

William Warren Munroe
763 Beach Road,
Qualicum Beach BC, V9K 1S2
April 11, 2018

Jay Chalke, Ombudsperson
Office of the Ombudsperson
Second Floor, 947 Fort Street
Victoria, B.C. Canada

Regarding: correct methods and data to accompany the findings; formal policies, clear accountabilities and clear steps to safeguard integrity of information used for public services.

Dear Ombudsperson,

I write to you given the Office of the Ombudsperson's role to "promote and foster fairness and accountability in public administration" and to "seek resolutions that are principled and practical".¹

Resolution: clear steps to safeguard integrity; scientific method

The resolution proposed here is to require reports, provided to or created by public service providers in British Columbia from the provincial to the municipal and regional levels, reports referred to when considering public service delivery must include the correct methods and data to accompany the findings, rather than incorrect methods and data to accompany unfounded, unsubstantiated numbers.

Also, to require BC Statistics implement formal policies, assign clear accountabilities, and establish clear steps to safeguard the integrity of BC Statistics' information products as does Statistics Canada.² BC Statistics officials referred clients to incorrect methods and data for over 10 years. See Appendices as part of this written submission / complaint / remedy.

More generally, but still to the point, a scientific method allowing honest discussion is preferred to the adversarial / legal method antagonistic to employees and citizens used to disguise deceit.

Reporting to Authorities continuously for over 15 years

For over 15 years (2002 to date) I have advocated that correct methods and data accompany population estimates and forecasts created by BC Statistics. Over these years, I have brought the issues of substandard practices as well as easily implementable remedies to BC Statistics' Population / Demography Section Chief Demographer given the Manager position, Immigration Analyst, Executive Director, Deputy Minister, Ministers responsible (Labour and Citizens' Services), the Labour Relations Board, the Auditor General, the Attorney General, Members of the Legislative Assembly (including requests to MLA for approval from the Legislative Assembly), and the Premier.

¹ <https://www.bcombudsperson.ca/about/our-vision-mandate-and-principles>

² Analytic Activities at Statistics Canada, 1999

Although providing correct information in a timely manner should already have been in place and considered expected practice, the discrepancy between expected and observed is as yet unresolved.

Block to implementation

Perhaps the difficulty in implementing formal policies and assigning clear accountabilities is a result of a preference to not be accountable and or a preference to not be required to provide reliable information; however, the stated goal of BC Statistics is to provide reliable information. The title, BC Statistics, implies the use of statistical / scientific methods rather than non-statistical, non-scientific methods.

Also, it may be the case that this issue (providing reliable information) is being blocked and ignored because disclosure reveals wrongdoing described herein, as well as other as yet unknown issues, on the part of Provincial Government of British Columbia senior officials (see Addendum A).

Remedy / Resolution – clear steps to safeguard integrity as well as apologies

Ombudsperson Chalke, could you please recommend to the Legislative Assembly the proposed resolution including implementing formal policies and assigning clear accountabilities to safeguard the integrity of BC Statistics' information products (i.e. correct methods and data to accompany "findings"), as well as explain the benefits of the scientific method (allowing honest discussion) preferred to the adversarial / legal method (used to disguise deceit).

If the scientific method were used, none of the problems described here in would have occurred – the problems would have been addressed properly allowing the solutions to be revealed and implemented as early as 2002.

Instead, the adversarial legal method was used, corrupting and infecting not only provincial and federal information products but also adversely impacting careers and livelihoods – sowing distrust in an effort to disguise fraud (see Addendum B).

Also, if while serving the public, the scientific method was used, if there were formal policies and clear accountabilities, if there were clearly defined step to safeguard the integrity of BC Statistics information products, I would not have been wrongfully dismissed, and I would still be a Population Analyst for the Provincial Government of British Columbia.

On a more personal note, my wife was diagnosed with stage 4 cancer in 2014 and I would very much like to work again to lift some of her burden. I would very much like to be allowed to seek employment without the burden of the "dismissal for insubordination" and statements that I am a liar (twice) making co-workers feel unsafe made by the BC Statistics' Population Section manager (while he was changing my work (forgery/fraud) to deceive Statistics Canada and Finance Canada without my knowledge) and bad at my job (while I fixed his work).

Although I was described as a most despicable person by the BC Pubic Service Agency lawyer (June 22, 2007), I contend these statements were simply used to fool an Arbiter to stop a fair

hearing and disclosure of the real matters in dispute, namely the real methods and practices used to create numbers, thereby avoiding revealing deceit - forgery / fraud (Addendum C).

Indeed, I continue to contribute and present refinements to methods used to calculate population projection scenarios from national to local levels at local settings and to International conferences³.

Clear steps to safeguard the integrity of information used to guide public services implemented in formal policies and assigned accountabilities, and an apology from the Provincial Government of British Columbia would be very much appreciated, an apology not just to me but to Statistics Canada and Finance Canada as well as British Columbians and Canadians.

Sincerely,



William Warren Munroe

Population Projections Project for Canada's census areas, Originator

(Former Economist in the position of Population Analyst, ranking provincial government expert on migration, BC Statistics, Provincial Government of British Columbia, 2002 to 2006)

More information available upon request

Addendum A: The attempt to achieve the intent to deceive

Forgery and Fraud by Provincial Government Officials to Deceive the Federal Government

Although I have provided evidence of the fraud to people in positions of government authority, the perpetrators have yet to be held accountable and the opportunity continues for falsified documents to be accepted as true by Statistics Canada and Finance Canada.

Instead of addressing the false statements revealed by comparing federal and provincial documents (see below), government officials and elected representatives have either ignored or dismissed the deception stating, for example: "disclosure harmful to intergovernmental relations or negotiations"⁴ and later "we do not see value in continuing to respond to enquiries of a similar nature"⁵; regardless, this issue needs to be addressed⁶.

³ Most recently at the International Conference of Population Geographies, Seattle, June 2017 and Ballenas Secondary School Parksville BC, January 2018

⁴ Response to Freedom of Information request for source of quote used to assert the "integrity" of BC Statistics, from Cindy Elbahir, Manager Central Agency Team Information Access Operations, June 22, 2012.

⁵ Assistant Deputy Minister, Service BC, former BC Statistics Executive Director, Angelo Cocco, September 2013. Mr. Cocco had served the Northwest Territories Statistical office during Statistics Canada's 2005 feasibility study.

⁶ "The Queen has asked me to thank you for your letter of 31st August... careful note has been taken of the issue ... and you were quite correct to address your appeal in the first instance to the relevant Canadian authorities."

