

If this is a different Jim Perrin, then I apologize for anyone having to read this LOL (seriously LOL) – and in that case, can someone please clarify as there is clear confusion. And I'd say.... Good reason to be confused? Also I tried calling the phone number 902 484 9197 it's not hooked up indicating a recent hire? Everything points to this being the Jim Perrin I think it is!

And please people – it's hard to structure something this long, if it seems a bit scattered I apologize – this is a lot of information / defense for one person.

And to that last email Jordan. I'd like to state, I fully understand my harsh tone but my points are not baseless and in the end if you are doing what you could be doing and should be doing – I will fully apologize and give you credit and I would definitely be up for hearing your grievances in your way but I hope you understand I have to assume I'm alone in this and I'm going to be critical of everything. In my way. And if you judge me in any way for that – it's really unfair.

And my request is simple. An HR resource and simple answers beside the questions, it can be copy and paste. Maybe, 10 minutes of your time? It's currently over 200 work hours.

Let me explain this to you from my "commoner" / "red neck" position. And show you direct evidence as to why someone would think they are being treated as a threat or should feel unsafe or like they are walking into a trap.

Well do this in stages as to see the escalation.

Is this the same Jim Perrin that recently left HRP for the "Private Sector"?

Perrin, James Police Superintendent Criminal Investigation Division

<https://www.halifax.ca/sites/default/files/documents/city-hall/accountability-transparency/Statement%20of%20Compensation%202018.pdf>

Salary - \$147,276.65

Benefits - \$1,491.07

Total - \$148,767.72

The median total income of households in Nova Scotia \$60,764

<https://www.novascotia.ca/finance/statistics/news.asp?id=13155>

148,767.72 / 60,764 = 2.448 Times the average income of a house hold in Nova Scotia – from Jim alone! Not including his wife.

****remember this total and this information, it's very important and we will have a fun little discussion about it later – the suspense! Get some popcorn! ****

Is this the same fella seemingly correlated closely with some really interesting events like not apologizing for quantified systemic bias (Most specifically, racism)? And I believe a semi recent event of unaccounted for drugs and money where they just assumed everyone was doing their job and that was good enough? Literally he says pretty much exactly that?

As the great Steve Murphy called him “Commander” – criminal investigation unit. There is one video where Steve definitely questioned Jim and then corrected and clarified Jim’s statement for him. He could not have known a fact that he was stating he knew – as per his own admission. **This was done to solely to sell his narrative**, not to distribute fact (I actually love Steve Murphy, seems like a solid Guy – Good vibes)

Also, Interrogation as an Interpersonal Skill on their **Public** Linkdn Profile and 7 people endorsed this statement.

Here’s a rough but effective definition from the internet:

Interpersonal skills are the behaviors and tactics a person uses to interact with others effectively. In the business world, the term refers to an employee's ability to work well with others. Interpersonal skills range from communication and listening to attitude and deportment.

Oh and many other skills, I took a screenshot ☺.

Essentially, this person is saying they believe interrogation is part of effectively working with others, meaning to effectively work with me, interrogation is appropriate!!?!?!? That’s their public statement and 7 people agree!

Regardless they are skilled at questioning. And that majority of practice within that skill comes from questioning people whom they suspect may have criminal intent! “Criminal Investigation Unit” – what does that sound like to you?

How should I take this? How should a “common” person take this? How does an HR person see that?

200 Hours? And you couldn’t see this? This is what you think is respectful?

But I don’t have a reason to think I might be walking into a trap? I shouldn’t ask for another HR representative to be okay with this?

You Jordan, couldn’t have arranged that meeting with all of us or another HR person? Why should Jim be setting those dates if he is not controlling the narrative? Clearly the meeting is of his narrative and intent, not of HR. And clearly I have no representation and have been clearly denied it without any reason.

If I wasn’t critical and just a regular, agreeable person trying to deal with this and just trying to report this – what would you have just done to me?

I shouldn’t even have basic HR protection or some basic answers provided? You think I don’t know how this process works? You don’t think I can’t properly define intimidation? You don’t think I’ve read the Charter of Rights?

But I don’t deserve anything right Jordan? I have no rights and I shouldn’t be protecting myself – I shouldn’t be critical? That makes me look bad? I deserved what happened to me and continue to deserve it and definitely don’t deserve my rights as a Canadian?

What are you thinking right now? **Please explain! You are a “Leader” come on!**

And you are going to argue this was some gesture of respect to me? The best product of 200 hours, 4 university courses?

