

William Warren Munroe
763 Beach Road
Qualicum Beach, BC, V9K 1S2
March 31, 2020

Harry Bains, British Columbia Minister of Labour,
Room 342 Parliament Buildings
Victoria, BC, V8V 1X4
Sent via email: LBR.Minister@gov.bc.ca

Regarding: substandard employment standards leads to substandard government service; request ESA section 6 revision to include "... truthful (rather than false) information ..."; exculpatory evidence of wrongdoing; Employer's representatives attempt to conceal wrongdoing "disclosure [of report revealing wrongdoing] harmful to intergovernmental relations or negotiations"; conduct in relation to a legal proceeding was dishonest, malicious, in bad faith; exoneration for public service providers subjected to retaliation (termination)

Dear Minister of Labour, Harry Bains,

I write to you to request the exoneration of public servants who were dismissed unjustly between the years 2002 and 2019 inclusive, as well as request the revision of Employment Standards Act (ESA) section 6 in order to be clear about what type of information Employer's give to employees regarding employment standards, namely truthful information rather than false information.

Supporting explanations and examples are provided in four sections all addressing collective agreements between provincial government of British Columbia (BC) employers' representatives and employees:

- 1) An employer must not threaten to dismiss a person because information may be or has been supplied under the ESA;
- 2) Exculpatory evidence of wrongdoing and attempted cover-up;
- 3) Comparison of false versus truthful information from government employers' representatives given to government employees;
- 4) Request for exoneration.

1) An employer must not threaten to dismiss a person because information may be or has been supplied under this Act

Making the minimum employment standards inapplicable causes general deterioration in standards

Thanks to you and your governing party for addressing the Provincial Government of British Columbia's Employment Standards Act (ESA) and Labour Code (the Code) so BC government public servants (employees) can expect to have the same standards and protection or exceed the requirements in the ESA.

Bill 8 - Collective Agreements. Any collective agreement that is made or renewed after May 30, 2019 has to meet or exceed the requirements in the ESA regarding ... termination ...

Kevin P. O'Neill and David T. McDonald, Fasken Martineau DuMoulin LLP, Vancouver: <https://www.employmentlawtoday.com/article/40373-significant-labour-relations-code-and-employment-standards-act-amendments-impact-all-bc-businesses/>

Mr. Bains, I was not aware until recently (after the revision of Bill 8 reverting the ESA to the pre-2002 standards) that during my employment with the BC public service (2002 to 2006), collective agreements such as the collective agreement between the British Columbia Public Service Agency (BCPSA) and the British Columbia Government Employee's Union (BCGEU) did not always meet certain ESA minimum standards.

This provision [in Bill 8] represents the greatest change for unionized employers of those contained in Bill 8 because it reverts the ESA to the pre-2002 regime. The fact is that most collective agreements that do not meet certain ESA minimums were deliberately negotiated in that way to give the employer greater flexibility and, in exchange, the union bargained better rights or benefits elsewhere.

Bill 8, Changes to British Columbia's Employment Standards Act, July 05, 2019, Abigail Cheung, Associate, Vancouver, abcheung@mccarthy.ca

"Better rights or benefits"?

Could it be rights were deliberately negotiated away in favour of better benefits? Could it be, the BCPSA came to an understanding with the BCGEU to not allow arbitration in cases of employee's complaints of discrimination, coercion and termination? Could it be, with this substandard agreement, the BCGEU would make an effort to appear to be upholding employees' rights, rights they had negotiated away?

"Making the minimum standards inapplicable in collective bargaining encourages collusion between employers and sham unions to arrive at substandard terms. This creates competitive advantages for employers who have these agreements. Competitive pressures will in turn cause general deterioration in standards.
(<https://www.bcli.org/wordpress/wp-content/uploads/2018/12/Employment-Standards-Act.pdf> p. 43)

By definition, "sham" unions would include established unions that would deceive their members. For example, unions pretending to protect members from retaliation who make a complaint as set out in the Employment Standards Act and reflected in the BC Labour Code, while in reality hiding the fact that rights, including the following, were negotiated away:

83. (1) An employer must not
- (a) refuse to employ or refuse to continue to employ a person,
 - (b) threaten to dismiss or otherwise threaten a person,
 - (c) discriminate against or threaten to discriminate against a person with respect to employment or a condition of employment, or
 - (d) intimidate or coerce or impose a monetary or other penalty on a person,

because a complaint or investigation may be or has been made under this Act or because an appeal or other action may be or has been taken or information may be or has been supplied under this Act.
(http://www.bclaws.ca/Recon/document/ID/freeside/00_96113_01)

[Comment: the BC Labour Code section 5 (1) has the same wording except "the Code" replaces "this Act"]

In other words, between 2002 (month and day not known) and May 30, 2019, an employee's right to not be terminated for making a complaint under the ESA, could have been negotiated away in favour of other rights or benefits "elsewhere". What stops labour relations from returning to the 2002 to May 30, 2019 sub-standards?