Letter from Queen Elizabeth II, Deputy of Correspondence Coordinator, Miss Jennie Vine, 17th, October, 2016. For a copy of the letter sent to Queen Elizabeth II go to wminformatics.com/WP/Articles/160831/QEII1c.pdf

Overall, *Statistics Canada*, having high standards and a trusted reputation based on formal policies with clear accountabilities designed to safeguard the integrity of their analytic products⁷, has been and *can still be used to endorse false documents*.

Consequently, documented false information by BC Statistics (BC Stats) officials (Dave O'Neil, Chief Demographer promoted to Population Section Manager; Jennifer Hansen, Population Analyst hired in 2004; Don McRae, Director, Population Section promoted to Executive Director, BC Stats; and Gordon Macatee, Deputy Minister, Ministry of Labour and Citizens' Services), was given to Federal Government officials, Statistics Canada, for a 2005 feasibility study addressing Canada's Equalization Payments Programme, in violation of Criminal Code (R.S.C., 1985, c. C-46):

Forgery

366 (1) Every one commits forgery who makes a false document, knowing it to be false, with intent (a) that it should in any way be used or acted on as genuine, to the prejudice of any one whether within Canada or not; or (b) that a person should be induced, by the belief that it is genuine, to do or to refrain from doing anything, whether within Canada or not.

2) Making a false document includes (a) altering a genuine document in any material part; (b) making a material addition to a genuine document or adding to it a false date, attestation, seal or other thing that is material; or (c) making a material alteration in a genuine document by erasure, obliteration, removal or in any other way.⁸

and Criminal Code (R.S.C., 1985, c. C-46):

Fraud

380 (1) Every one who, by deceit, falsehood or other fraudulent means, whether or not it is a false pretence within the meaning of this Act, defrauds the public or any person, whether ascertained or not, of any property, money or valuable security or any service,⁹

I point out here that the Deputy Minister (Chief Executive), Gordon Macatee, had improperly appointed Dave O'Neil to the management position in 2004. This appointment was not based on merit or following a competitive process.

Evidence of Fraud

The false reporting can be found by comparing two documents highlighting the deception, one, a feasibility study regarding methods and data to determine equalization payments published in 2005 by Statistics Canada states the methods and data used to estimate subprovincial (Census Subdivision - CSD) population given by BC Stats officials to Statistics Canada:

"BC Stats produces its CSD-level population estimates using regression methods with specific symptomatic indicators (number of residential electrical connections and Old Age Security (OAS) recipients). For more details on the methodology, see Generalized Estimation System (GES), Small Area Population

⁷ ANALYTIC ACTIVITIES AT STATISTICS CANADA, presented by Ivan Fellegi, June 1999, at the CONFERENCE OF EUROPEAN STATISTICIANS. http://wminformatics.com/WP/ANALYTIC_ACTIVITIES_AT_STATISTICSCANADA.pdf

⁸ Justice Laws Website, Government of Canada, <http://laws-lois.justice.gc.ca/eng/acts/C-46/section-366.html>

⁹ Justice Laws Website, Government of Canada, <http://laws-lois.justice.gc.ca/eng/acts/C-46/section-380.html>

Estimation Methodology published by BC Stats in 1998 and available on their website.¹⁰

In 2011, (at my insistence), BC Stats revised the 1998 methods paper describing some of the many changes to the methodology between 1998 and 2005:

"After extensive analyses it was later determined that telephone line data (Telus) was a suitable indicator and was subsequently added to the model in 2000. With the availability of the 2001 census and further model development it was indicated that the OAS data were no longer statistically significant and were dropped from the model in 2003."¹¹

In 2005, Statistics Canada endorsed BC Stats as having a methodology producing population estimates of "better quality" than Statistics Canada's (STC) methods.

"CSD-level population estimates produced by three provincial/territorial statistical agencies (Quebec, British Columbia, Northwest Territories) were all found to be of better quality when compared with those based on any of the three STC methods."¹²

Why did BC Stats officials change the methodology between 1998 and 2005? Because the 1998 methodology produced estimates of unacceptably low quality when compared to the 2001 census results. How did BC Stats officials deceive Statistics Canada about the low quality? They submitted false population estimates and error calculations. Why did BC Stats officials not tell Statistics Canada about the methodology changes between 1998 and 2005? Because doing so would reveal that the 1998 methodology was problematic. Also, the changes made things worse not better. Why did BC Stats officials fire the Population Analyst (the Author) who raised concerns about the problematic methodology? Because the Population Analyst in a position to discover the deception.

In this manner, false information was included in a report to Finance Canada and endorsed by Statistics Canada as being of "better quality" than Statistics Canada's. This endorsement was then used to dismiss concerns about BC Stats not revising their methods paper for over 10 years. In this manner the BC Stats officials earned promotions and more money.

Discovering the false reporting

I am familiar with the problems with the 1998 methodology because shortly after having been hired to serve the public as an Economist in the position of Population Analyst for BC Stats in 2002, two long-time employees and I were asked to figure out why BC Stats' 1998 methodology produced subprovincial population estimates for 2001 that were so different from the 2001 census results (the census provides the benchmark with which to compare post census annual population estimates).¹³

¹⁰ "The Equalization Program and the Property Tax Base: Feasibility Study Conducted by Statistics Canada", Statistics Canada, February 28, 2005, p. 63.

¹¹ GENERALIZATION ESTIMATION SYSTEM (GES) Small Area Population Estimation, Method and Error Evaluation, August 2011, (GES 2011) P. 8. BC Stats officials still had not corrected the 2005 submission to Statistics Canada. In 2011, I wrote to BC Statistics' Executive Director, Angelo Cocco, to correct the 2011 GES but he did not reply.

¹² "The Equalization Program and the Property Tax Base: Feasibility Study Conducted by Statistics Canada", February 28, 2005, p. 7.

¹³ Details of my employment, dismissal, requests for arbitration, requests to remove the block to arbitration and a fair hearing into the real matters in dispute, namely the real methods and data used to create population numbers go to: www.wminfomatics.com/WP/Home.html

The long-time employees, Mr. O'Neil and Frank Ip, could not figure it out; however, the hypothesis I developed and tested revealed the problem. The assumption that the changing number of people per dwelling per CSD was not significant was untrue. By correcting for differences, the error was reduced. Also, I was able to provide easily implementable solutions; however, these were rejected. Instead, BC Stats officials, Mr. O'Neil and Mr. McRae, imposed highly unreliable, error prone, unsound methods and data including the use of the change in the number of telephone landline hookups (Telus) as an indicator of population change. Telus data was purchased since 2000, with testing being done in 2002 to compare with the 2001 census results. In 2002, I asked but was not allowed to see the writeup of the testing.