You were willing to throw me out in the cold without a tatter on just so you literally didn't have to think about it too much!

I would suggest that Irving Shipyard speak with their contractor regarding their public profile and the statement being made regarding interrogation and ask to clarify that very public and obvious statement in regards to their Intent within Irving shipyard and their average interaction with employees. The Shipyard should also clarify the intent within the context of this situation as should it in all similar situations where this person is making such a public statement and is interacting with employees or staff or people involved in anything, in any official capacity.

Upon interaction with Jim, Those people should be made full aware (Full disclosure) of this persons background, capabilities and intentions and in that **there should always be an HR representative present** and VISIBLE on ANY thread! **That's safety for both sides (Shipyard and Persons, He said – she said – Is there unfair pressure?) and is good practice. Have fun arguing otherwise.**

Now - Would you send someone into be questioned without legal representation? Would you deny someone representation as you are now? Would you state that Jim does not contain a clear advantage in conversation manipulation and that he is not skilled in coercion? Specifically to get people to say certain words or phrases? It's literally their mandate as an investigator – to question everything and push! I'm not saying he inherently has bad or malicious intent just because he's skilled (Which I appreciate skill – I'm intrigued), I'm saying exactly what it is!

A clearly unfair, threatening advantage. Especially to someone not expecting it and not educated – It's an indecent attack. And In fact, our law has deemed it such.

And no employee / person should ever be subjected to that without full disclosure and clear representation! Let alone funneled into it without discussion, disclosure or representation - like you just tried to pull.

And if this ever occurred Jordan and I find a single instance of it – you want to believe I'm going to have something to say about it - just as you should if you had any decency or consideration for due process or individual rights. It's your responsibility!

But to that same point, you also need to properly protect the Shipyard and I can be quite detailed about his, especially in regards to the use of Jim specifically (If I was black (or other visible minority)?! – Ask legal how that might have gone down, and then would you have just used someone else because of my race?!? What could someone do, to extort opinion given that known bias and history (just or unjust)? That's a major oversight. That could have been a major law suit!

So - I get a contractor who has everything to gain from remaining partial to Irving and was a police officer, skilled in interrogation and is and this is the first person you think I should meet – alone and shouldn't ask for another HR resource to even see how they feel about that?

And you think I'm over reacting?

All while, I'm here literally telling you – in good faith - it's just me and I don't know law and I don't have the education or resources!

And in this I have to wonder: Is this the Shipyard possibly trying to “pass” its responsibility on to this contractor, Jim? – was that some sly attempt at covertly doing it and then he tells me (like being served)?

I do not and will not support that at all, I have a right to due process. And in that, I have the right to face the people and system who did this to me and do not and will not recognize any type of transfer of responsibility / accountability for their actions. And I have done nothing unlawful – you folks have and continue to (And these recent actions are a new event)! You do not get to redirect responsibility for your actions to a third party because it's convenient for you to not be accountable for what you say –that would be the most disturbing statement or action to date from the Shipyard and to me would signal complete failure.

So Shipyard - you will be directly accountable for everything that gets said or you will accept full accountability and responsibility for everything Jim says and Does, past and present. In writing. As you have deemed him your “expert” and consider him “impartial representation” and in so clearly the voice of the Shipyard!!?

And this state of responsibility will be clearly relayed and accepted by the Shipyard along with its clear reasoning. I will never accept anything less than the Shipyard being fully accountable for its actions, if it can't – why should it be handling our defense projects? Seriously? It can't even take responsibility for what it says and does. Then why!?!?!

If you bullies can't take accountability and try to pull this. It is you who is refusing to reasonably cooperate and trying to misdirect. And if your HR department can't be responsible for what it says, how can you argue the integrity of your HR department? You can't! They can't be accountable for what they say but you argue the Shipyard doesn't have a problem with accountability?? When its heart can't be accountable and is compromised?

And let's be clear again .

I have done nothing threatening and my tone is appropriate (And is my literal legal right) – it is just me in this. Being clearly intimidated yet – I'm still providing facts and fair argument and being completely open about how I feel. And still offer my cooperation and just ask for basic fair representation in a safe environment – and that's threatening? My wording and approach to human behavior may not be traditional but you have no right to label me a threat because of my individuality. Do you folks understand the charter of rights? I have the right to free thought – I'm providing facts and quantified instances – I've never slandered anyone! I have freedom of expression and in that I have done nothing threatening at all, never suggested it – there or here and never will. **My character is based on me, meeting me, not some words to fit a narrative** – literally people fought and died for these rights but you people think you should label my individuality a threat because it fits your narrative?!??