Terminated because a complaint was made under the BC Labour Code

In my case, after forwarding my complaint to the Deputy Minister, Gordon Macatee, (January 30, 2006) the manager, Dave O'Neil, ordered me to leave my computer on, turn in my security pass and leave the building. The shop steward, Marvin Paxman, helped me carry my belongings.

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

(Copy of a portion of an email from a Freedom of Information release 2009)

To be clear, I was not asked to turn in my security pass, I was told. Also, I was not asked to leave the building, I was told to leave the building.

Termination hearing not allowed

Nonetheless, I still pursued a fair hearing into the real matters in dispute, namely substandard practices and retaliation for suggesting improvements. Minutes before arbitration was to proceed (June 2007), we (BCGEU representative Jan O'Brien and I) were informed there would be a preliminary hearing to see if arbitration would be allowed.

Three months after the preliminary hearing (October 2007), a misinformed Vince Ready decided not to allow arbitration to proceed on the grounds that by replying (within time limits) to the dismissal letter sent to me by the Deputy Minister, I was going down the wrong channel – I was not allowed to send a letter to the BCGEU cc'd to the Deputy Minister replying to the letter sent to me by the Deputy Minister.

Master Agreement Article 8.9 Dismissal or Suspension Grievances

"(a) In the case of a dispute arising from an employee's dismissal, ... 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 employee receiving such notice."

Negative work environment harbors retaliation rather than finding constructive resolutions

Some people in organizations including government become negative towards others. Sometimes the negativity can be between Employees towards Employer representatives or vice versa.

For example, because my reply to the Deputy Minister received no response, I asked the Deputy Minister about the status of my grievance. A new Deputy Minister, Lori Wannamaker, replied that by ending my letter with a salutation of hope for a "constructive resolution", I could be seen as having breached the Master Agreement by seeking a remedy outside of proper procedures – going down the wrong channel.

In some governments, employees cannot say they hope for a constructive resolution to an Employers' representative. Some arbiters will block a fair hearing into the real reasons for terminating an employee if that employee says they hope for a constructive resolution to an Employers' representative. Some Employer representatives may prefer negativity when dealing with employees. Such standards may permeate workplaces.

Other government employees were denied arbitration between 2002 and 2019 also.

"Despite the lack of evidence, when it came to the arbitration process, Scott said he wasn't confident the union was solidly behind him, and he feared the government would only further badmouth him."

"I was sort of backed into a corner, and when I finally did [say no to the arbitration] they were totally happy," Scott said of the union. (Fired B.C. health researchers say their union failed them, Cindy E. Harnett, Times Colonist, July 2, 2015 06:00 AM, <https://www.timescolonist.com/news/local/fired-b-c-health-researchers-say-their-union-failed-them-1.1986500>).

Not going to arbitration made the union representatives "totally happy". Why? Was there an agreement between the BCPSA and the BCGEU to not allow arbitration into the real matters in dispute to proceed, even regarding termination – wrongful dismissal? Little wonder former Premier of BC referred to BC's Capital as having a "sick culture" (May 2012).

Why were government employees, such as myself, not informed about the imposition of working conditions that did not meet certain ESA or BC Labour Code minimum standards such as termination procedures?

ESA should be revised to include "... truthful (rather than false) information ..."

In my case, after being allowed to take courses in Project Planning, Relational Databases, Consulting, the manager blocked me from attending two courses I had requested, both regarding labour relations, one offer by the BCPSA and the other by the BCGEU (shop steward training).

Neither the BCGEU or the BCPSA informed me of the substandard working conditions and the loss of protection from retaliation for making a complaint.

Recent changes to Bill 8 include a requirement that the employer must make available to each employee information about the rights of the employee under the ESA.

Informing employees of their rights

6 An employer must make available or provide to each employee, in a form provided or approved by the director, information about the rights of the employee under this Act.

http://www.bclaws.ca/Recon/document/ID/freeside/00_96113_01

Mr. Bains, could this section of the revised ESA (2019) be revised to include "... truthful (rather than false) information ..."; therefore, this section would read:

Informing employees of their rights

6 An employer must make available or provide to each employee, in a form provided or approved by the director, truthful (rather than false) information about the rights of the employee under this Act.

Minister Baines, in my case, information about the rights of a BC government employee regarding making a complaint as set out in the Code was false. BC Statistics (BC Stats) Executive Director, Don McRae, did not provide truthful information and say to me something like:

“Mr. Munroe, the collective agreement has been changed and you have no protection from retaliation, including termination, for making a complaint. Even if you are following the procedures as they are laid out in the Master Agreement and the BC Labour Code.”

Instead, the Executive Director pretended the collective agreement still met the minimum ESA standards while it did not, resulting in me being fired and put through another 3 years of futile procedures (to the appeal to the BC Labour Board ruling) in an effort to exhaust all opportunities for a fair hearing into the real matters in dispute.

