

Original was a handwritten letter. This is a typed copy.

Mrs. Beryl Gaffney, M.P.,  
Constituency Office,  
250 B Greenbank Road,  
2<sup>nd</sup> Floor,  
Nepean,  
ONTARIO K2H 8X4.

19-BGT-SNC

6 Lansfield Way,  
Nepean,  
Ontario K2G 3V8  
Tel. (613) 225-1931

February 4<sup>th</sup> 1993

Dear Mrs. Gaffney,

“On-Site” / Energy Pathways Inc.

Thank you for, your letter of January 14<sup>th</sup> 1993 detailing The Hon. Bernard Valcourt’s response, and I appreciate your efforts to date on my behalf.

I have to tell you, however, that the Minister’s reply is totally unsatisfactory, for the following reasons:-

1. Regarding the possible effects of a participant’s U.I. Benefits “expiring” whilst the participant is in the program, this is utter nonsense. Furthermore, I was told by Maria Iadinerdi at C.E.I.C. 135 Rideau Street, a year ago, that once you are on the “On-Site” program the benefit period is automatically extended up to the end of the program; in addition there is no mention of this rule concerning “expiry” of U.I. benefits in the information about “On-Site” that I have, enclosed with my initial letter to you in July 1992.

(2)

I can only assume that there is some new rule involved here that the Minister did not want me to know about, until it was too late. I have now been receiving U.I. benefits since July 1992 – i.e. about 7 months – and these will run out in about 2 months as of now.

2. I took the painting and decorating contract at N.D.M.C. from January 1992 to July 1992 because there was nothing else available, and under the circumstances it was the obvious thing to do. Had I quit early (i.e. before July 10<sup>th</sup> 1992) in an attempt to be available for “On-Site” at the “right” time, my U.I. benefit period would have been cut by something like 12 weeks; I discussed the point in May and June 1992 with Lise Houle at C.E.I.C. 135 Rideau Street – one of the people referred to in my initial letter to you in July 1992 – and therefore the advice I was to continue to the end of my N.D.M.C. contract, which I then did (and incidentally they were good people to work with).

On finishing at N.D.M.C. on July 10<sup>th</sup> 1992, I enquired again about “On-Site”, only to be told that there were no

places left. Furthermore you can only be considered formally for “On-Site” once you are formally established as being eligible for U.I. benefits.

The above is all documented.

Thus there was a set-up in which circumstances conspired to prevent me from being considered at all,

(3)

which Bernard Valcourt covers up by simply stating that “unfortunately, (I was) not one of those selected”.

So far as I am concerned this amounts to blatant evasion and incompetence.

The next “excuse” is going to be that I am “no longer eligible for On-Site, because my U.I. benefits have expired”. And of course the Minister conveniently ignores what I am supposed to do now, in 1993 – as opposed to 1992, which is now history.

3. There have been previous instances of evasiveness incompetence, excuse-mongering, chicanery and withholding of basic information by C.E.I.C. in my case, both before and since my arrival in Canada in 1982 on several occasions, with regard to “On-Site” and other things. These have included the following:-

3.1. Failure by C.E.I.C. to inform me about the 20-week eligibility rule for U.I. benefits which applies to all new entrants to the Canadian labour force, prior to my coming to Canada – at the interview in London, England, or at any other time. (This was aggravated by SNC dismissing me after only 15 weeks, due to “lack of work”, when they hired me from

(4)

England for what was supposed to be a permanent job For at least two years – followed by the corruption, chicanery, double-talk and mental incompetence that I had to deal with from SNC and their lawyers, which went on for over 8 years, detailed in previous correspondence).

3.2. I complained about the situation back in 1983 to then-Minister of Immigration and Employment, John Roberts, and at the same time asked for special help in finding work. Not only did I not get any help but his office lied by stating that C.E.I.C. had approached Pratt & Whitney Canada on my behalf, and found me 6 months employment with a company called Shamrock Rembourrage in Montreal – when they

had done no such thing. Furthermore, the “job” with Shamrock Rembourrage, a furniture restoring company, was a minimum-wage job which lasted just 6 days.

