any of my information is insufficient I should be asked to explain further.

59. 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.

60. Again, the documents are out of sync. I want to see the CHRC response to the many points in my June 3, 2014 document and I want to reply to them. I also want them to reply to the points in this document.

Barry Ceminchuk