Minister Bains, being told the truth would have been far better than the unwritten retaliation procedure of making false accusations and character assassinations to justify termination of employees who make a complaint as set out in the Code - pretending to fire them for just cause. Given that representatives of the Employer lied to the public as well as federal government officials, perhaps we should not be surprised that they would lie about an Employee.

Informing employees about falsification of information by employer’s representatives

As mentioned, ESA Section 6 requires employers to provide information to employees about employment standards ensuring minimum standards are met, but does not require, employers to provide information to employees about products or services standards ensuring minimum standards are met.

Perhaps employers should also tell the truth to employees if products or services are substandard.

While serving the public as Population Analyst (January 14, 2002 to February 15, 2006) no one informed me that my accusers had provided Statistics and Finance Canada with false information to be included in a study conducted by Statistics Canada for Finance Canada regarding possible refinements in methods and data to estimate population for Canada’s Equalization Payments programme.

No one told me the truth by saying something such as:

“Mr. Munroe, we are making mean spirited personal attacks against you including false accusations so you will quit because you are in a government position where you will discover sooner than later that we, your superiors, have deceived Statistics Canada and Finance Canada by giving them false information to make it look like our methods and data produce population estimates that are of “better quality” than Statistics Canada’s numbers when compared to the Census of Population.”

[Comment: indeed, while I was seeking assistance to address my co-workers’ aggressive yelling the shop steward, Marvin Paxman, told me the best thing I could do was to quit.]

This theme, the requirement that Employers and their representatives provide truthful information regarding the rights of employees to include the right of employees to be told the

truth about wrongdoing committed by Employer's representatives will be expanded upon in section 3).

2) Exculpatory evidence of wrongdoing and attempted cover-up

Statistics Canada's 2005 feasibility study compared to BC Stats' 2011 methods document

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

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

The other document published in 2011, BC Stats' officials revised the 1998 methods paper describing some of the many changes to the methodology between 1998 and 2011:

"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." GENERALIZATION ESTIMATION SYSTEM (GES) Small Area Population Estimation, Method and Error Evaluation, August 2011, (GES 2011) p. 8.

To be clear, when Statistics Canada conducted the Equalization payments feasibility study, from September 2004 to February 28, 2005, the BC Stats' officials who targeted me for removal told Statistics Canada officials that BC Statistics uses the 1998 methodology; however, during the feasibility study BC Stats' did not use the 1998 methodology.

Why did BC Stats officials not tell Statistics Canada officials the truth, that the methodology had been changed? Why did BC Stats officials tell British Columbians, attending public consultation meetings to address recommendations to close public schools in 2010, that they still used the 1998 methodology? Shouldn't population numbers be supported by correct methods and data rather than incorrect methods and data for over 10 years?

Problem recognized by new BC Stats' Executive Director but not a problem to Minister

This lack of integrity, unsupported unverifiable population numbers, was recognized as a problem in August 2011 by then BC Statistics' Executive Director, A. Cocco, (in response to incorrect information at public school closure meetings) stating that the publication of correct methods and data was "long overdue".

In November 2011, the Minister responsible for BC Statistics, Margret McDiarmid, with the advice of the Assistant Deputy Minister of ServiceBC, dismissed concerns about the

unsupported population numbers by quoting Statistics Canada's 2005 Equalization Payments feasibility study as follows:

Dear Mr. Munroe:

The Honourable Dr. Margaret MacDiarmid has asked that I respond to your emails dated November 3 and November 9, 2011, regarding your views on the quality of population estimates for British Columbia and your dismissal from the BC Public Service in April 2006. As the Assistant Deputy Minister responsible for Service BC, I am happy to address these matters.

I understand that BC Stats brought to your attention in previous correspondence, that assertions you provided regarding (i) arbitrary manipulation of the estimates process, and (ii) the unreliability of the estimates information provided to clients and citizens, are incorrect.

The integrity and objectivity of the population estimation procedures and methods are guarded by BC Stats, and the quality of the resulting estimates is unparalleled. Statistics Canada, Canada's national statistics agency, holds in high regard the methodology and estimates produced by BC Stats: In a 2005 feasibility study prepared by Statistics Canada (STC) for Finance Canada, the agency concluded that:

"...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. "

BC Stats' provincial ministry clients and Statistics Canada are quite satisfied with the underlying methodology and quality of outputs associated with BC Stats' sub-provincial populations estimates program.

...

The rest of this letter is quoted below. Please be aware, BC Stats had not brought to my attention that my assertions were incorrect. What of my assertions were incorrect? No one from BC Stats replied to my offers to correct statements in the 2011 GES paper.

[Comment: within a day of the release of the 2005 feasibility study (February 28, 2005), rather than the members of the Population Section celebrating Statistics Canada's "better quality" endorsement, Mr. O'Neil accused me of making a verbal attack on a female co-worker. He withdrew this accusation at a meeting I requested with the shop steward.]