I told John Roberts’ office that I thought a public inquiry into SNC’s hiring practices concerning engineers from other countries, and particularly England, should be instituted and nothing whatsoever was done about it.

3.3. Advertising of “On-Site” by C.E.I.C. has been

(5)

extremely poor – possibly because they don’t want too many people to know about it. I myself found out about it accidentally, in January 1990. In February 1990, I had a meeting at what was then my local C.E.I.C. Office at 305 Dorchester West, Montreal, to discuss solutions to my situation. A couple of trick questions from me revealed that they knew nothing about the “On-Site” program. They then insisted that I was “not eligible”, but the counsellor concerned agreed to refer the matter to a more senior person, in view of the circumstances. After waiting for five weeks and hearing nothing, I sent a registered letter to the counsellor concerned and then had a reply from the local manager, who insisted that I was “not eligible” because I had “insufficient insurable weeks” – but this was because I couldn’t get any full-time employment since being dismissed by SNC, which he knew perfectly well. So the fact that I had been unemployed in the usual sense, as a result of being dismissed by SNC, then being denied U.I. benefits due to only having worked for SNC for 15 weeks, then not being able to get any other full-time employment, became the reasons for keeping me off the “On-Site” program which in

(6)

turn contributed to ensuring that I remained unemployed as an engineer.

As a result, I sent a very strongly-worded letter and documented complaint to the local manager, Mons. Normand Sauriol, warning of serious trouble if this situation was not corrected. He still did nothing. At about the same time, the C.E.I.C. office at 3450 Ontario Est closed, and (so I understand) Mr. Sauriol was promoted.

3.4. I was referred to another C.E.I.C. programme, “Individually Subsidised Jobs”, by Mons. Maurice Daigneault of C.E.I.C. 305 Dorchester West, in Montreal, as

a result of several meetings with him in December 1988 and early 1989. However the subsidy was and is only available once you have a job – and no Canadian employer whom I've applied to for an engineering position has ever offered me one.

In April 1989 the office at 305 Dorchester West, which was for executives and professionals, was Closed; from then on I had to deal with strange people at the office at 3450 Ontario Est, which in turn led to the troubles described in 3.3 above.

Mr. Daigneault apparently also know nothing about “On-Site” in any case he never mentioned it – whereas “On-Site” has been operating in Montreal since 1987

3.5. Barbara MacDougall's five –year immigration plan (for the years 1991-1995 inclusive) was made public in October 1990. In it, it was claimed that the Federal Government was concerned to see that all immigrants are allowed to integrate themselves properly into Canadian Society.

In November 1990, a month later, the go-ahead for the Hibernia oil production platform project was announced.

I made a lengthy and fully-documented protest about my situation to Barbara MacDougall's office and demanded that she assist me to get work on the Hibernia project. At the same time I applied formally, in the usual way, for work on the project.

The end result was a three-page letter from one Micheline Lévesque, of Monique Vézina's office (Minister of State), the whole thing being devoted to telling me what I already knew about C.E.I.C.'s “services” to unemployed people, and then telling me to go to my nearest C.E.I.C. office – without any apology whatsoever, and without bothering to carry out any sort of check into what had been going on in my case, when furthermore she knew perfectly well from the contents of my letters that I had in fact been to my local C.E.I.C. office already, and when in addition

(8)

she knew perfectly well that I already knew everything about C.E.I.C.'s operations. In short, a complete filibuster and utter waste of time.

Protests from my M.P. in Montreal (Allan Koury, Conservative, Hochelaga-Maisonneuve) also achieved nothing. At his suggestion I also wrote to “Gazette Probe” – Who in fact contacted C.E.I.C., also got nowhere, and then refused to print anything about it (possibly because they are in cahoots with SNC and their dirty little

“lawyers”, so as to ensure that such people are allowed to continue lying, cheating, and obfuscating at the expense of immigrants, whom nobody really likes anyway – why else would Canadian newspapers print articles entitled “Canadians don’t want immigrants in their major cities”, and others that I could quote, that I have on file?) How much more stupid and pig-headed can people get?

