

June 3, 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). The complaints are against the same Respondent (the Canadian Human Rights Commission (CHRC)) and are related.
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.
3. This document is my response to the Section 40/41 Reports, dated May 5, 2014.
4. 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.

MY COMPLAINTS

5. I sent lengthy detailed information to the Investigator that included an 8 page letter to him, with 4 attached documents totalling 28 pages. These explained many points and raised many issues. I want this included as evidence with these complaints and as they exceed the 10 page limit I have uploaded them (with names removed) to a website I am not currently using, they are at:

WWW.INTERNETHEX.COM/chrc

Contact email is: bceminchuk@yahoo.com

6. I also want my documents of March 15, 2013 that were sent to me in the letter from the Investigator dated January 8, 2014, included as evidence.
7. I also made multiple previous complaints (see heading BACKGROUND) and have a lot more information now than I did when I wrote the March 15, 2013 document.
8. The Reports do not adequately explain my position and do not discuss the many issues I raised. I provided many quotes from the CHRC's own documents (merit, limits, individual rights, no reverse discrimination, no preferences, no quotas) that show the CHRC is not to do what they are doing which shows a violation of the act, raised multiple questions of law and issues (criminal code, corruption, public endangerment), and showed the unconstitutionality of preferences and the Employment Equity Act, and these are not addressed in the Reports. I also raised many points that show these complaints should be referred to a Tribunal (see heading TRIBUNAL below).
9. I do however not blame the Investigator, he seems to be trying to conscientiously and objectively follow the parameters given to him by the CHRC. The problem is the CHRC parameters do not cover many of the issues I raised and the questions of law and the unconstitutionality issue, and they do not handle Section 12 complaints (which mentions "the public"). These points show the CHRC procedures are inadequate, they should cover these

areas. Therefore, the Reports are incomplete.

10. And, they are not the real issue here (see CRUX below). The CHRC complaint information discusses the sections of law and provided forms to check boxes and my previous complaints show they just block the complaints with the simpleton Employment Equity statement. I point out the CHRC complaint information does not say that complaints will be blocked with the Employment Equity statement, 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. Such contradictions show this should go to a Tribunal.

11. I do understand the confusion, I sent lengthy detailed information and relevant points were interspersed with other points. I was also trying to clearly show that the CHRC's own documents and the many other points show the CHRC is not to do what they are doing. I will expand on this below. To cover the points for the Investigator:

STEALING COMPLAINT

12. This is current and ongoing, the Canadian Human Rights Commission has been promoting stealing jobs from white guys, that is counselling discriminatory actions. They are telling people to displace, pass over and bar white men, men including Aboriginal men (women only jobs), and whites (minority only), from jobs. This is a discriminatory policy based on race and sex with employment. White men, men and whites are treated differently in that they are passed over and/or displaced and barred from jobs. I am saying the CHRC is using race and sex with employment.

13. This is a loss of opportunity and/or denial of employment. Some are also deterred from applying (deterred is an industry term saying people do not have to apply when they know they will be discriminated against). Also, I am not sure of the source, "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 CHRA Section 3.1. 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*). They are counselling reverse discrimination.

14. This is also in violation of CHRA Section 12, "incites and an intention to discriminate", and Sections 10 and 8 (see GUIDE document, page 4 which mentions Section 8 includes "any written or oral inquiry that expresses or implies any limitation, specification or preference based on a prohibited ground of discrimination.").

15. I also mention the CHRC GUIDE document, on page 4 says "The Canadian Human Rights Act entitles all individuals to equal employment opportunities without regard to race or ... sex" which shows the CHRC actions violate the law.

16. It is also in violation of many explanatory quotes from CHRA documents and webpages that I provided in my lengthy documents. These points and the many points I showed in my documents under headings "ACTIONS THAT VIOLATE", "LIMITS" and "MERIT", showed the actions are covered by the law and violate the law. The simpleton Employment Equity statement is absurd, they are trying to ignore these points.

17. My lengthy quotes also show what Employment Equity is supposed to be when done properly. These points show the CHRC is twisting it to steal jobs and money from better qualified people. This is a big point. A conspiracy to twist to steal.

18. This affects my job and business (products, using my computer knowledge to develop

products) opportunities. CHRA Section 25 says “employment” includes a contractual relationship. 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. I am also a member of the public (Section 12 mentions “the public”) and government hiring schemes are of public interest and the merit system (true merit, best regardless) is to be protected (Breach of Public Trust). And, this is a policy complaint against the policies.