Lack of integrity acceptable

To be clear, the same Statistics Canada document showing BC Stats' officials deceived Statistics Canada officials was used to assert BC Stats' "integrity".

Having served the public as Population Analyst (2002 to 2006), I knew that the 1998 methods and data were changed after the release of the 2001 census results, in 2002, because the 1998 methodology produced population estimates that were unacceptably, statistically significantly different from the actual 2001 census results – of poor quality.

Naturally, I was very curious about this 2005 feasibility study, a study conducted while I served as BC Stats' Population Analyst, a study that I was not aware of until June 2012 - six years after I was fired; therefore, I requested a copy or at least the title of this study.

Disclosure harmful to intergovernmental relations or negotiations

My many requests (12 over a 6 month period) to Minister McDiarmid and ADM Hughes, did not receive a reply; therefore, I made a Freedom of Information request for the source of the quote “better quality” which was denied:

Dear William Warren Munroe:

Re: Request for Access to Records Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act (FOIPPA)

I am writing further to your request received by the Ministry of Labour, Citizens' Services and Open Government. Your request is for:

The full reference to a 2005 feasibility study prepared by Statistics Canada for Finance Canada as referred to in a November 22, 2011 letter authored by Betty-Jo Hughes.

Please be advised the records you requested are withheld in their entirety pursuant to section 16 (Disclosure harmful to intergovernmental relations or negotiations) of FOIPPA.

Sincerely,

for Cindy Elbahir, Manager Central Agency Team Information Access Operations

To be clear, access to the study used to assert BC Stats’ integrity was denied by the Provincial Government of British Columbia claiming “disclosure harmful...”

Why did BC Stats’ officials change the methodology between 1998 and 2005? Why did BC Stats officials not tell Statistics Canada about the methodology changes between 1998 and 2005? Why did BC Stats officials fire the Population Analyst (the Author) who raised concerns about the problematic methodology?

Information Laundering

As revealed in BC Stats’ 2011 publication, false information was included in a report to Statistics and Finance Canada. This false information was then endorsed by Statistics Canada as being of “better quality” than Statistics Canada’s. During public consultation meetings to address public school closures, this endorsement was used to dismiss concerns about BC Stats’ dissemination of unsupported unverifiable population numbers for over 10 years.

Similar to ‘money laundering’ (“the process used to disguise the source of money or assets derived from criminal activity.”), information laundering is the process used to disguise the source of information derived from deception such as forgery, or fraud.

Also Mr. Bains, did you know that the Minister of Labour cannot investigate problems nor suggest improvements to Labour Standards regarding wrongful unjust terminations of individuals? According to Ms. Hughes you can’t:

...

“In response to your reference to the Labour Relations Code (the Code), I would like to provide additional information. The Code provisions dealing with ministerial appointments of third parties to assist in labour relations disputes are not intended to apply to disputes between individual employees and their employers. Rather, such appointments are made in relation to issues and disputes relating to collective

bargaining between unions and employers. In a unionized workplace, disputes between individual employees and their employers are resolved through processes established in the applicable collective agreement.

I appreciate the opportunity to respond to your concerns and trust that the information I have provided has addressed these issues in full."

Bette-Jo Hughes
Assistant Deputy Minister
Service BC

pc: Honourable Dr. Margaret MacDiarmid, Minister of Labour, Citizens' Services and Open Government Mr. Angelo Cocco, Executive Director, BC Stats

<http://wminfomatics.com/WMAalytics/Articles/120127/mlcs1a0001.pdf> and
<http://wminfomatics.com/WMAalytics/Articles/120127/mlcs1a0001.pdf>

As was shown already, my case was not "resolved" - there was no resolution. In fact, saying "constructive resolution" to the Deputy Minister was used to block a fair hearing. Also, Ms. Hughes chose a narrow interpretation of the "Guide To The British Columbia Labour Relations Code" given to me by the local MLA wherein it states the Minister has the authority to:

"Make appointments of mediators, industrial inquiry commissions, and/or special officers to assist parties in resolving their labour relations disputes."

Not only did Ms. Hughes ignore BC Stats' Executive Director's confirmation that the publication of the correct methodology was "long overdue" (over 10 years), Ms. Hughes also chose to ignore the role of Minister: "to assist parties in resolving their labour relations disputes."

Was this dismissal of evidence of lack of integrity (for 10 years), pretending to support the "integrity" of BC Stats publications, simply a way to maintain substandard government generated statistics and employment standards. From the "Guide" regarding the "Code"

"The Ministry plays a leadership role in transforming service delivery to British Columbians. Fulfilling this role depends on a committed and skilled work force operating in a customer-focused, innovative and results-oriented culture."

Please be aware, customer focused, innovative and results oriented employees providing reliable information (statistics) are susceptible to termination if they are in a government position where they would discover false reporting and/or raise concerns about substandard practices.