Between 2002 and 2006, I repeatedly pointed out the need for refinements and that the new methods and data be published. My concerns were confirmed in 2004 and again 2005 because the imposed unsound methodology was producing highly erroneous numbers. For example, according to the unsound methodology, the populations for all of the lower mainland CSDs (i.e. Vancouver, Burnaby etc.) were declining from 1996 to 2003 (due to using telephone landline hookups as an indicator of population change) – obviously these were wrong. To correct them, Mr. O'Neil had me use a pencil to write in what I thought the population numbers should be. I again insisted on changes to the methodology (including not guessing the population estimates).¹⁴

While serving the public in the position of Population Analyst (2002 to 2006), I was never informed about the 2005 feasibility study. Instead, Mr. O'Neil took the new Population Analyst hired in 2004, Jennifer Hansen, to the September 2004 meetings in Ottawa where the feasibility study and the population estimation methods and data were discussed. In 2005, I was to no longer run the population estimates model nor was I included any longer in discussions about the methodology.

In this manner I was excluded, marginalized, and eventually ordered by Mr. O'Neil to turn in my security pass and leave the BC Stats building while my request for assistance (in the form of a grievance) was before the Deputy Minister. In this manner, the BC Stats officials were able to submit false information for Statistics Canada's feasibility study addressing Canada's Equalization Payment Programme, earn an endorsement (albeit fraudulently), be promoted, and receive more money rather being found out.

BC Stats officials' deception underlies the 'reason' I was removed from the contacts list, subjected to aggressive yelling, false accusations, of being bad at my job, making co-workers feel unsafe (on the day the feasibility study was published), not allowed mediation to address the accusations, given more and more menial tasks with shorter and shorter time limits, dismissed for insubordination, denied arbitration by the BC Public Service Agency supported by the BC Government Employees Union, etc. The 'reason' was not just because I had answered the call, figuring out why the 1998 methodology provided inaccurate numbers, and not just because I provided and advocated improvements, but because I was in a government position where I would discover BC Stats officials' false reporting to Statistics Canada and Finance Canada sooner than if I were fired; therefore, I was fired in hopes that I would never discover the fraud – *fired in an attempt to achieve the intent to deceive Statistics Canada and Finance Canada for provincial government officials' personal gain.*

The Intent to Deceive

Did BC Stats officials purposefully provide false information to Statistics Canada for the Equalization Payments Programme study for Finance Canada? Or did the BC Stats officials mistakenly provide

¹⁴ ElectionsBC contract for \$50,000 <http://www.wminfomatics.com/WP/PEDcrit.pdf>

incorrect information? Did BC Stats officials and/or other BC government officials attempt to conceal the false reporting?

Given that BC Stats officials asked Statistics Canada to include BC Stats' methods, data, population estimates and error calculations for the feasibility study, and having been informed that this information would be used in the feasibility study for Finance Canada, BC Stats officials clearly knew the importance of providing truthful methods, data, population estimates and error calculations to Statistics Canada and Finance Canada.¹⁵

Given that the stated goal of BC Stats is to provide "reliable information", BC Stats officials' job was to know the difference between reliable information and false information; therefore, they should have known the difference between reliable information and false information.

BC Stats officials could have and should have informed Statistics Canada that the 1998 methodology produced population estimates with high error compared to the 2001 census results. BC Stats officials should also have informed Statistics Canada of the many changes to the methods and data between 1998 and 2005; however, they did not.

Instead, BC Stats officials provided Statistics Canada and Finance Canada with the low quality 1998 methodology along with falsified 2001 population estimates that mirrored the 2001 census results. BC Stats officials had to have purposefully changed the 2001 population estimates to look like the 2001 census results.

The 'reason' BC Stats officials changed the 1998 methodology was because the 1998 methodology produced population estimates that were statistically significantly different from the 2001 census results. By not informing Statistics Canada about the many changes to the methodology between 1998 and 2005, BC Stats did not have to explain why the 1998 methodology was changed.

Did BC Stats officials correct the false information when the feasibility study was published February 28, 2005? Statistics Canada was not aware of the false reporting until after I received a copy of the 2005 feasibility study from Statistics Canada in June 2012 when I replied explaining the false reporting.¹⁶

Also, other provincial government of British Columbia officials attempted to impede access to Statistics Canada's 2005 feasibility study claiming, as mentioned, "disclosure harmful to intergovernmental relations or negotiations". Once again, an opportunity "to see the administration of public affairs is in accordance with the law" was avoided. Responding to my request for a "fair hearing into the real matters in dispute, namely the real methods used by BC Stats to create population numbers", BC Attorney General representative claimed, "the Minister of Justice and Attorney General is not able to review the evidence you have provided or comment on whether your case has been properly addressed

¹⁵ "The Equalization Program and the Property Tax Base: Feasibility Study Conducted by Statistics Canada", Statistics Canada, February 28, 2005, p. 63.

¹⁶ In 2010, 4 of 15 Qualicum School District public schools were recommended for closure based on enrolment forecasts. The 1998 methods were provided along with the population estimates. My inquiries prompted a revision of the 1998 method in 2011. My concerns about timeliness were dismissed quoting the 2005 feasibility study, "better quality". My request for a copy or title were denied on grounds "disclosure harmful to intergovernmental relations of negotiations". Being an agency with integrity, STC sent me the feasibility study. I replied in July 2012 with a short email then again in October 2012 with a more thorough letter.
http://wminfomatics.com/WP/Articles/121019/STC_MLCS_2.pdf

or advise you about how to proceed.”¹⁷ See how easy it is for provincial/territorial government officials to falsify documents to Statistics Canada and Finance Canada and get away with it. Little wonder the Premier of BC, Christy Clark, described the Capital of BC as having a “sick culture”¹⁸

Disclosure of BC Stats’ highly unreliable, error prone, unsound methods and data to Statistics Canada and Finance Canada, would be an embarrassment to BC Stats officials. By deceiving Statistics Canada and Finance Canada, BC Stats officials were able to receive an otherwise unjustifiable endorsement, “better quality”, be promoted, and receive more money.

Potential for Fraud Continues

This case highlights how fraud can persist as well as permeate other government programs. As well as being included in Statistics Canada’s report to Finance Canada, the endorsement of “better quality”, earned by deceit, was then used by BC government officials to dismiss concerns of citizens addressing public school closures in 2011, concerns as to why BC Stats had pointed people to methods and data not used for over 10 years.¹⁹

Unfortunately, Statistics Canada does not verify that the correct methods and data accompany BC Stats’ population estimates and error calculations.²⁰

Canadians are not well served when falsified documents are provided to Statistics Canada and then endorsed by Statistics Canada as though the submissions meet Statistics Canada’s standards. Falsified documents should not be given an unjust endorsement and then included in a report to Finance Canada, as well as used to dismiss concerns that incorrect methods and data accompany unfounded numbers.