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. In my previous complaints I mentioned the CHRC being involved with the actions (Document A, paragraph 18, Commission involved with telling people to violate the limits) and the CHRC did not deny it. Also with my previous complaints, at least one Respondent mentioned the CHRC (title “Acting Secretary General) being involved. 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.

20. The CHRC should say what they are really doing, say that they are telling people to discriminate against people (displace, pass over and bar) and that they are using their silly representative numbers to discriminate against people and steal jobs. This is race and sex based with employment.

21. The CHRC should also say they want to steal jobs from white guys, and Aboriginal and minority men, and whites, and do not care about the victims.

22. They should also say which interest groups and politicians are involved with this scheme to funnel government jobs. This is public information; they work for the people of Canada.

BLOCKING COMPLAINT

23. This is current and ongoing, the Commission has blocked reverse discrimination complaints. This is a discriminatory policy, a denial of the service of processing complaints based on race and sex (Section 5). This is also a violation of Section 12 (calculated to incite others to discriminate) by protecting the discriminators. It is also in violation of many explanatory quotes from CHRA documents and webpages (GUIDE, Myths) as explained in my lengthy documents.

24. White men are treated differently in that their complaints are blocked. This is also removal of their rights.

25. I have had multiple recent previous complaints blocked with the Employment Equity statement (see heading BACKGROUND). The Reports mention the File numbers. This shows a policy of blocking complaints based on race and sex.

26. Also, I was told, in a telephone conversation, by a CHRC staff member (Mr. Jamie Masters) in January 2013 that such complaints are “common” and that “they will not get anywhere”. He also mentioned the phrase “too many white males”. I will testify to this and provide this statement, and everything I say in my submissions, under penalty of perjury.

27. This statement shows that reverse discrimination complaints involving displacing, passing over and barring white men from jobs, which is stealing jobs from them are being blocked and that there have been many such complaints. This shows the CHRC has a policy of blocking such complaints, regardless of facts.

28. This statement also shows they are using numbers to discriminate against people, which shows a violation of the last line of the Special Programs and Employment Equity heading in the CHRC GUIDE document, “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.”

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.

30. Also, as the CHRC is involved this affects almost everyone.

BOTH COMPLAINTS

31. If the above is not sufficient I have included excerpts from my letter to the Investigator of February 17, 2014, about both complaints (my comments are indicated by “[]”:

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. [NOTICE conduct covered]

28. The CHRC has admitted they are counselling such in my reverse discrimination complaints above [previous complaints] 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. [By blocking my complaints with their simple statement they are saying all the actions are acceptable, which is admitting the actions]

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. [Again, by blocking my complaints with their simple statement they are saying all the actions are acceptable, which is admitting the

actions, which as they have admitted the actions, I obviously have 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. [My detailed quotes, etc. show they are violating the act]

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. [Again, they are violating the act, violating the points in the explanatory quotes shows they are violating the act]

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.

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.” [Also see CHRA Section 50(2), Tribunal issues not Commission, and Section 49(5) requires a Tribunal member to be a lawyer and belong to a bar]

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.

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.

BACKGROUND

32. As I mentioned I recently made other, multiple reverse discrimination complaints and after providing information and filling out CHRC forms regarding employment, grounds of race and sex, and appropriate sections, these were blocked. The File numbers are in the Report.

33. The CHRC first said I was complaining about Special Programs and Employment Equity and this did not violate the CHR Act. The preceding sentence is referred to as the "simpleton Employment Equity statement" throughout this document. My response was to point out the CHRC document "GUIDE TO SCREENING AND SELECTION IN EMPLOYMENT", heading "SPECIAL PROGRAMS AND EMPLOYMENT EQUITY" (notice the heading of "Special Programs and Employment Equity" the point at issue) which clearly shows the simple point of limits, and many quotes from the CHRC's own documents and webpages (Guide, Myths, merit, etc.), and laws. These were explained in detail in my documents (Documents A and B) attached to the letter to the Investigator and on my website. These points directly contradict the CHRC blocking drivel. The CHRC people do not seem to understand the simple concept of limits.

34. When I again pointed out my points, the CHRC then 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.

35. My response was, from my November 14, 2013 document (Document C): "this is laughable, singleton 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 [Document B]). 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."