Minister Bains, are you allowed to make appointments of mediators, industrial inquiry commissions, and/or special officers to assist parties in resolving their labour relations disputes? Or investigate? Or recommend solutions? Or exonerate wrongfully dismissed Public Servants?

3) Comparison of false versus truthful information from government employers' representatives given to government employees

Why tell the truth?

As highlighted in section 1) the difference between true and false information should be recognized in the ESA.

But what about truthful information for employees regarding changing work practices from meeting standard practices to substandard practices, substandard results, as well as incompetence, false reporting, and deception.

This type of information would not conceal wrongdoing by employer's representatives but rather it would reveal wrongdoing by employer's representatives to the employee. In a workplace where the employer's representatives try to frame an employee for the employer's representatives' wrongdoing an employee would be aware of the real reasons for termination.

For example, if truthful, official government statistical agency's employer's representatives would provide information about the acceptance of disseminating numbers that do not have integrity, as well as information about non-statistical practices to be used to create numbers used to guide public policies.

More specifically, this section explores what BC Statistics' employer's representatives might have said if they were truthful about changing working conditions including substandard practices.

From integrity to a lack of integrity

What would the Executive Director of BC Statistics, Don McRae, have said if he were to provide truthful information to a statistical agency Analyst (employee) about the practice of below minimum statistical agency standards?

Mr. McRae did not inform me about why I was targeted for removal. Just prior to recommending to the Deputy Minister that I be dismissed; Mr. McRae did not say to me something truthful like:

Mr. Munroe, remember when you started working here 4 years ago, the Census of Population results were released shortly thereafter and our, BC Statistics', population numbers were very different from the Census results.

I asked you to kick out outliers in an effort to reduce the error, but nothing reduced the error until the municipality of Surrey, also an outlier, was removed. Since Surrey was too big to kick out without raising questions, I asked you and two longtime employees to figure out why our methods, data and model produced numbers of such poor quality.

The two longtime employees, (who had helped develop the poor quality methodology) could not figure it out, but you did proper hypothesis testing of underlying assumptions and you figured it out. The then Manager of the Population Section, Ruth McDougal and I congratulated you while one of the two longtime employees, the Chief Demographer, Dave O'Neil, called your hypothesis testing "dumb luck".

You also suggested improvements (such as using health care registry data), but Mr. O’Neil and I came up with new methods and data – methods and data that you said would only make things worse. You even went so far as to develop projections revealing potential problems with the methods and data that we came up with, but we went ahead anyway; however, Ruth McDougal, did agree with you. You asked to see the testing of the new methods and data we came up with, but you were told by Mr. O’Neil “DS, is doing the testing and you are no DS”. Nonetheless, you had regularly insisted that the new methods and data be made public.

Two years later, your projections showing the problems with our new methods and data came true and we had to change the methodology again. As you know, Ruth McDougal retired, and Dave O’Neil was given the Manager position by restricting the job posting from open across Canada to only BC Statistics personnel.

[Comment: Mr. O’Neil had been the Union’s shop steward for BC Statistics’ employees for over 10 years before taking the manager position and designated an “Excluded Employee”. He was also a union representative in discussion regarding job security during the implementation of technological innovations. He served as the Chief Demographer for over 20 years.]

As fate would have it, shortly after realizing we had to change the methodology again, as per your warnings, Statistics Canada informed us, [Don McRae, and Mr. O’Neil], that Finance Canada requested a feasibility study regarding refinements to methods and data used to estimate population for Canada’s equalization payments programme. You were not told about this study.

Nor did Mr. McRae tell the truth about why I was subjected to false accusations

Mr. Munroe, the reason Mr. O’Neil did not take you to Ottawa for the meetings with Statistics Canada, and chose instead to take the newly hired Population Analyst (4 months) was because you would likely reveal the fact that BC Statistics methods and data were of poor quality and needed to be changed again.

Instead, we did not tell Statistics Canada officials that we changed the methods and data after the census release 4 years ago due to the poor quality of the population estimates when compared to the census results. Instead, we pretended that the old poor quality methods and data produced numbers that were almost exactly the same as the census results.

How did we trick federal officials? It was easy. We had the actual census numbers. Instead of telling the truth about how our methods and data had produced numbers of poor quality when compared to the census 4 years ago when you started, we lied to Statistics Canada officials pretending that the old methods and data produced population estimates nearly exactly the same as the census results. Instead of telling the truth, we changed the numbers to very closely match the actual census results - to make them “look good” – to look almost exactly the same as the Census of Population results. The point is that we deceived Statistics Canada and Finance Canada into thinking that our methods and data produced population estimates that were of “better quality” than Statistics Canada’s.

The reason you were yelled at, accused of doing things wrong that you did not do, and called a liar by Mr. O'Neil shortly after his return from Ottawa was because Mr. O'Neil wanted to start to make a case against you that you were incompetent, and not wanted as part of the BC Statistics 'team'.