That's illegal and disgusting behavior as a people.

What is seriously wrong with you folks? Does it make you happy disrespecting this country and our values? Because you literally and legally are!! And this isn't the first time!

If you used anything other than speaking to me face to face to determine my threat level and try to use some “expert” to reduce my individuality to a few words or tone and in that remove all of my rights because of individuality. You literally chose to strip me of my inherent rights as a Canadian who pays their taxes to you people. Not because of any actions, no instance of physical or aggressive behavior in or around that office, no police record – nothing. **But your own self-interests!**

Because that’s the easy path right Jordan? Would have been hard to deal with this while on vacation or before the holiday’s right? Or even, in the week after?

But I’m a threat!? Seriously 15 mins to have a meeting to ensure representation and confirmation that this is definitely being investigated? You are going to argue that’s an obscene request or expectation!? You couldn’t call me on the phone? What negative thing could have come from that? You wouldn’t have needed to disclose ANY new information at all.

So unless you labeled me a threatthen there is absolutely no reason for this. And if you did label me a threat it was huge miscalculation and gross violation of my rights.

If I’m a threat - It’s literally based on your self-imposed and self-inflicted ignorance - then you blame me for your folk’s lack of decency, competencies and your complete disregard for my rights and right to individual expression!? I hurt no one and my general tone shifted to harsher after clearly giving you a massive amount of time (160 - 200 hours for you alone Jordan) – And after you clearly refusing and denying me fair representation (Based on something I don’t even get to defend!)? Everything is based on fact. But I’m unreasonable!?

Now Jordan – What happened in history when rights were removed by people in power, just because it was convenient to the people in power? What horrible events have occurred when people aren’t given proper representation, fair process or human decency? What happens in a world where you are Guilty until proven innocent – why do we not employ that ideology in Canada? What events happen in places where they do enact this draconian ideology? Let’s just say, we know very well and that’s why Canada is what it is – free. Freedom of expression, freedom of individuality and freedom to ask the hard questions! And we absolutely have the right to fair representation!

But thank you for the depravity sir, I clearly deserve this!

Here let’s undergo a little education – because it’s most definitely needed and this only takes like 20 minutes, nothing remotely close to 160 hours. And this could probably change your life!

This thing you are about to read is called The Charter Of Rights and Freedoms, it’s the Canadian Constitution – You probably heard of it before and pretend to know it but it protects you every day!? And it applies to both **YOU and ME. We both have rights ☺ not just your side ☺**

*******I would recommend every single one of you - reading every line*******

Legal – Please Review.

<https://laws-lois.justice.gc.ca/eng/const/page-15.html>

See Fundamental Freedoms. **All of 2. I have a right to expression and my opinion! SO what I’m trying and how I’m trying it – is freedom of Conscience and Freedom of expression. I am not directly**

attacking anyone or slandering anyone and the majority of my tone shifted after CLEAR violation of my rights and I cannot be deemed a “threat” based on my freedom of expression! You have no rights to look into my life unless you deemed me a clear threat. And in doing so, you have to tell me! If you looked at ANY other person in my life, and used any type of associate determination (especially Jim). That is illegal. You literally have an obligation to tell if you are considering I’m a threat as that’s a legal statement! Because it has LEGAL ramifications FOR ME, regardless if you are suing me and thus you inherently HAVE TO TELL ME.

See Mobility Rights 6.2B – You are directly interfering with my ability to get jobs in multiple sectors in this province. Directly, knowingly and for your convenience. This is clear obstruction – this affects multiple sectors directly in this province, including the Government! As well as any contractors, especially any I would need clearance for! And to that, I have started applying out of province because of it! You would push talent out so you folks can be lazy? What can I do – it’s been almost 40 days and I can’t even get a meeting or fair representation?!? You are chasing me out of my own province illegally. I can’t even get a reference from you folks – and what about behind closed doors – is your argument that these people don’t know other business people and they don’t talk? The longer this goes on the worse you make it for me. But I bet you loved all those days of vacation Jordan? 40 days and were just “possibly talking” to a clearly BIASED source and I’m not afforded proper representation. So how much longer? How many more vacations? **You are directly and intentionally interfering with my right to work in this province!**

See Legal Rights - 7. What security of person have you afforded me? **You left me exposed to a massive and quantified threat** and deprived me of due process – multiple times – even when I was a direct employee! And now, as my first meeting you are sending to an Interrogation expert and have CLEARLY denied me fair and reasonable representation – upon me essentially begging for it?!? That’s intimidation! That’s not security of person. Definitely 8 – depending on how far your probe into my life has already gone (not speaking / meeting me is highly unreasonable!). If YOU FOLKS have investigated even a single piece of information - you have violated my rights and I have an absolute right to know. **That a security breach.** You folks had an absolute obligation to meet with me, if not you have CLEAR reasoning as to why I’m a threat! And I demand clarification – as is my right to defend myself against actual evidence!