3.6. In the above mess, the only people who really behaved properly and ethically were Maurice Daigneault, Mme. Marie-France Lahaye (C.E.I.C. 1001 Rue Atwater, Montreal) and Mons. Michel Maxwell (C.E.I.C. 3450 Ontario Est, Montreal), as follows:-

Maurice Daigneault Already referred to.

Mme. Marie-France Lahaye

After receiving a detailed report of my situation that

(9)

I had prepared in May 1983 (13 months after my arrival in Canada and 9 months of unemployment following dismissal From SNC, when no other jobs were available and when I had no U.I. benefits), Mrs. Lahaye told me to refer the problem to my then-M.P. in Montreal. After discovering that the M.P. was none other than Prime Minister Pierre Trudeau (he represented the riding of Mont-Royal, which included Cote St. Luc where I was living at the time), Mrs. Lahaye insisted that I should still write to the M.P. – i.e write to the Prime Minister. Well, I did so – and Mr. Rudolf Kloppenburg, the Deputy Director of Legal Affairs at the Ordre des Ingenieurs du Quebec, helped me draft the Letter. I asked for (a) help in getting re-employed and (b) help in settling my dispute with SNC, and met one of his assistants (Mrs. Eleanor Cote) in connection with this. I got no practical help in getting re-employed, and nothing was done about SNC because it was “before the courts”. Which is undoubtedly why SNC employed their mentally-incompetent “lawyers” to produce as many delays and waste as much time as possible, so as to keep my situation in a state of being “before the courts” ad infinitum – so as to prevent anyone else from helping me, prevent

(10)

the media from saying anything, with the intention of producing a permanent and idiotic mess based on lies and sophistry that would permanently hinder me from getting a job.

This, in a country that claims to badly need engineers and which claims to uphold human rights.

Michel Maxwell

C.E.I.C. 3450 Ontario Est, Montreal. He was the Counsellor referred to in para. 3.3 above. He wrote a formal letter confirming my eligibility for the “Individually Subsidised Jobs”, and did what he could – within the limits of his position - to help me get on to the “On-Site” program, and the fact that this failed was not his fault.

3.7. All the above is documented. If Mr. Valcourt or any members of his office wish to argue on points of fact, they would be well advised not to try – and if they do I will take steps to expose them and see to it that they are removed from their jobs.

So far as I am concerned, the whole approach of C.E.I.C. could be summed up as follows:

“If we make a mistake, so what? If he complains

(11)

and wants it corrected, deny everything, refuse any apology and cover it up with bullshit. If he complains about that cover it up with more bullshit – then he will go round the bend, everyone will say he’s gone mad, he’ll never get a job, then he’ll be out on the street, then we’ll have got rid of him, and that will be that”.

The only exceptions to this were Maurice Daigneault, Marie-France Lahaye, Michel Maxwell, and (later on ) Maria Iadinerdi.

The other people involved – people in C.E.I.C., SNC and their law firm Dunton Rainville Toupin and Perreault (as detailed in previous correspondence) were either negligent, dilatory, mentally incompetent or purveyors of sophistry – or some combination of these. AND ALL OF THEM WERE QUEBECOIS.. Anyone who want to accuse me of racism had better go and Accuse Mordecai Richler of racism – or, for that matter, Michel Gratton (author of “French Canadians”, which I’ve read, just published).

This, when Quebec more than any other province wants immigrants and simultaneously complains about the number of immigrants who leave Quebec for other parts of Canada. Going to the Human Rights Commission is a waste of time because of the absurd time delays involved – and besides we

(12)

are all told that the legal system is supposed to protect our rights, whereas in practice it does nothing of the sort because it is full of people with gross personality defects who conspire and collude with corrupt businessmen. C.E.I.C. and SNC know this perfectly well – so they simply take advantage of the situation to exacerbate the mess. So do the dirty little men and women fiddling about in law offices in Montreal – who get paid handsomely for making stupid, dirty, smelly poo-poo on the orders of so-called “businessmen” - who in turn behave like nothing more than crude, incompetent, know-nothing, thugs with a massive inferiority complex. As for Guy Saint-Pierre, President of SNC – he wouldn’t be where he is if he hadn’t had part of his engineering education in England (he got his Masters at Imperial College, in London). – quite apart from Other things – yet here he is contradicting himself in a totally incompetent and irresponsible manner, allowing SNC’s bank account at the Royal Bank (of which he is a Director) to be seized, just to be nasty to me.