[Comment: The substandard collective agreement was creating substandard information used to guide public services.]

Nor did Mr. McRae explain that federal officials were given false information:

We, the rest of the 'team' were making every effort to get you to quit because 4 years ago you answered my call and figured out why our, BC Statistics', methods and data produced population estimates of poor quality – for doing your job well you were considered to be a threat to the rest of the 'team'; therefore, we had to get rid of you.

First, we'd treat you with increasing malice and bad faith. If you were not going to quit, if you were going to pursue a resolution to a complaint, we would fire you, blame you for problems in BC Statistics, make sure you do not get severance pay, and block a fair hearing into the real matters in dispute, namely the real methods and data used to create population numbers by BC Statistics.

Mr. Munroe, even though you answered the call and figured out the problems, we did not tell you that Statistics Canada informed Finance Canada that BC Statistics produces population estimates of "better quality" than Statistics Canada. Instead, within 24 hours of the release of the 2005 feasibility study, "Conclusions to Finance", containing this quote (better quality), Mr. O'Neil accused you of verbally attacking a female co-worker during a Population Section meeting.

You asked to meet with Mr. O'Neil and the new shop steward, Marvin Paxman, the next day where Mr. O'Neil withdrew his claim explaining that the female co-worker was a "frustrated manager" and that her request to have her position re-classified to a higher pay position had failed and that she was having trouble at home.

[Comment: she was a cartographer not a manager. At the end of the meeting, Mr. O'Neil, Mr. Paxman and I, agreed to focus on constructive dialogue rather than negative dialogue.]

Nor did Mr. McRae explain why the Population Section members did not celebrate Statistics Canada's endorsement that BC Statistics' produces population estimates of "better quality" than Statistics Canada. He did not tell the truth and say something like:

To be clear, during this Population Section meeting, Population Section members were not told about, nor did they celebrate Statistics Canada's "better quality" endorsement of BC Statistics. Instead, you, the Population Analyst who knew of BC Statistics' poor quality, were falsely accused of making a verbal attack on a co-worker.

Shortly thereafter, Mr. O'Neil got you to revise a report that you had never worked on before and he told you to use a particular (incorrect) dataset you had never worked with before. You filled in the numbers from the (incorrect) database into the report you had never worked on before and you took it to Mr. O'Neil. Mr. O'Neil told you to take the report straight to me [Mr. McRae] rather than the normal practice of Mr. O'Neil reading

the paper first to ensure it was done correctly, i.e. the correct dataset was used. I, in turn, used a **red pen and put large red Xs across all the numbers (from the wrong dataset) and heavily stroked out lines through sentences from the beginning to the end of the 5 page report.** I gave it to Mr. O'Neil and he gave it to you. You told Mr. O'Neil that he had told you which dataset to use, and he replied that you should have used a different dataset.

You asked to meet with me and Mr. O'Neil. The next day, you said you would have caught the mistake if the column headings in the wrong dataset were labeled properly. I said maybe the headings labels would be changed.

From then to the end, when you were "escorted" out of the BC statistics offices, February 15, 2006, you continued to be accused of doing things wrong that you did not do - subjected to false accusations, yelled at by the other longtime employees, removed from the contacts list, removed from all responsibility for mission critical work, given more and more of your co-workers menial tasks with shorter and shorter time limits etc.

You came to me twice describing the negative workplace and I told you I have heard of these kinds of workplaces before and that it can be tough, but you need to be aware of the military side of government. I told you just do what you are doing, persevere or move on and that I would not interfere with Mr. O'Neil's management style.

Nor did anyone explain why I was taken off the contacts list. Mr. McRae did not explain:

Perhaps when you came to me, I should have mentioned to you that Statistics Canada stated in a report to Finance Canada that BC Statistics' Population Section's methods and data produce population estimates of "better quality" than Statistics Canada's methods and data, but, since you did not know about this endorsement [albeit based on deception] and you did know the truth, indeed because you figured out why BC Statistics methods and data created population numbers that were of "poor quality", we just could not take the chance that you might reveal the truth to Statistics Canada and Finance Canada of our deception.

That's why you were taken off the contacts list. Everyone else in the Population Section including the Cartographer and the newly hired Population Analyst are on the contacts list but not you.

Nor did anyone explain why Workplace Skills courses would make things worse. Mr. McRae did not explain:

At a meeting you requested with Mr. O'Neil and the BCPSA, and BCGEU representatives, Carol Gore and Cathy McCallum respectively, to promote Workplace Skills courses for the "team", when you pointed out examples of substandard practices, Mr. O'Neil became very angry, yelling that you are a "liar" who makes "co-workers fear for their [job?] safety".

The meeting was stopped before you could say any more and we (me and Mr. O'Neil) were able to convince the BCPSA and BCGEU representatives that you had a behavioural problem – personal problems that we believed caused your poor work performance.