“Proceedings in criminal and Penal Matters” See all of point 11. 40 days... REALLY? No, you don’t get to affect my life for 40 days and then decide okay were going to do this now, let’s sue him and drag it out longer – You had SO much actual time. And you didn’t even meet with me. You’ll have no defense. I demand to know if legal proceedings are expected and in that I have a right to know if I’m labeled a threat and I have a right to the evidence used in those determinations BY LAW.

“Treatment or punishment” – 12 : Based on how you are choosing to affect my life and this blatant attack and violation of my fundamental rights as a Canadian. And your failure to adhere to Nova Scotia Guidelines and inability to recognize the level of stress this caused while there and now coupled with your failure to provide resources or clarification - when you could have easily and reasonably resolved a lot of these. And are affecting my employment knowingly, directly and purposefully without any valid good cause and are subjecting me to an interrogation expert!

I don’t deserve to be treated like this as a Canadian – this is unjust treatment! It’s a form of punishment for reporting CLEAR systemic abuse, based on facts as well. And I absolutely have the right to defend

myself and you are depriving me of it! Are you going to say, that affecting my life like this when you can clearly do something is not cruel? Especially given the resources Irving has!?? It 100% is unusually treatment or punishment – not providing due process, no meetings, denying my rights, not even contacting me, and sending me to an interrogation expert with NO representation. Not clarifying my threat status? Not answering any basic questions, Not protecting me, But this is common? No way! This is punishment, intimidation and extremely unjustified and unusual treatment.

See “Enforcement” 24.1 & 2. **To challenge you labeling me a threat.** If you labeled me a threat then it is my CONSTITUTIONAL right to be able to defend myself and be made aware. If you have made ANY legal decisions regarding me or how to approach me– I have the right to be aware! This includes the Government. And am demanding this be clarified – this includes if you labeled me a threat – you literally have to clarify! It’s almost 40 days. At this time, you need to clarify your stance – laziness and vacations is not an excuse. **I have a right to see the evidence against me and contest that evidence.**

And it’s absolutely disgusting to know our National Shipbuilder, Who partners directly with the Government of Canada - would strip me of my inherent rights. And would attack – and yes attack

A Canadian and their character, and on top of that for requesting something so BASIC to our law and process – fair representation. I asked to meet a long time ago, way before ever raising this issue like this! And you leave me exposed and considered this respectand then.... patronize me about things taking time?

My rights are inherent as a Canadian sir – they take no time. They are immediate and not granted to me by you Jordan!? Is that how you believe this works?

All this after 200 hours??

Seriously – if you folks are not ashamed and try to argue that you haven’t really messed up – you should resign. No seriously Jordan.

So - Jim how do you feel about that- being a police officer? Do you think this has been a reasonable timeframe before someone speaks to me? And will you’ll argue this wasn’t out of convenience for the Shipyard especially after Jordan took a vacation? And then I’m here begging for representation as I’m wide open against a serious quantified threat – the interests! That a quick meeting was unreasonable!?

What a bizarre argument that is going to be and I’m sure if you put that on paper – it’s only going to help my case.

And then what – are you going to try to argue that I am not facing a very real threat myself?

You are going to try to argue this person “right at the top” wouldn’t go further to shut me down? They wouldn’t or couldn’t – you can’t argue this! There is an absolutely quantified factual history of them attacking and intimidating employees and using their employment to literally control them and shut them up! So you can’t reason that? Their actions were clearly unethical – so will you reason they cannot or would not be unethical?

You folks left me exposed to a real serious threat – my abuser! – And why? You know and knew very well what this person has already done to me and others, and you know full well what their friends could do to me. And you just leave me here exposed. I can't get a job reference – nothing!

After I provided massive value to the Shipyard and this Country.

And are you going to say there isn't proof? This is all just an "allegation".

That's beyond shameful and it's a perfect definition of negligence.