I’m still awaiting the final answer from the Quebec Bar Association concerning what they are going to do with SNC’s lawyers - Dunton, Rainville, Toupin and Perreault; the Bar Association’s letter to me of November 10<sup>th</sup> 1992 stated that an inquiry was under way. If you want, check

(13)

this for yourself: ask for Maitre Pierre Bernard, telephone (514)954-3438. The file number is 92-1-25512BE. And if he says it’s “confidential”, tell him that Mr. Chisholm, who initiated the enquiry, wants to know what is being done. And if I discover that nothing is being done, or will be done, a finger of suspicion will be pointing at the Chief Justice of Canada, Antonio Lamer – who is also a member of the Bar Association’s Disciplinary Committee, and also a Quebecois.

4. Now, briefly, I am going to change the subject. I appreciate your suggestion about the Rev. Keith Calder and the self-help group of unemployed executives and professionals. Certainly there should be some mutual moral support there; also, if I decide to be necessary to take the government to court over the other things already described, I would see some slight possibility of backing from such a group, some of whom may have had similar experiences.

However it won’t solve the “On-Site” problem or the re-training issue generally, from my standpoint, so I wouldn’t

really expect it to be of any significant help in terms of finding a job.

5. Notwithstanding all the problems referred to above, I'm pursuing my own program of updating my skills so

(14)

as to get back into engineering (and so as not to be condemned to low-paid, insecure, menial work for the rest of my life). In Ottawa this is easier than anywhere else, thanks to the proximity of C.I.S.T.I. – the Canada Institute for Scientific and Technical Information – where, as a client, I have direct access to Canada's national repository of scientific and technical information published all over the world, free access to some parts of the computerised information search service, photocopying at 10 c a page and free borrowing of books (though they are charging \$6.00 for each book borrowed after February 15<sup>th</sup> – a sign of the times).

With the aid of this, among other things I'm currently preparing a review paper, with suggested solutions, concerning a very persistent problem with centrifugal pumps – the same type of pump that provides our public water supplies and does numerous other vital jobs (sewage disposal, in oil refineries, pulp and paper mills, breweries and various oil field duties, to name a few. This will be submitted for publication to some engineering journals and a few potential employers whom I think will have reason to be interested. In fact (believe it or not) I spend most of my time on this or studying other papers I've collected from C.I.S.T.I.

I'm also talking to a new company in Ottawa that has designed and patented a new piece of waste-heat recovery and pollution control equipment. They seem

(15)

interested but the outcome is uncertain and depends largely on things outside my control or the company's control – connected with finalising their business plan and the level of interest that will be shown by outside investors. It is also expected to generate big export orders, once it gets off the ground. It possesses the interesting feature of protecting the environment and simultaneously justifying itself in terms of conventional economics – i.e. a saving in fuel bills, in hospitals (for example). “On-Site” could well be applicable to this. Bernard Valcourt, wake up !

I have no time any more for the “traditional” Canadian approach to job hunting, with its obsession with quibbling and controversy over resumé formats, interview technique, colour and style of interview suit, body language,



“four minutes to the job you want” etc. It’s all bullshit, and all it leads to is endless rejection letters based on not quite “meeting the requirements of the position”, lack of “Canadian experience” (example: Graham MacDonald, Chief Mechanical Engineer, Industrial and Marine Division, Pratt & Whitney Canada) – or based on the “excuse” that I’m “out of date”, “have been out of engineering too long” and all the other irrelevant, insulting and pejorative crap that goes on.