While you continued to seek Workplace Skills courses for the team as BCPSA had suggested, your days were numbered. You spoke to one of your female co-workers promoting the benefits of the Workplace Skills courses for the team. At the end of your meeting, she agreed and said "Thank you". But Mr. O'Neil would not allow Workplace Skills courses saying "they would only make things worse". Of course, you were not told about the fact that Mr. O'Neil and I had falsified information provided to Statistics and Finance Canada.

Nor did anyone explain that by following procedures a Public Servant would be fired. Mr. McRae did not explain:

You complained about unfair treatment and I told you to read the Master Agreement and file a grievance of abuse of managerial authority. You countered that a human rights violation was more appropriate since Mr. O'Neil justified the harassment toward you by contending you could not control your behavior which in turn implied a mental disability, not being able to control ones behaviour. Your request to use the Human Rights violation clause of the Master Agreement was not allowed because, according to our lawyers, you would have to prove that you do have a mental problem.

I asked you, at a hearing with BCPSA and BCGEU representatives, if you have proof that you have a mental problem. Due to the irony of this question, I could not contain myself and blurted out a partially stifled laugh. Because you could not provide any documentation proving you have a mental problem, the BCPSA representative said the Abuse of Managerial Authority clause would be followed.

Knowing that by deceiving Statistics and Finance Canada, Mr. O'Neil and I were in violation of the Statistics Act, I was in the perfect position to stop your grievance. I ruled that the resolution would be that there is no resolution and that the case was closed.

Despite your being told by the BCGEU representative that the BCGEU would not support your efforts any further, you forwarded your complaint to the Deputy Minister (January 30, 2006).

Before the Deputy Minister gave his opinion on your complaint, Mr. O'Neil came to your office (February 15, 2006) and ordered you to close your window, leave your computer on, turn in your security pass and you were "escorted" out of the building. The shop steward, an old friend of Mr. O'Neil, helped you carry out your belongings.

Request for assistance would result in being registered for an "assessment" of a believed behavioural problem

After your [fake] firing, I sent you a letter ordering you to attend a meeting and that you may be subjected to disciplinary actions. At the meeting in a large meeting room full of government officials (representatives of the Employer) you were told you had been registered in a program for employees whose personal problems are believed to be the cause of the poor work performance – the BCGEU Employees' Family Assistance program" for employees with documented work performance problems where the employee is informed three times of the problem(s) and signs indicating that they have been informed. Of course, we didn't get you to sign your recognition of problems

because you had none. Indeed, you were continuing to fix problems with BC Statistics practices, and you initiated and championed the successful estatsBC project, you were in the process of completing the transfer of BC Stats data into relational databases, etc. – in other words you were a threat to those of us who were falsifying information rather than providing reliable information as per the stated public goal of BC Statistics.

You requested Workplace skills courses again to no avail. Instead, because you refused to accept the terms of returning to work - refusing to attend an inappropriate program (the BCGUE Employees' Family Assistance program) after you had been [fake] fired while your complaint was before the Deputy Minister, the Deputy Minister agreed with me to dismissed you for insubordination.

[Comment: Both the BC Labour Code as well as the Employment Standards Act clearly state; An employer must not refuse to continue to employ a person or threaten to dismiss or otherwise threaten a person because a complaint has been made under this Act or because information may be or has been supplied under this Act.]

Nor did Mr. McRae explain why he phoned me at my home to strongly advise me to attend the Family Assistance Program for employees with documented work performance problems, saying something like:

Mr. Munroe, because you did not return to work after you were ordered to turn in your security pass and leave BC Stats' building - threatened with dismissal – while your grievance was before the Deputy Minister and because you would not attend the Family Assistance Program for Employees who have documented work performance problems believed to be caused by personal problems – the program I registered you in – “discriminating against a person with respect to a condition of employment”, - I phoned you at your home to strongly advise you to attend the Family Assistance Program. I didn't care if your wife or children would hear the conversation. Indeed, I was only trying to appear as though I was looking out for your welfare. I did not mention that you advocated Workplace Skills courses rather than the Family Assistance Program as suggested initially by HR.

After I strongly advised you, you became very angry, raised your voice, telling me to never call your home again.

[Comment: I took all the stats courses at university that I could including graduate level courses, having written one of the two best term papers in my multiple regression analysis course, the methods claimed to be used by BC Statistics. I went into Statistics because it was (I thought) safe from irrationality, absurdity, foolishness, ridiculousness, nonsense, and farce.]

Nor did Mr. McRae inform me that a fair hearing regarding termination would not be allowed, saying something like:

Blocking a fair hearing into the real matters in dispute was easy. We just hired the most expensive arbiter in the province and did not tell him about our dishonesty. We just made it sound like we were trying to help a poor quality employee who might be having personal problems, giving the impression that we are kind and willing to pay for

counselling for you and maybe that would help your family too. That sure went well. For us I mean, not you.