And we haven't even gotten started. Go grab a coffee – I've got some more education for you folks.

In fact, I'll give you a wakeup call from the real world. Because you folks can't hear everyone else from behind all that glass.

The police System under which Jim was heavily involved was definitely okay with disposing particular people they didn't like to particular inconveniences. Inconveniences which did and will have long lasting effects in their life, professionally and mentally – ones that Jim would not apologize for. That can never be taken back – no matter how many times you apologize. (And in fact, the police have had the same type of effect on the LGBTQ+ community – I don't think this is the case but - what if this guy doesn't just like me because of my orientation? Are you going to argue there is no history of exactly this behavior?

But I don't deserve fair representation!? Guys - if you just talked to me when you literally by law should have - we'd know what was up.)

And to that same fact – their Chief of police later had to very specifically apologize for that same matter and in fact, make such a dramatic turn of decision as to go as far as to say – and this is a direct quote:

"I, as chief, will take personal responsibility and follow up in any case"

Relating directly to systemic bias and accountability and targeting specific groups based on their personal feelings – not law!

So will you argue Jim could not mess my life up easily? Are you going to argue they wouldn't just say what their boss told them to, in this case Irving? (It's that or he PERSONALLY didn't believe they should apologize – you can't argue that, which goes against the official police chief's statement – and did he lodge a complaint if he did not agree) – And you don't believe that they can't make a phone call and they don't have buddies? (Check his social media – they are literally milliseconds away!) And that he won't leverage those resources or couldn't covertly? And that's not intimidating? And that police never do that and I should just trust them and I should just trust you?

How did that forceful thinking turn out (Most specifically) for the Black community? We know exactly how that turned out – objective from anything I could ever have done or been involved with. And they are still apologizing for it! And will for some time.

So let me ask you all this - When police are questioning someone in an official capacity – say at the Police Station, don't they record the conversations / legally have to ensure you are given the chance to proper representation? And with full disclosure of the conditions of their questions – informing them

they are in fact being questioned? This Representation is chosen by the person and not the police or other parties? For obvious reasons? You know... this thing called "Conflict of Interest" it's also outlined in the Nova Scotia Guidelines I believe!

And in that, you cannot substitute responsibility? Have someone else come in and be responsible for you? Where do you ever see that happen – that's clearly hiding and intentionally obstructing the view?

Ask Jim what would happen to a police officer if they clearly violated these rights. Especially if done intentionally and willfully and knowing someone is begging you for proper representation!

But I don't know what I'm talking about here right? I shouldn't be asking these questions? All this makes me look like a threat and guilty?

What does it make you folks look like? Seriously?

Seriously as a threat assessment to Canada – you are failing. You can't even ensure, safe fair representation and deem me a threat with no basis. **You removed a Canadians rights, literally violating the Charter of Rights!** The basis of our very law and freedoms! Removing my right to due process and my HR record. You have failed to identify yourself, or confirm in ANY type of substantiated way that even an HR claim has been opened. And after 200 Hours – the first person you say I should speak to is a security interrogator (Your view of impartial) who has clear GAIN in supporting the Shipyards interest (And this will be laid out nicely later). And that you couldn't have had someone speak to me earlier?

And that's not intimidation? You could not reason how that would be intimidating? Are you serious?

And you think that's not a threat to this country? That way of thinking –stripping a Canadians rights? That's not a threat to the integrity of the Shipyard? That's not threat to the Integrity of our Constitution – our Freedoms and Rights?

You by fact and definition are a threat to this country! You so quickly, easily and without any second thought - tossed out the constitution in favor of vacations and convenience. And stripped my rights.

How is that safe for Canada or Canadians?

On top of the POOR quality work being pumped out?

You folks are guilty. You folks are failing this country because it's convenient to you. And you are failing a Canadian and attacking them. It's quantified and it's in your face!

Do you feel like a big hero for all this Jordan?

How did the constitution taste when you actually had to read it? What do you feel now that you know for sure - you don't get to decide when I get rights?

I see you.

Here is some clear speculation, because I've traveled quite a few roads already (I've assumed many flavors of this)... and this one seems pretty likely. I wonder if you think I'm over reacting. (EMPIRIC) is that going to be your defense? Get some experts to craft some narrative? It's smart, I'll give you folks that.