36. All my previous complaints were blocked with the same statements, regardless of facts.

37. 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 incompetence, lack of basic knowledge and poor reading skills.

CRUX

38. The Report from the investigator, File #20130165, heading Conclusion, page 5, says "It appears that the complainant fails to understand that the Employment Equity Act is to ensure equal access to employment for all Canadians through measures taken so that

underrepresented groups fully participate in the labour market”.

39. I have worked with computer systems and policies and procedures and in the context of procedures and a legal conclusion this is laughable, simpleton level and ridiculous. They obviously do not understand the issues of how you do something and the concept of limits.

40. Again, what the CHRC said with my previous complaints was I was complaining about Employment Equity and this did not violate the act. This was said in all 5 of my previous complaints. This shows the crux of the issue is I am complaining about Employment Equity.

41. My response has repeatedly been, and still is, this is laughable, simpleton level and ridiculous. I will try to explain again:

42. This is simpleton level in that it does not consider the many quotes in my detailed documents and the CHRC document that I provided that discusses Special Programs and Employment Equity. I mentioned this at least 12 times in discussions and in my submissions to the CHRC. The quote from the CHRC's own document and from the web page GUIDE TO SCREENING AND SELECTION IN EMPLOYMENT, heading “SPECIAL PROGRAMS AND EMPLOYMENT EQUITY“ is (also Document D with detailed information):

Special Programs and Employment Equity

The Canadian Human Rights Act allows for special programs designed to improve opportunities for groups that have been traditionally disadvantaged because of race, ethnic origin, age, sex, disability or other prohibited grounds of discrimination. As well, the Canadian Human Rights Commission audits employers and takes necessary action to ensure they comply with the Employment Equity Act, which is designed to improve job opportunities for four specific groups — women, Aboriginal people, members of visible minorities, and people with disabilities. Many employers have found special programs helpful in achieving equality in the workplace.

Commission policy permits employers to collect the data they require to plan and support special programs, even though the information collected may touch upon one of the prohibited grounds. 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.

43. Notice the first paragraph says something similar to the Employment Equity quote in the report. The CHRC people only seem to be able to handle the one point in the first paragraph. The second paragraph explains further and shows a limit to Employment Equity (starting at “However ...”). It is like the CHRC people do not have the intellectual ability to put two thoughts together or to understand points made over two paragraphs, and the simple concept of a limit.

44. I also mention that the current MYTHS web page (there as of May 27, 2014) say the same thing, do not discriminate against anyone, no reverse discrimination, no quotas, etc. This is explained further in my detailed information, Document A, page A7, paragraphs 66 – 69.

45. To further explain, and trying to explain conceptual thinking, the Employment Equity quote in the report is similar to saying people can drive. This seems nice, however there are issues like properly equipped, licensed and insured vehicles, an appropriate valid drivers license and rules of the road and speed limits. The CHRC people seem to just see the driving part and do not think of the other issues. In Alberta, 16 year old children are expected to have the intellectual ability to understand these concepts.

46. Or, in other words, they say I do not understand Employment Equity, and this same point has been made to me multiple times in verbal and written discussions with the CHRC staff. At

least once, implying that as they have told me this multiple times I must be too dumb to understand. It was said in different ways but they are all saying essentially I am complaining about Employment Equity and this does not violate the Act. Your words are similar but said using different words.

47. Again, my response has been, as I tried to explain in Documents A and B and C, this statement is simple minded, there are limits to Employment Equity and a proper way to implement it. The limits are explained extensively in my documents, and include multiple quotes from the Canadian Human Rights Commission's own explanatory documents and web pages.

48. It is actually kind of funny, they are implying I am too dumb to understand Employment Equity and I am saying they do not understand the concept of limits and their own documents implying they are too dumb to understand the concepts. I have concluded the CHRC people do not have the skill set and intellectual ability to understand the concepts here.

49. I should not have to teach adults how to read and put two thoughts together and understand the simple concept of limits.

50. Issues like this should not arise and considering that I explained this many times, and included many, many quotes from the CHRC's own documents and web pages, and that the CHRC deleted many of the web pages I quoted from that show they are wrong (although the Myths page was still up last time I checked on May 27, 2014), and the CHRC will not answer my questions as to why they deleted the web pages, and the CHRC is not admitting what they are doing despite my pointing out many actions in my previous complaints (quotas, preferences, barring men from jobs, etc.), makes me very suspicious that there is something fishy going on here. This just seems the CHRC is trying some silly drivel to block cases and hoping the investigator does not realize what is really going on.