Mr. Munroe, we didn't fire you because of your age, place of origin or any of the other grounds covered by the Charter of Rights. We were determined to get rid of you because you would likely discover our false reporting to Statistics and Finance Canada. It did not matter that you had fixed our mistakes, not only for the population estimates and projections, the monthly interprovincial migration model (that had not worked for approximately 10 years before you were hired), along with numerous corrections you suggested that fixed problems, nor that you initiated and championed the successful eight person estatsBC project, that tied into the LIQUIDS relational database you also developed. No, no, no, we fired you because it is far better for us to fire and disgrace an employee than it is to reveal our (Mr. O'Neil and I) our incompetence. As well, it is far easier to fire Statistics Agency Analysts who maintain statistical standards than it is to maintain statistical standards especially with these substandard employment standards.

[Comment: Ten days after being [fake] fired Deputy Minister Gordon Macatte supported the Executive Director of BC Stats, McRae, and found no managerial abuse. A year and a half later, at a hearing into whether arbitration would be allowed, a misinformed Vince Ready was not told about the [fake] firing and therefore, he was not aware of the threat to dismiss or otherwise threaten a person.]

4) Request for exoneration

Mr. Bains, having been deceived by representatives of the Employer and Employees, I did not know why I was targeted for removal; therefore, I included the possibility that I was discriminated against on grounds covered by Canada's Charter of Rights. I listed many possible grounds in my letter to the BCGEU cc'ed to the Deputy Minister Macatee as well as in my request to the BC Human Rights tribunal. The BCHR Chair dismissed all grounds except ancestry directing me to the Supreme Court. The lawyer I retained (\$3,000) said I look like a whiner and would not pursue my case.

At the preliminary hearing into whether arbitration would be allowed to proceed, the BCPSA contracted Heenan Blaikie lawyer, Ms. Rosen, after describing me as a despicable human being, at length, raised her voice proclaiming loudly, "THIS IS NOT A HUMAN RIGHTS CASE".

Mr. Baines, the exculpatory evidence ("Conclusions to Finance", p. 63 and BC Stats' 2011 General Estimations System methodology paper, p. 8) proves that the BC Statistics officials who had me fired were, at the same time, responsible for giving federal government officials false information. This false information resulted in a false endorsement used in turn to assert BC Statistics' "integrity" while BC Statistics disseminated unsupported unfounded, ungrounded population numbers.

Mr. Bains, as you can appreciate, I do not mind not working for an employer's representatives who make false accusations and (fake) fire an employee then order them back to work threatened with disciplinary action directed to have a psychological assessment as part of counselling to address a believed behavioral problem, not able to control ones behavior labelled by the manager as "passive aggressive". Later, this was changed by Mr. McRae from

aggressive to passive and “intense”; however, I discovered this change through a Freedom of Information request over 3 years after being fired. Why was I not told?

Mr. Baines, may I please be exonerated and/or can the block, imposed by the BCPSA, stopping a fair hearing, be removed to allow a fair hearing to proceed with the addition of the exculpatory evidence revealing my accusers’ deception? As you are likely aware, recent legislation is allowing input from former government employees, including those of us who were unjustly / wrongfully dismissed.

In hopes of being made whole again and allowed to contribute to society without the burden of “dismissed for insubordination” on my employment record, and falsely accused of being “bad at [my] job” (even though I was fixing these accuser’s mistakes) and in hopes of ensuring integrity of information used to guide public policy, yours truly,



William Warren Munroe
Population Projections Project for Canada’s census areas
www.wminfomatics.com/PopulationProjections/Home.html

For more information about government WorkPlace visit: <http://wminfomatics.com/WP/index2.html>

Following links prefaced by <http://wminfomatics.com>

- Reference from Graduate level Statistics Professor: </WP/petition/Exhibit1.pdf>
- Letter to Minister of Justice with supporting emails: /WP/Articles/120704/MinJust4I_ed2.pdf
- Unsupported population numbers a problem: /WP/BCStatsEmail_Question.pdf
- BC Statistics’ Generalization Estimation System (GES) Small Area Population Estimation Method and Error Evaluation papers were published in 1998 and 2011, - GES 1998 and GES 2011
- 2005 feasibility study revealing false reporting: /WP/Articles/120618/conclusions_to_finance.pdf
- Letter to Minister and StatCan: /WP/Articles/121019/STC_MLCS_2.pdf
- 2013 Congress presentation: /PopulationProjections/CPS_PPP_Validate.pdf
- Letter to the Employer, Queen Elizabeth II: </WP/Articles/160831/Queen-Elizabeth-II-why-no-one-saw-financial-crisis-coming.pdf>
- Letter from the Employer, Queen Elizabeth II: </WP/Articles/160831/Queen-Elizabeth-II-response-you-are-quite-correct.pdf>
- Public Prosecution Service of Canada: </WP/Articles/2017/171214/CrownProsecutor1q.pdf>
- Information Laundering: </WP/Articles/2018/2018-02-01/PMTrudeau1u.pdf>