To help safeguard the integrity of analytic products provided to Statistics Canada, Statistics Canada need only require submissions adhere to Statistics Canada’s formal policies with clear accountabilities as well as verify submissions. Policies include requiring internal and external reviews and verification / replication not only to ensure that correct methods and data accompany “findings” but to understand what the findings represent.²¹

Addendum B: How British Columbia used Statistics Canada for Information Laundering

How Statistics Canada has been and can be used for information laundering

Canada’s official statistical agency, STC, takes seriously it’s role to ensure Canadians are well informed by implementing formal policies and assigning clear accountabilities with clearly described safeguards.²² For example, requiring verification to ensure correct methods and data

¹⁷ David Merner, Ministry of Justice, Province of British Columbia, http://wminfomatics.com/WP/Articles/120813/MoJreply_DM1.pdf

¹⁸ <http://www.timescolonist.com/news/premier-christy-clark-shows-disdain-for-sick-culture-of-victoria-1.13852>

¹⁹ Bette Jo Hughes, Assistant Deputy Minister, ServiceBC, on behalf of Margaret MacDiarmid, Minister of Labour, Citizen Services and Open Government, November 22, 2011.

²⁰ Nicole Montsion, Client Services / Service à la clientèle, Demography Division, Government of Canada, October 7, 2011, <http://wminfomatics.com/WManalytics/Articles/120127/StatCanBC1a.pdf>

²¹ ANALYTIC ACTIVITIES AT STATISTICS CANADA, presented by Ivan Fellegi, June 1999, at the CONFERENCE OF EUROPEAN STATISTICIANS. http://wminfomatics.com/WP/ANALYTIC_ACTIVITIES_AT_STATISTICSCANADA.pdf

²² “Analytic Activities At Statistics Canada”, presented by Ivan Fellegi, to the Statistical Commission and Economic Commission For Europe, Conference of European Statisticians, June 1999. An insightful 7-page description of how

accompany findings rather than incorrect methods and data accompanying unverifiable, unsubstantiated, unfounded numbers – numbers that can be made up to support the programs and approaches of the current government.

Unfortunately, some, if not all of Canada’s provincial/territorial statistical agencies, such as BC Statistics, have not implemented formal policies nor assigned clear accountabilities with clearly described safeguards; therefore, incorrect methods and data can accompany unverifiable numbers mostly designed to justify the programs and approaches of the provincial/territorial government.

A further problem arises because false methods, data, and so-called findings from provinces/territories can be accepted by STC without verification. It is even possible the false information can be endorsed by STC as being of “better quality” than STC.

Similar to ‘money laundering’ (“*the process used to disguise the source of money or assets derived from criminal activity.*”²³), information laundering is the process used to disguise the source of information derived from deception such as forgery, or fraud.²⁴ Here are some examples of disguising the source of information derived from deception in Canada from the federal, provincial/territorial, regional, to municipal levels.

False Information from provincial officials for Equalization Payments Programme Study

A small group of Provincial Government of British Columbia (BC) officials gave STC officials false information for a study by STC into methods and data to determine Canada’s Equalization Payments for Finance Canada. This false information was accepted by STC without verification. BC Statistics’ (BC Stats) falsified numbers were found to be almost exactly the same as the census results – closer than the numbers calculated using STC’s methods and data; therefore, STC endorsed BC Stats’ method and data as producing population estimates of “better quality” than STC’s.²⁵

Statistics Canada’s annual publication censored hiding provincial government’s deception

The small group of BC Stats’ officials’ deception even impacted STC’s Demography Division’s annual publication “Canada’s Demographic Estimates” for census divisions across Canada, wherein the differences between STC and BC Stats’ calculations and estimates were stated. In response to questions about STC’s inferior quality (in truth STC is better than BC Stats), large

to safeguard the integrity of information used understand social and economic dynamics: the forces which might be beneficially impacted by policy. wminfomatics.com/WP/ANALYTIC_ACTIVITIES_AT_STATISTICSCANADA.pdf

²³ <http://www.fintrac-canafe.gc.ca/fintrac-canafe/definitions/money-argent-eng.asp>. The Financial Transactions and Reports Analysis Centre of Canada (FINTRAC) is Canada's financial intelligence unit.

²⁴ Fraud and forgery described in wminfomatics.com/WP/Articles/2017/statistical-agency-forgery.html

²⁵ "The Equalization Program and the Property Tax Base: Feasibility Study Conducted by Statistics Canada", February 28, 2005, p. 63 describes BC’s method, data and “findings”. These differ from BC Statistics’ methods and data used during the feasibility study described six years later in “GENERALIZATION ESTIMATION SYSTEM (GES) Small Area Population Estimation, Method and Error Evaluation” BC Stats, August 2011, (GES 2011) p.8. See the article “Is it true, does Statistics Canada consider BC Stats’ population estimation methods to be of “better quality”?” November 22, 2011, wminfomatics.com/WP/index2.html.

portions of the publication were removed. Information useful to Canadians but revealing of BC Stats officials' deception.²⁶

Statistics Canada's endorsement used to dismiss concerns about false information

Concerns, raised by parents/guardians, and citizens addressing public school closures, about BC Stats' incorrect method and data accompanying unfounded, unverifiable numbers for over 10 years were dismissed by BC Government Ministers and officials quoting STC's endorsement. To be clear, BC Stats' incorrect methods and data accompanying unfounded numbers for over 10 years were considered acceptable because STC found that BC Stats false method and data produced population estimates (albeit it fraudulently) of "better quality" than STC's.²⁷

"Disclosure harmful to intergovernmental relations or negotiations"

A freedom of information request for the source of the quote "better quality", used by the Minister of Labour, Citizens' Services and Open Government spokesperson to assert the "integrity" of BC Stats was denied claiming "disclosure harmful to intergovernmental relations or negotiations".²⁸ More truthfully, "disclosure helpful to everyone but harmful to BC Stats Officials' careers".

Dismissing concerns about incorrect methods and data accompanying unverifiable unfounded population numbers for over 10 years, Ministry of Education experts forecasted continued declining enrolment referring to unsubstantiated numbers, mostly designed to support the current government's policies - closing public schools while enrolment in BC was rising again - boom, bust, echo.

"Canada's latest baby boom caught experts by surprise".

The lack of understanding of fundamental demographic shifts such as boom, bust, echo was not isolated to BC. After interviewing demographers, Canadian Population Society members, academics, and government officials across Canada, a researcher wrote an article, published in a main stream newspaper with nation wide distribution, titled "Canada's latest baby boom caught experts by surprise".²⁹

Even with one of the world's best statistical agencies, (STC) as well as the so called "better" (but duplicitous) BC Stats' Population Section, basic demographic information used to guide public service delivery in Canada could not be more wrong.