Police are respected right, you bought inherent trust didn't you? It's a good move really. Like I get it, because no matter what these guys say – you know A, B and C will generally believe / Trust their "Opinion":

- Where A Are the highest ranking Social Contact
- Where B Are (roughly) parallel ranking Social Contact (And these people held good positions!)
- Where C Are, generally agreeable people towards authority

And to push this fact further – these people have a clear, recorded history, **you literally purchased *authoritative* social equity – it's brilliant.** I mean aside from all of this, what a purchase. **And the social equity they can now gain from the Shipyard? It's incredible - they would be crazy to compromise that opportunity! What quantifiable – non contestable gain! For both sides!**

And nothing for me!

Do you have them all to your selves? I hope you bought them out for any "just because" situations.

Jim – if you haven't accounted for this raw social equity in your price– look into it. What they likely need you for here, is worth a lot – or is it that you get that already and the tradeoff is for more Social Equity? **You know exactly what you are buying and selling here don't you?**

Jordan did you hire them or did one of your bosses? Was this your plan – if it was not then you need to read this very carefully to understand what they are very likely trying to do. You need to question where these guys came from and the why. Who hired / suggested them. And their back end connections.

Also Jim – You should be questioning this. This is quite clearly an imbalanced situation and you clearly have a massive amount of inherent social equity and quantifiable and objective gain in this – those are facts. And that level of gain, can quickly turn into motive – that's a logical police thought right Jim?

You and the Shipyard also both have incredible motive. There is incredible gain to you, especially if you leverage even a portion of your social equity. And do you think these "Leaders", especially the ones right at the top don't know what they bought? Do you think they aren't smart enough to Know what this means – you know they know.

This isn't their first rodeo and you yourself were a police officer. You would be silly not to at least consider this a very real possibility – especially as an investigator!

It's strategic which also tells you this is all highly premeditated and this means something big if you objectively look at this.

In hiring you, how is Irving using that social equity and is that fair? Are you aware of your Gain loss / the strategic advantage of using someone like you in this kind of scenario? Where public opinion, push and pull - would absolutely matter? If you say there is not – then you are inherently mistaken Jim and that's concerning – I am not fabricating any facts or details either – I'm just pointing it out!

And if the Shipyard haven't gathered a statement from me, technical account, even asses me as a threat (impartially) And in the whole time of not doing this - leave me labeled as a threat for at least 40 days - When I've done nothing and have no right to representation or to defend myself (Quantified fact) Can you point to any place in Policing this is ever allowed? And in policing, if police created a whole back story, without gathering direct evidence, accounts, technical account, and other people's stories – what might that imply Jim?

Please just at least consider this.

And then what would it be if they tried to craft their own narrative and use overwhelming social equity to enforce that narrative, clearly unfair representation and a massive amount of resources? Yet I'm the person or people who should be treated as a threat?

What would this mean overall about the Shipyard – does that make you feel comfortable as a Canadian? That they would try that on another Canadian? That they would use our resources, to create a fake narrative of convenience and leverage your “new entry” position and social equity hoping that your particular position GAINS / WANTS / NEEDS might sway your opinion? Will you trade your decency?

As a police officer –how does it feel knowing I've been labeled a threat for at least 40 days and have not been given fair representation – yet they get you? Would you think that's fair? Especially after I tried contacting them so many times?

Now Jim – this is serious. Given a very well know situation where your boss clearly was wrong I can point to a place where you supported their determination. Now you could have resigned because of them making you say you would not apologize, you could have staged you own – in office protest (wrist band, etc) or you could have lodged a complaint – did you do any of these? If not, that's complacency with systemic abuse – for your gain! Remember this - Even if your decision was 49/51, they maintained your equity even though they were clearly wrong! And even knowing that discrepancy now - I'm betting you would still lend your trust and resources to them and they would to you? You don't hurt that reference!

You would not have wanted the negative consequences would you? - a Bad Reference or Being let go , or reduction is social equity – that's obvious – it was calculated. So in this you have either shown that you either agreed – that HRP should not have apologized, or you didn't agree but remained quiet and allowed that systemic abuse and bias to continue because of the personal loss to yourself. All this on top of knowing you were a “Leader” within that system!

So, are you going to say there isn't an instance where I can clearly question a situation similar to this? Systemic abuse while the perpetrators (Harassment - Your direct employers) are literally being protected from accountability, protected from saying “Sorry” / fully admitting its full impact on those people affected?

And now, let's factor in how much money you made as a police officer. And consider financial motivations and perhaps why you left HRP?

Total - \$148,767.72

Which is 2.44 times the Median household income for just you alone!