51. As I said in my letter to the investigator, "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."

52. I point out that with the above "However ..." this means there are limits and shows a violation of the act, which means blocking complaints with this is ridiculous. And, the "However ..." also shows the standard that really should be applied to my complaints, using numbers to discriminate against people.

53. I again mention that any civil servant or politician cannot change the merit system. That you do not know this is inexcusable.

54. Employment Equity is supposed to be trivial benign actions like advertising, etc. and then hire on merit (take the best regardless (as the GUIDE says)) and the simpleton thieves in the Commission are twisting it to steal jobs from better qualified people. They then play this silly drivel game trying to block complaints.

STANDARDS

55. I raised many issues with the CHRC standards for my assessing my complaints and these are explained in many points above.

56. They should be looking at whether the complaint involves employment and race and sex, and whether there is a chance the Respondent is doing what they are accused of. I am complaining about actions that involve employment and using race and sex and the information I provided showed that. For example, I am not complaining about some guy on a bicycle hitting

my parked car causing more than \$1600 damage, and taking off (which has actually happened). This car incident would be frivolous in many ways. However my complaints are again with employment and involve a policy of using race and sex to discriminate against men (including Aboriginal men), whites and white men.

57. Also, I am complaining about a policy not an act of discrimination, and a Section 12 violation. These should be handled differently.

TRIBUNAL

58. First, I have to ask the obvious question. What is the problem here? The CHRC should welcome an inquiry by the Tribunal if they think they are right. The CHRC is sure going to a lot of trouble to hide what they are doing, including not saying what they are really doing, deleting web pages that show they are not to do what they are doing and not explaining their deleting actions, avoiding the issue that their actions violate their own documents (and I provided many quotes), all to hide my complaints from a Tribunal. Why not just send the complaints to the Tribunal? What is the problem here? What is the CHRC afraid of?

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?

60. I also again mention the CHRC deleted webpages that I quoted from after I made my complaints. The quotes clearly showed the CHRC is not to do what they are doing. The fact that this evidence was deleted, which brings up evidence tampering, also shows the complaints should be referred to a Tribunal.

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?

62. In my letter to the Investigator I also pointed out that these complaints should be referred to the RCMP or to a Tribunal. I raised the issues of the CHRC doing their actions properly, many questions of law and unconstitutionality and these issues cannot be decided by Commission people. Therefore, the complaints should be referred. This was not mentioned in the Report.

63. I again point out the Commission cannot decide CHRA section 49(5) issues (which involves "question about whether another Act or a regulation made under another Act is inconsistent with this Act") and that it requires a Tribunal member to be a member of a bar. I raised this issue in my documents. This also means the Investigator is not qualified to decide the issue. And, I also point out the Tribunal decides questions of law, see CHRA 50(2) (Power to

determine questions of law or fact). This is beyond the Commission, and again shows the complaints should be referred to a Tribunal.

64. I also am now accusing the CHRC of wilful and reckless conduct, which is also a Tribunal determination, see CHRA Section 53(3).

65. The CHRC comment about the results of a Tribunal Inquiry is also absurd, this assumes the results of a hearing and a determination of multiple questions of law that are clearly beyond the CHRC.

OTHER POINTS

66. I also would like the Report to say that CHRC's own documents agree with what I say and contradict what the Commission says. I provided pages of quotes and many issues and these are not even mentioned. Also, I say hiring should be on merit (best regardless of race or sex). This is how government hiring is to be done as everyone should know. And there are many other points on merit like "Sacred Ground" and a CHRC webpage said Employment Equity "should not be construed ... to contradict the merit principle in the public sector". And the Commission points on Special Programs and Employment Equity are contradicted by CHRC documents. This shows the absurdity of the Commission position.

67. 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 in the public interest.

68. By the way, politicians are subject to the laws as is anyone. They cannot express or imply discrimination or an intention to discriminate with the civil service (Section 12 (a)). Commission staff should not protect and hide these politicians, they are trying to use government jobs for votes and contributions, which is corruption and election rigging. They will sell your job too.

CONCLUSION

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.

Barry Ceminchuk