Good information up, misleading information down

²⁶ "BC Stats' Executive Director goes on CBC Radio Claiming Close Ties to Statistics Canada", December 5, 2007, wminformatics.com/WP/index2.html; "Restricting Access to the Annual Population Estimates Compendium from Statistics Canada", June 15, 2009, wminformatics.com/WManalytics/Articles/090616/090615.html

²⁷ See Letter to Minister of Labour, Citizen Services and Open Government, Margaret MacDiarmid "British Columbia's Official Population Statistics must be verifiable" and response from spokesperson, Betty Jo Hughes, Assistant Deputy Minister, ServiceBC, November 2011, www.wminformatics.com/WP/index2.html

²⁸ wminformatics.com/WP/index2.html, June 22, 2012

²⁹ <http://news.nationalpost.com/2014/07/04/canadas-latest-baby-boom-caught-experts-by-surprise-in-part-because-our-birth-rate-is-declining>, Sarah Boesveld, National Post, July 4, 2014.

Every 5 years Canadians count Canadians as part of the census from small towns and villages, and regions added together to provinces/territories and to the nation as a whole. Yet the process used to disguise the source of post census numbers derived from deception cascades from the national, provincial/territorial, regional, district, to the municipal levels.

For example, in response to a question about why the new enrolment forecast was so much lower than the previous forecast, a Superintendent of Schools replied, "Any attempt to suggest/imply a grassy knoll conspiracy theory is disrespectful"³⁰ rather than simply providing the method and data. Four of fifteen public schools in the district were closed referring to a single unverifiable enrolment forecast while enrolment increased.

At a town council meeting, a representative from a different Ministry (Health) presented a very different single possible (unverifiable) future scenario showing an over 30% population increase for the same district.³¹ Requests to address the unverifiable numbers and present to the town council several well-defined projection scenarios calculated directly from Censuses of Population (rather than a single unfounded possible scenario pretending to foretell the future) were denied claiming "there is no law" requiring all requests to present be allowed.³²

³⁰ Rollie Koop, Superintendent of Schools, Qualicum School District, March 2014. Mr. Koop went on to say that the disrespect was towards "the work that trustees, staff, and the community has done collaboratively to this point". Requests to see the methods and data used to come up with the enrolment forecast had been made as part of the community's' public consultation process.

³¹ "VIHA forecasts 30% total population increase while the Qualicum School District Superintendent forecasts 0% increase for school age children." March 18, 2014
wminformatics.com/WManalytics/Articles/140318/QSDFR_PPP_5.html

³² Trudy Coates, on behalf of Town of Qualicum Beach staff and council, April 2013

Addendum C: Letter to Minister of Justice

William Warren Munroe
763 Beach Road
Qualicum Beach, BC V9K 1S2
July 20, 2012 (edit July 10, 2013)

Minister of Justice and Attorney General
Honourable Shirley Bond
PO BOX 9044 Stn Prov Govt
Victoria BC V8W 9E2

Re: Request for continuance³³; and audit of BC Stats; and removal of “just cause” and “insubordination” from record; inappropriate use of “another channel” used to stop grievance proceedings; 32160 BCPSA BCGEU _Warren Munroe, BC Human Rights Tribunal Case Number 4376, JAG File 392989

Dear Minister,

1. Thank you for your reply dated June 22, 2012. Regarding your statement

“Regarding your concern that you were discriminated against on the basis of your ancestry, the British Columbia Human Rights Tribunal has jurisdiction over such matters.”

2. Please be aware, the British Columbia Human Rights Tribunal (BCHRT) Chair ruled out all grounds covered by the BC Human Rights Code I presented, except for ancestry (Section 26).

3. Also please be aware, I submitted a human rights grievance December 5, 2005, prior being dismissed, but was forced by the Ministry of Labour and Citizens’ Services (MLCS)³⁴, the BC Public Service Agency (BCPSA) and the BC Government Employee’s Union (BCGEU) to use a different procedure (Section 7 to 10).

4. For using forced procedure, I was found guilty of going down the “wrong channel”; therefore, my grievance was not allowed to proceed. (Section 28-30)

5. Please allow me to explain what was not explained to the arbiter who, in October 2007, agreed to impose a block on the grievance proceedings into the real matters in dispute.

6. First though, please be aware, as the Population Analyst for BC Stats from 2002 to 2006, I reduced error in many methods and models. I also regularly requested the write-up of the testing of the use of telephone landline hookups as an indicator of population change, not only because it missed an increasing number of people, particularly young urban adults, but also because of co-linearity problems in regressions with electrical landline hookups.³⁵ These were just some of the more glaring examples of non-statistical and substandard methods used by BC Stats to create population numbers.

³³ For Acts and Codes relevant to this case see www.wminfomatics.com/WP/petition/Acts1.pdf. Evidence of the real methods used by BC Stats to create population numbers can be found at www.wminfomatics.com/WP/home.html.

³⁴ Since being dismissed from the Public Service in 2006, after 4 years of service, the Ministry’s title changed to include Open Government.

³⁵ Don McRae, the Executive Director of BC Stats wanted telephone landline hookup data to be used along with electrical landline hookup data to estimate population change for BC communities, because "two indicators look

7. My concerns were met with an effort to discredit as seen in the following sections.

8. While my grievance was underway (March 2005)³⁶, my requests for work place skills courses³⁷, and mediation, were refused and instead I was told by the manager that the discrimination towards me (aggressive yelling, removal from all responsibility, removal from contacts list, etc.) was justified because, I have a form of mental problem making me unable to control my behaviour and incapable of team work.³⁸

9. In December 2005, I wrote:

From: Munroe, Warren LCS:EX
Sent: December 5, 2005 9:03 AM
To: McRae, Don LCS:EX
Cc: Paxman, Marvin LCS:EX
Subject: RE: Personal harassment

...I draw attention to this because Dave O'Neil accused me of having a mental problem which makes me incapable of team work.

It is because of this mental disability, he contends, that my co-workers are not willing to attend meetings with me.

Indeed, my mental disability is so bad, I have been told, that my co-workers fear for their personal safety, and this is why my co-workers and the manager (Dave) have been going for coffee together without inviting me for over a year, even though I have asked many times to join them.

Regardless, I feel strongly that the manager (Dave) should not use this contestable mental problem as a reason to discredit me and to treat me with disrespect.

I have been asking for team effectiveness training with the view that it would be helpful for myself and agree it would be helpful for all of us, as I have seen how incredibly skillful facilitator's came [sic] be.

I therefore want to make sure that it is clearly understood that my contestable mental disability has been used by my manager Dave O'Neil to discriminate against me.

I therefore am making a complaint of discrimination and choose to proceed in reference to Article 1.9."³⁹

10. The Executive Director of BC Stats, Mr. McRae had stated:

"I am obligated to interpret the allegations as a formal complaint of misuse of managerial authority, under Article 32.15 of the Master Agreement.

better than one". My requests to see the writeup of the testing of this indicator were met with statements like " DS tested the use of Telus data, and you are no DS." I continue to request publication of the real methods.