Why would you leave this job after so long? You made really good money and were likely close to retiring? You had lots of friends there and privilege! You made a huge amount of money and probably could have sat behind a desk for the remaining amount? That's a big number... and since you left how do you pay the bills? Typically people at income levels become dependent on that income level, so how will you fill that gap - if you don't have income? And with your position within this whole system – why leave – why not go up?

To me – it seems perhaps it was an agreed on decision. It would be hard to move up if that was the case? And it would be uncomfortable to explain the discrepancy in statements (Apology / no apology), how would you answer that? It would be awkward – anyone can see that but if you aren't there? No awkward! But also, the HRP couldn't just let you go – because that would send a wrong message. It also explains why you would depart quietly from guaranteed money and comfort. Must people don't just choose discomfort when they are given the type of opportunity you had?

So – what is Irving paying you? It must be pretty good? You must need money – going from making that much to working in the private sector – are you willing to compromise that financial security? They obviously have something you want – what is it? Clearly money is a key motivation – how dependent on that Money are you? What about your search for Social Equity – which can be more valuable than money.

Did we just make a really interesting discovery about your transition to the private sector? As a police officer – would you not be thinking this?

Would you compromise both of these to support and represent me?

Regardless - Stories are being crafted and your social equity is being used to help protect abusers again, and you've shown questionable behavior in similar decisions – what are you going to do? Are you going to help them crush me so you get your business / new venture / Name off the ground?

Is that the man you are after what 30 years of policing? That's who they made you – I don't deserve proper representation and my first meeting should be with a man trained in interrogation, with no representation?

This is an important question for you Jim – if you were in charge – this is what I deserve? You don't think there might be some other narrative going on here, higher up than me? What about the Charter of Rights –just because you're no longer police, you won't adhere or help enforce?

You would be okay with labeling a Canadian a threat when they have done nothing (But provide substantial value – which we haven't even discussed) and then these people refuse to provide any resources, representation and they won't even clarify my HR record which I have an ABSOLUTE right to, or provide references which they CLEARLY know the impact of. And 40 days? Find some precedence where that makes sense!?! What would it look like if there was this much evidence and the police did nothing, in fact you knew what these bullies could do and just let it happen? And dragged it out for 40 days – knowing how it hurts the victim. Saying there is nothing they can do / say when it's literally your responsibility? Ethically and Legally!?

I understand money is nice, it makes life easier – trust me I know. But what these guys did – was not just bad from a harassment perspective, they quite negatively impacted the quality of our technical

work and absolutely compromised the state and quality of National Security and our Defense project. All while literally telling people they deserve it! Your daughters would just deserve it – not based on their skill, not based on their quality of person but because some entitled people tell them “They should be happy to have a job” because that “leader” can’t personally look their failure in the face – and why? There is no good reason for it - none. When it’s literally their (our) tax dollars paying them – it’s disgusting. And I know as a human if you had to face it – you would see it for exactly what it was. And everything I wrote isn’t even the whole story technical or HR. And isn’t even from other people’s encounters, statements and experiences.

I can only imagine what you would hear if people were given an environment where they know they have the freedom to speak knowing they could never be targeted – as there is a clear proven history of just that!

So - are you going to help a bunch of rich privileged folks lie, deprive a Canadian of their rights, mislead Canada about our projects, and severely harass and abuse your Daughters both personally and professionally. They then use Canadian resources to then try to label them a threat and try to remove their rights – all for demanding quality, respect and someone actually be accountable?

All while this system failed miserably and is failing hard – look at the news – how many delays now? Do you think there isn’t a root cause? I can tell you this Disease is a MASSIVE part of it Jim. I’ve seen it. Do you think I’m not a detailed and observant person? Do you think I haven’t gone over this hundreds or thousands of times? If you stop for a second and just assume I’m telling the truth – what does that mean Jim, what does it mean about the state of our defense project and the people running it?

What does it mean about the state of our country where we would let that happen to our citizens so blatantly!? Because they deserve it, we as Canadians deserve it and it’s required to build ships? If that’s what you believe then I’m saddened by your view on Canadians capabilities and how incapable you must see the rest of – that we would “deserve” this or should “just be happy” with it.

Is that what you told people stopped by street checks? It’s for their good, they should be happy with that quality or service, that “product” was the best police could offer?

I have a feeling that you as a person understand that we have so much more than fear, poor quality and protecting bullies to offer as a country and as a pack.

So now, let’s speculate on their narrative for you – here’s what they’ll most likely try:

You get a few “experts” who have “seen this all the time” right, because why would a security person, especially new to market say they couldn’t handle this?