(16)

In Canada , there are some individual people who know what they’re doing – but Canadians collectively don’t know what the hell they’re doing, and then Canadians collectively bullshit in order to cover this ignorance up when someone like me comes along and discovers how stupid they are. And some of them are blatant bigots. Two possible viewpoints – which often lead to diametrically-opposed conclusions, which is great for generating confusion and controversy at the expense of job seekers. And especially immigrants. And especially British engineers, who are not respected at all in their own country: as Ken Awcock of Brown & Root Vickers said to me when I went to see him about work on the Hibernia project, “in England an engineer is like a piece of shit”. His words, not mine. Is that enough, or must I supply another deluge of documentation – detailing what is going on in England?

I know we’re in what is probably the worst recession since the Great Depression of the 1930’s, but after what I’ve seen going on, I’m not the slightest bit interested in this as a basis for further “excuses” , from Bernard Valcourt or anybody else, and as far as I’m concerned Bernard Valcourt can damn well do something to correct my situation with respect to “On-Site” – or lose his job, be taken to court or both. Here are some other questions for Bernard Valcourt :-

(17)

1. Grant Trump, Executive Director of the Canadian Council for Human Resources in the Environment Industry recently stated that re-training of workers (for example engineers) from ”sunset industries” or “declining” industries like oil and gas will be a challenge, if it is to be done quickly so that they can become part of the “quickly expanding” environment industry. A recent Federal Government report, “Human Resources in the Environment Industry” predicted that up to 7,000 across Canada will be created by 1995; about 3,000 of these will be for environmental scientists, air quality specialists and hydrogeologists. This report was released

in November 1992 and Mr. Trump's organisation, based in Edmonton, Alberta, was formed at about the same time.

Therefore, there could be companies in Alberta (for example that might be able to use me, after some re-training and/or private study using C.I.S.T.I.'s facilities).

Would Mr. Valcourt care to comment on this?  
(Reference: "The Ottawa Citizen" Tues. Feb 2<sup>nd</sup> 1993, page D11 (file 5.9 – 504))

2. I am in contact with an Ottawa company that has a unique product with big export potential, which simultaneously recovers waste heat (from boiler flue gases, and the like) and greatly reduces acid-rain-producing emissions (SO<sub>2</sub>, NO<sub>x</sub>) and also greenhouse gases (in particular, CO<sub>2</sub>). The waste heat recovered results in reduced fuel bills for the user, so that the system justifies itself in terms of conventional

(18)

economics. Would Mr. Valcourt consider assisting me to work with this company, where I might help with both the engineering work and with sales? Surely this is a special case that is worth considering in view of the export revenues that the company should eventually earn for Canada which will contribute positively to the tax base, including Mr. Valcourt's department? Surely investment of any kind for the purpose of improving export revenues is particularly important at the present time?

3. Would Mr. Valcourt agree that corruption and incompetence in business and the legal profession, if exposed, could be extremely dangerous to Canada's prospects for attracting immigrants, especially to Quebec?

4. Would Mr. Valcourt care to comment on the reasons for the apparent optimism of French people (from France) about prospects in Quebec, and possible interest from German and Swiss people as well? Why is the Quebec government actively recruiting qualified French-speaking nationals for work in the aerospace industries (involving mechanical engineering, among other things) and hospitality industries, considering Quebec's appalling unemployment rate and poor-quality politics, and why are neither the Quebec Government nor the Federal Government apparently doing anything to help unemployed engineers (such as myself) to get re-employed, for example in aerospace? (Reference: "The Globe and Mail", Sat. Jan 23<sup>rd</sup> 1993, page A9. File 5.9-495)

Obviously I could compose many other such questions but I think that will be sufficient for now.

I apologise for the length of this letter, and I hope I don't have to write another one because this sort of thing takes up too much of my time, quite apart from anyone else's, and if people did things properly – for a change – there would be no need for it. This crap has got to stop, and I had to explain the circumstances. Could I suggest that a meeting with the Minister, or one of his assistants, might be a good idea to bust this log-jam up, rather than more letter-writing? I would appreciate your comments on this.

Yours faithfully  
(signed) R.T. Chisholm

ROBERT T. CHISHOLM B.Sc. Hons. (Eng.), C.Eng.(U.K.),  
M.I.Mech.E. (U.K.), Jr. Eng. (Quebec)