³⁶ In March 2005, the Population Section manager threatened me with a formal reprimand, See Exhibit 3 – Exhibits can be found at www.wminformatics.com/WP/petition/petition.html

³⁷ HR, Carol Gore, advised I ask the manager for work place skills courses for Population Section. He replied they would only make things worse. I was not allowed to take work place skills courses and was removed from two courses designed to promote harmony in the work place. Exhibits 4,5,6,7,8,10,11,12,13,15,16,18

³⁸ October 13, 2005 with Carol Gore and Cathy McCallum present. Documents thru FOI are not available.

³⁹ Exhibit 16, pg. 1 to 4. See <http://www.wminformatics.com/WP/petition/Exhibit16.pdf> . Yellow background is added in this letter to highlight statements.

And that "the format [sic - read formal] complaint under Article 32.15, ... was received on Dec 1, 2006 [sic - read Dec 1, 2005]."40

11. Please understand, I was required to prove I have a mental disorder to proceed with a discrimination (on grounds covered by the BC human rights code) violation.

From: Charbonneau, Michelle M PSA:EX
Sent: December 5, 2005 3:57 PM
To: Gore, Carol PSA:EX
Subject: RE: Personal harassment
BTW - I spoke with David Nixon reconfirming our brief discussion.
Question: If filing a complaint under Article 1.9 i.e. Article 1.7 Human Rights, do you have to have a mental disability?
He confirmed that you do...
Similar case pattern: if you file a Human Rights complaint attesting discrimination because of illness, you have to be ill.41

12. ... contrary to the Appeals Court ruling (see Section 36 and 37) otherwise I was required to proceed with a grievance of abuse of managerial authority.

From Carol Gores notes received through FOI, Ms. Gore wrote ...
ER Investigation Meeting
December 6, 2005
9:30 AM
BC Stats Board Room
Don: is there medical basis to disability?
Warren said no
Ms. Carol Gore goes on to state
so will proceed with 32.15 complaint42

13. After an investigation regarding the manager's accusation that the grievor has a mental problem making him unable to control his behaviour making co-workers fear for safety, thereby justifying the manager's and the co-worker's discrimination, the shop steward stated

"I asked about their ruling with regard to the accusation by Dave [manager] ... who acknowledged the remark. Mr. McRae said they found that that incident did not constitute a misuse of managerial authority." Exhibit 13

14. Then Don McRae ruled

"the resolution would be that there would be no resolution", and that the case was considered "closed" (Dec. 12, 2005).43

15. I forwarded my grievance to the Deputy Minister, Gordon Macette, on January 30 2006,

a) again requesting work place skills courses:

"the manager chose to not support the work place skills program but instead reacted negatively to this opportunity and chose to participate in efforts to discredit the person who had been the subject of the yelling. Exhibit 18

40 Ibid. p3 point #1)

41 From the transcripts from Freedom of Information (FOI) of discussions between Public Service Agency representatives, Carol Gore and M. Charbonneau (Exhibit 16a) and included in letter to MLCS as new evidence, Sept, 2010, www.wminformatics.com/WP/Facts6aMLCS1j.pdf.

42 Exhibit 16b.

43 The shop steward told me that there was no write up of the Dec. 12, 2005 meetings, but the FIO package shows that there was a write-up and that Mr. McRae changed the accusation, from passive "aggressive" to "intense".

b) and describing some of the non-statistical methods:

Changes to the Generalized Estimations System including "Splitting the data" - the municipalities - into two groups then running regressions separately; (p. 22) advising against "compound growth rate" for one group of municipalities; correcting "dependency ratio"; fixing "the PED [Provincial Electoral Districts] estimation procedure." etc. ⁴⁴

c) yet emphasizing positive solutions

"I honestly feel that given the opportunity, the members of the population section can work out problems and come up with positive solutions.

16. But before the Deputy Minister replied, the manager, D. O'Neil, with the shop steward present, ordered me to close the office window, leave my computer on, gather my belongings, turn in my security pass, and leave the building February 15, 2006.⁴⁵

February 16, 2006, Don, Dave, Carol, Michelle
Re: Warren Munroe

Don - he's been asked to leave the building
Dave told him [Warren] he could take his personal items.⁴⁶

17. Just to be clear, I was ordered, not asked.

18. On February 24, 2006, (Exhibit 25) the Deputy Minister found

I do not see any evidence of "misuse of managerial/supervisory authority"

19. I was ordered to return to work and strongly advised (in writing), by Mr. McRae, to see a counselor to address my "problem", March 9, 2006

"In light of your continued reference to unsubstantiated claims of intimidation and harassment by your manager and co-workers, the employer is making a formal referral to BC Employee and Family Assistance Program." Exhibit 30

20. However, this assistance program was not applicable ...

"A formal referral to BC Employee and Family Assistance Program (BCEFAP) is a formalized (in writing) offer of assistance to an employee whose personal problems are believed to have adversely impacted their work performance. This referral occurs after deterioration in an employee's work has been documented. Formal referrals to the BCEFAP are used only after work performance review has identified unsatisfactory performance."

⁴⁴ The substandard quality of reasoning that justified using telephone landline data reflects the substandard quality of reasoning that justified my dismissal for insubordination and continues to justify the refusal to allow arbitration / mediation to proceed. See Exhibit 18 and 18a.

⁴⁵ www.wminfomatics.com/WP/petition/February%2016.pdf. See the emails immediately prior to the dismissal, www.wminfomatics.com/WP/petition/Fellegiemail1.pdf, regarding advice to the D. McRae.

⁴⁶ <http://www.wminfomatics.com/WP/petition/Fellegiemail1.pdf>

21. I had an excellent work record having reduced error, time and cost, with no unsatisfactory performance⁴⁷; nonetheless, during a phone call from Mr. McRae⁴⁸, and in discussions with the BCGEU, I was required to participate in this program or I would be dismissed.⁴⁹

"The Employer confirmed there would be an initial assessment and five counselling sessions provided. You were also notified that failure to attend would result in a recommendation to the Deputy Minister for your dismissal. You did not attend." See exhibits 43 and 44. (BCGEU May 28, 2006)

22. I insisted upon mediation⁵⁰; however, I was notified of my dismissal for insubordination and just cause in a letter directly from the deputy minister on April 28, 2006.⁵¹

"I have received a recommendation that you be dismissed from your employment as a Population Analyst with the Ministry of Labour and Citizens' Services. Your dismissal was recommended as a result of your insubordinate behaviour, your failure to follow direction, and your failure to accept any responsibility for what you perceive as a dysfunctional workplace.

