

Social Benefits Tribunal
1075 Bay Street 7th Floor,
Toronto, ON M5S 2B1
FAX: 1-416-326-5135

Mr. Robert T. Chisholm,

Ottawa,
ON K2G 1H1

January 10th 2007

For the attention of: Ms. Mary Lee, General Manager

Dear Ms. Lee,

Re: Social Benefits Tribunal File 0605-04207 (OTT) – Denial of Permission to have observers present in the Hearing Room

With reference to your letter to me of January 9th, the approach to this matter by your department and the legislation behind it are totally unsatisfactory.

I would remind you that in normal Court hearings, observers are allowed to be present. Dis-allowing it in this type of case, and mine in particular, smacks of legalistic finagling designed to cover up what is going on in order to protect the positions of the lawyers and other people involved in whatever capacity.

I can relate to concerns you may have about the possibility of a hearing being disrupted by the presence of observers. It is not strictly necessary that observers be present in the hearing room itself. What is actually relevant is the decision and the reasons for it.

The suggestion that "...the decision will not be of precedent value for the issues you raise...", where the word "you" refers to myself, is incorrect, for many reasons even though the Tribunal might pretend that these are "irrelevant" – based on their not being explicitly contemplated in the social assistance legislation, or some such.

I would also remind you that Roger R. Pousseault, a current member of the Tribunal and employed in a judicial capacity, was partly responsible for creating this mess in the first place - in his then-judicial capacity as President of the federal Board of Referees which wrongly refused me Unemployment Insurance benefits in February 1995. Lawyers for H.R.D.C. aggravated the mess later on. Your department has had more than enough opportunity to examine the evidence, on my web site and in the hardcopy documents which I sent to you and the City of Ottawa in December. Yet at no time up to now has it even been acknowledged.

In general, the tone and language of your letter of January 9th suggest that your department intends to cover up, by corrupt legalistic means, what has been going on. It is also quite clear that your department is pretending that this is allowed just because the legislation says so.

You will kindly note that it is MY life, and therefore I MAKE THE DECISIONS ABOUT WHAT SHALL OR SHALL NOT BE KEPT CONFIDENTIAL. Nobody, including your department, has any business telling me otherwise - just because some lawyer, who is only interested in money-grabbing and protecting his own position at everybody else's expense, says so.

I reserve the right to have other interested persons in the waiting room, so that I can brief them immediately after the hearing.

Robert T. Chisholm FAX 1-208-246-8017
cc: Mr. R. Fox, Case Presenting Officer, City of Ottawa.