

William Warren Munroe
763 Beach Road,
Qualicum Beach BC, V9K 1S2
May 21, 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; form and time issues.

Dear Mr. Chalke,

I write to you again (letter dated April 11, 2018), 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

Also, I have posted my April 11, 2018, 2 ½ page, letter with attached supporting documents (17 pages) for your convenience at wminformatics.com/WP/index2.html as it appears these were not read, nor understood.

Form letter issues

Instead of recognizing the receipt of relevant information (files/documents/appendices), I have been asked by Early Resolution Officer, C. Morris, in their 1-page letter (received May 7, 2018) that I address 5 points and to answer 7 other questions in a 2 page "Complaint Form", as well as other questions in the body of the form and their letter.

C. Morris does mention that I have "concerns regarding steps to safeguard information used for public services" but does not otherwise address my submission – cover letter and Appendices. C. Morris asks that I be "specific to the concerns not addressed and the outcome you are seeking". These points, questions in their cover letter and the form, and this request have already been answered in my original submission.

For example, in my 2 ½ page cover letter, in the first paragraph titled "**Resolution: clear steps to safeguard integrity; scientific method**", I specifically address the outcome I am seeking. Also, for another example, questions # 1 and #2 of the "Complaint Form" ask for "the name of the organization you are complaining about" and for "names of the people you have dealt with..." These questions are addressed in the next paragraph in my 2 ½ page letter titled "**Reporting to Authorities continuously for over 15 years**" as well as in the submissions Addendums A thru C. Again, C. Morris did not recognize these submissions Addendums A thru C.

Also Question #3 of the "Complaint Form" provides 4 lines to "Tell us your complaint. Tell us what you have done to try to solve the problem yourself. *(Please give us any files or reference numbers and the dates these things happened)*". C. Morris does not recognize my description of the issue nor what I have done, efforts outlined in the "*files or reference numbers and the dates these things happened*" that I provided in Appendices A thru C.

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

C. Morris highlights “that when a person contacts our Office requesting an investigation ...” Please recall, in my submission, I did not request an investigation. Rather, I provided evidence and requested a resolution thereby addressing 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”.

Nonetheless, this issue of reliable information, advocated for years and years, should be addressed sooner than later as explained in Addendum C, - the Letter to Minister of Justice explaining why this is an urgent matter, stating: “As you can appreciate, this matter should be addressed as soon as possible.” This letter answers C. Morris’ “Complaint Form” last question (#7) “If you consider the matter urgent, explain why.”

Perhaps in the future, submissions to the Office of the Ombudsperson (BC) can be read from beginning to the end. Also, perhaps the reader could recognize the receipt of relevant information provided in the submission. For example, the “files or reference numbers and the dates these things happened”.

Also, perhaps if the Office of the Ombudsperson (BC) reader has questions regarding missing specific relevant information, the reader will ask for the missing specific information rather than ignoring the specific information provided.

Also, perhaps a form letter could ask whether the remedy addresses the intent to deceive the public and or other public service providers – deception such as fraud and or forgery?

And whether, the writer had served the public and was in a government position where they would discover fraud/forgery committed by management officials if they were not fired. If so, how was the deception discovered.

And whether, the writer was subjected to a constructive/wrongful/egregious dismissal. And whether, the dismissal occurred while a grievance was under consideration, and whether arbitration was blocked by the BC Public Service Agency, supported by the Union representatives and the Labour Relations Board.

Time issues

Mr. Chalke, to not waste your time or anyone else’s, could you please answer the following 2 questions:

1. *Should information used to guide public service delivery be supported by correct methods and data accompanying findings rather than incorrect methods and data accompanying unfounded numbers?*
2. *Should public service providers who raised concerns about incorrect information have “dismissed for just cause” and “insubordination” removed from their record and be allowed a fair open public hearing into the real matters in dispute, namely the real methods and data used to create official statistics?*

Your timely response is appreciated.

Sincerely,



William Warren Munroe, M.A.

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