...you are hereby dismissed from employment with the Public Service, effective immediately " See exhibits 36.

23. I replied on May 1, 10th (but received no reply) and 24th disputing "just cause" describing discrimination, again, including grounds covered by the BC Human Rights Code,⁵² as set out in the Master Agreements Article 8.9 Dismissal or Suspension Grievances

"(a) In the case of a dispute arising from an employee's dismissal, rejection on probation, suspension greater than 20 days or suspension for just cause pending investigation, the grievance may be filed directly at arbitration, with a copy to the BC Public Service Agency and the Deputy Minister of the appropriate Ministry, within 30 days of the date on which the dismissal, rejection on probation, or suspension occurred, or within 30 days of the employee receiving such notice."

24. The BCPSA had already heard from the Deputy Minister ...

⁴⁷ See my Employee Performance, Exhibit 2. If unsatisfactory performance was identified, the Master Agreement requires I be informed. In this manner, an Employee would be able to identify, and attain, satisfactory performance. What was the unsatisfactory performance? Filing a grievance? Pointing out substandard methods?

⁴⁸ This phone call violated not only the Master Agreement but also the BC Public Service Act because it does the opposite of promote harmony but rather promotes disharmony and disgust. This practice must stop. Article 8.10 (a) "The Employer agrees that, after a grievance has been initiated by the Union, the Employer's representatives will not enter into discussion or negotiation with respect to the grievance, either directly or indirectly with the aggrieved employee without the consent of the Union." The Union did not consent Exhibit 27.

⁴⁹ BC Labour Code, Section 5 (1) "A person must not (a) refuse to employ or refuse to continue to employ a person, (b) threaten dismissal of or otherwise threaten a person, (c) discriminate against or threaten to discriminate against a person with respect to employment or a term or condition of employment or membership in a trade union, (d) intimidate or coerce or impose a pecuniary or other penalty on a person, because of a belief that the person may testify in a proceeding under this Code or because the person has made or is about to make a disclosure that may be required of the person in a proceeding under this Code or because the person has made an application, filed a complaint or otherwise exercised a right conferred by or under this Code or because the person has participated or is about to participate in a proceeding under this Code".

⁵⁰ Exhibits 28, 31, 34. Also see the letters from the Employer and the BCGEU in February, March, and April 2006

⁵¹ Exhibit 31.

⁵² Exhibits 38, 42.

From: Charbonneau, Michelle M PSA:EX
Sent: Tuesday, May 23, 2006 11:02 AM
To: Davies, Nancy PSA:EX
Subject: Munroe

"just dropped off a copy of the letter that Warren Munroe wrote to G. Macatee on May 10/06. In the letter he states that he had informed the BCGEU that he did not agree with the claim of just cause regarding his dismissal. two questions:

1) the Deputy's office is asking for advice in how to respond to this letter and normally I would be cautioning them that as he was pursuing a grievance process - not to get involved.

2) Has your office rec'd a grievance from the GEU? We haven't heard of anything from the ministry end of it. If it has been filed at arb, would we state that he has gone outside of the grievance process and therefore it's been abandoned?

Michelle Charbonneau
Labour Relations Specialist
Labour Relations Branch⁵³

25. Over six months after submitting my grievance to the Deputy Minister (January 30, 2006) the BCGEU sent a form (July 11, 2006). This form was referred to as the beginning of the grievance by the LRB in their decision June 2008.⁵⁴

26. Receiving no assistance from the BCGEU in the summer and fall of 2006, I made a submission to the BCHRT including the following grounds: Active, involved, innovative, education, experience [tradesman], team player, results oriented, age [the BCGEU rep asked how old I was because if I was near retirement I would not be represented; Jan O'Brian's called me a tradesman who returned to university late in life], place of origin [rural], sex [male], political belief [democratic], ancestry [racial slurs and profiling; also I filled out the government employment equity form admitting mixed European / Aboriginal ancestry].

27. The Chair person, Heather MacNaughton, ruled out all grounds except for ancestry.

"Your complaint does not set out facts that show that the Respondents' conduct could be discrimination in employment based on age, sex, place of origin and political belief."⁵⁵

28. After dropping my case at every opportunity, BCGEU representative, Jan O'Brian, suddenly appeared saying I could trust her. She was aware of the BCHRT Chair highlighting ancestry in letters sent from December 2006 to June 2007.⁵⁶

29. In June 2007, the MLCS argued that arbitration not be allowed to proceed claiming I abandoned arbitration by going down the wrong channel and that this is "NOT A HUMAN RIGHTS CASE!" and that if I pursued arbitration I would be financially responsible for the co-workers who I was accused of making fearful (Ms. Rusen, contract lawyer for MLCS).⁵⁷

30. In October 2007, well over time limits, the arbiter specifically pointed to the May 2006 letters cc'd to

⁵³ The arbiter was not made aware of this. www.wminfomatics.com/WP/petition/Exhibit40a.pdf.

⁵⁴ Fumbling and bumbling by those in positions of authority (similar to the way BC Stats creates population numbers) can not be used to deny a fair hearing, Labour Relations Code, Section 156

⁵⁵ January 2007, BC Human Rights Tribunal Case Number 4376. I asked about ancestry not being ruled out but was told my request for a hearing was denied. Lawyers refused to take my case, one saying I look like a whiner after charging me \$3,000.

⁵⁶ See <http://www.wminfomatics.com/WP/Journal.html>.

⁵⁷ The stenographers recordings are being withheld by the MLCS. www.wminfomatics.com/WP/FOIJP2a.pdf, but I keep notes of the meeting.

the Deputy Minister sent within timelines, as abandoning arbitration.⁵⁸

"The fact of the matter is that the grievor wrote no less than four times to the Deputy Minister, the subject of the correspondence being the same as his grievance."

"Did Mr. Munroe "endeavour to pursue the same grievance through another channel"? It is my finding that he did."

31. What? (please read Section 22 and 28 again carefully) ...in other words, for following the Master Agreement Article 8.9 Dismissal or Suspension Grievances, for providing copies to the Deputy Minister the arbiter ruled the grievor had gone through another channel, and as a result I am not allowed to face my accusers, nor continue with the disclosure of the real matters in dispute.

32. Shortly after the arbiter agreed to impose a block on proceedings, October 2007, Jan O'Brian dropped my case writing "I wish you well in your new endeavours."⁵⁹

33. Again within time limits, I requested relief, informing the LRB ...

"The quality of the work done by the Population Section is at the heart of this issue."

"For example, the use of the change in telephone land lines as an indicator of population change was implemented without proper statistical testing (cell phones makes this indicator suspect), as was the splitting of the municipalities into two groups. Also, the Provincial Electoral District Population Estimates and Projections were created using non statistical methods. Databases were unorganized and incorrectly labeled. The Ministry of Finance changed the migration projection arbitrarily, lowering it 7,000 people below model projections. Since the migration numbers were low for the lower mainland, (7,000 people missing and cell phone use) I was ordered to take people out of Comox/Courtenay and other high growth areas (Kelowna) and told to put them into Richmond and Burnaby (telephone hookups had dropped) and I refused."

34. With no time limits, the LRB supported the block in June 2008, October 2008, June 2009.

"The Applicant grieved his dismissal on July 11, 2007."

"For the reasons given above I find that the Applicant has not established that the Arbitrator made any reviewable errors. Accordingly, his Section 99 application is dismissed."⁶⁰

35. This report must be corrected to read the grievor was informed April 28, 2006 and grieved the dismissal on May 1, 2006, not July 2007.

36. Over these years, I wrote hundreds of letters⁶¹ including the following

⁵⁸ Comment: If cc'ing, in reply, to the Deputy Minister (as required by the Master Agreement) describing violations human rights and natural justice can be used to stop a grievance process, Employees must have the right to know. I contend that I was removed from courses regarding the Master Agreement in an effort to keep me ill informed and easily dismissed as well as accused of causing fear without a chance of a fair hearing. Also the arbiter can reasonably be considered dependent rather than independent as he can be removed from a special list of arbiters at the objection of either the BCGEU or the BCPSA.

⁵⁹ <http://www.wminfomatics.com/WP/Journal.html> October 9, 2007

⁶⁰ See <http://www.wminfomatics.com/WP/Journal.html>, July 2, 2008 G.J. Mullaly, Vice-Chair, LRB

⁶¹ See the approximately 50 correspondences since, to those in positions of authority links below, including letters to lawyers and the Minister of Labour and Citizens' Services, specifically showing that mediation and arbitration

From: information@wminfomatics.com
Sent: June 3, 2009 11:39 AM
To:
Subject: discrimination labour law racial slurs mental/behaviour problem dismissal

Hello,

I was told by my former Employer (BC Stats, Min of Labour and Citizens' Services), (supported by the BCPA and accepted by the BCGEU), that I could not utilize a discrimination / harassment procedure to address accusations that I have a mental / behavioural problem, (that, apparently, made it impossible for people to work with me, making two female co-workers feared for their safety), unless I could prove that I have a mental / behavioural disorder. Does a person who is accused of having a mental / behavioural disorder have to prove that they have a mental / behavioural disorder to utilize discrimination proceedings?

To use another example: Does a person who is accused, harassed and dismissed, for being considered a homosexual have to prove that they are a homosexual to utilize discrimination proceedings?

Has there been a ruling on this?

Warren

37. I received this reply.....

From:
Sent: Wednesday, June 03, 2009 5:16 PM
To: information@wminfomatics.com
Subject: RE: discrimination labour law racial slurs mental/behaviour problem dismissal

No, you can succeed if you can prove you were discriminated against based on a "perceived" disability - this principle has also been applied to those being harassed for being perceived as gay (see School District No. 44 (North Vancouver) v. Jubran, 2005 BCCA 201 at para 43 & 44)).

38. In June 2009, I contacted the LRB again and received a reply, referring to decisions BCLRB 97/2008 (June 2008) and BCLRB 173/2008 (October 2008), but was told

The conduct you complaint [sic] about occurred years ago, from 2002 to 2007. . . any application under the Code would far exceed any acceptable filing time and could be dismissed on that basis alone.⁶²

39. To be clear, the process I was put through took from March 2005 to October 2008, four months shy of 4 (four) years. Canadians, including British Columbians, including government Employees indeed, any person charged with an offence has the right

a) to be informed without unreasonable delay of the specific offence;

b) to be tried within a reasonable time;

40. Dear Minister, you suggested I contact the BCHRT, and I have informed you that I did and described to you the results.

41. You also explain that the person appointed to the position of Minister of LCS has responsibility; however, the people in this position over the years have maintained the block to proceedings.

have been denied on grounds covered by the BC Human Rights Code in contravention of the Canadian Charter of Rights <http://www.wminfomatics.com/WP/Facts6aMLCS1j.pdf>

⁶² <http://www.wminfomatics.com/WP/LRB090622a.pdf>

42. As you can see from the evidence, the deviations from proceedings, set out by the relevant acts, codes, and agreements, can reasonably be seen to unjustifiably block a fair hearing into the real matters in dispute, namely, the real methods by BC Stats to create population numbers for places in BC.

43. Also, the use of “wrong channels” to stop a grievance proceeding, especially referring to copies of a dismissal grievance sent to the Deputy Minister within timelines, as required by the relevant Master Agreement Article (8.9) is far too loosely and broadly applied, making violations of the BC Public Service Act, the BC Labour Code, the Master Agreement, the BC Human Rights Code, and the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms all too easy to be maintained and supported, and therefore, should be addressed.

44. Underlying this inadequacy, and it’s support, are the problems that arise from stifling discussion and information exchange in favour of creating fear. These problems result in less reliable information being used in decision making.

45. Given that the Ministry of Attorney General provides civil legal services to ministries to assist them in fulfilling their business objectives, objectives which must include the purpose of the Public Service Act, in accordance with the rule of law, and is responsible for the province’s human rights system, will you please:

- 1) clarify whether this case has been addressed properly,
- 2) and if not, will you please provide clarification on how to proceed,
- 3) and until there is a fair hearing into the real matters in dispute, namely the real methods used by BC Stats to create population numbers,
 - a) may I be considered innocent until proven guilty⁶³
 - i) removing from my record “just cause” and “insubordination”
 - b) and may I receive an apology, for having been subject to egregious displays of bad faith.

46. Dear Minister, as you are aware, the Purpose of Public Service Act, is to

“(e) promote harmonious relations of the government and employees and bargaining agents that represent employees in the public service.

47. and we share

“a desire to improve the quality of the Public Service of British Columbia”.⁶⁴

As you can appreciate, this matter should be addressed as soon as possible. Sincerely,



William Warren Munroe

cc. Minister of Labour and Citizens' Services, Vince Ready, MLA R. Cantelon, and other interested people.

Links can be found via www.wminfomatics.com/WP/home.html;

for Exhibits see www.wminfomatics.com/WP/petition/petition.html;

Letter to LRB, June 2009 www.wminfomatics.com/WP/petition/CoverLRB.pdf

Letters to the MLCS, September 2010 www.wminfomatics.com/WP/Facts6aMLCS1j.pdf

More evidence is available upon request.

⁶³ As per the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms, d) to be presumed innocent until proven guilty according to law in a fair and public hearing by an independent and impartial tribunal;

⁶⁴ Master Agreement 13, Article 1.1(b) regarding Quality