What a narrative! You just need them in the story long enough to what - profile me? Hopefully I hit a few “indicators” – regardless of who I actually am. These guys already “Know my type” – right (policing systemic bias – they know best right! See Street checks for a good case study on what happens when you apply this logic to people)? Maybe, try to validate their/your actions by some acquaintances or something? (Illegal) And hopefully this justifies your threat assessment? And then what trap me with some words and try to put a hard legal cap on it?

And Will these indicators just be counted, 1...2.....3 or will they be a percentage of my total content and cooperation? Will it be considered that I have no representation and literally have to defend myself against the will of billions of dollars? Will I ever get to debate / discuss these “indicators” fairly and not just because I’m sued by these “heroes”? Will they ever apply these indicators / strategy to this person “right at the top?” Will the clear violations of my rights as a Canadian be accounted for? **I have so many questions. And I’m ready to ask them!**

They think they will crush me with someone else’s social equity and interests, so it doesn’t look like them? The ole switch-a-roo?

Well I see you folks, I’ve seen you folks. And I’ve got my eyes on all of you.

Anyways, at this time, these contractors, are clearly predisposed by definition of being employed to protect the Shipyards Interests (How would you argue otherwise? You are paying them and if they didn’t need your money – they wouldn’t be working for you!), thus the Shipyards interests directly inherit the majority of that social equity! Wealth by proximity (It’s not always money, something can be almost “invaluable”). Think about this, if NOT FAVOR / FAVOR working for Irving and they score 51/49 – why not leave, why work with them – there must be some ethical concern, they are police!?! 50/50 Gets weird because then it’s their personal choice – and do most people choose the more difficult path? No - Pointing to 49/51 which represents the most basic form of logical employment, this says that even with just the slightest of justification in their heads – the bare minimum. You still get the majority of the Social Equity! If not, you would both have to disagree and how would that be beneficial to either Jim or this person “right at the top” – it’s not. And in fact would probably incur financial and reference issues for Jim if he doesn’t support Irving! As well an uphill battle that won’t look good for his new Entry in to the “Private Sector”, and we all know newbies are willing to put up with more, that’s a fact (Look at what you did to me alone)! – Because obviously they want the job or wouldn’t be there! Don’t mistreat your customers or they won’t be customers – and you folks haven’t even really established trust yet. **What an opportunity to “establish” this trust between Jim and the Shipyard? Regardless, what will the reference say? Do you think people will want to hire a security guy, who went after the people paying them on his first job (or in such an early market stage – would you have hired them knowing that? No way!)?**

It’s incredible and clear motivation for his opinion to swing a particular way. What could I offer him? Nothing.

But I just have to trust all of you blindly? I see you people.

So in the end, you inherently have bought social equity that is clearly in your favor and already partial to your interests and gains you some pretty valuable “just because” points – without me ever getting to say a word. And the words I do get to say are to an interrogation expert, the Shipyard bearing no accountability? **That’s an objective fact!**

Brilliant! This isn’t me being sarcastic either. But I have anticipated this partially in a funny – not funny way. I assumed your representation of me, through these “Ranks” at particular levels would not be so blatant. So I first assume this was not your choice Jordan (And if it was sir, you should respectfully relieve

yourself of this issue and step aside) – this came from above you. And that this was either a huge miscalculation, this is a different Jim Perrin or you think you got me!?!? And you don't have me.

Now - I don't have that kind to social equity **directly banked** and you folks know that - but I have some, it might be surprising. And I've got lots of facts and this is highly relatable to the large majority of people in Canada. And I know that - so if you try to slander me, sue me or try to force your money / influence on me – it will not work. I have a strategy for dealing with it as it was anticipated.

Millennials are quite resourceful – we know the how to leverage the social equity of the masses. And what would that do to you Jim if you got this wrong? Especially in relation to your past? And the best part I won't need to craft some narrative like you “Leaders” – it's all laid out plain here – you did it.

It's something we should all think about? Really carefully, somethings have much more inherent values than money. Social Equity seems to have quite the value as per the Shipyards indirect admittance. But it can change – money keeps a much more constant and predictable rate.

And I really hope you try all of this – you have no idea what you are in for.

And in fact, if you think you are going to sell some “Over reacting” narrative... then based on videos and on evaluation of sincerity in movements I'd much rather talk to this Jean-Michel, I'm sure we could have a really interesting discussion about impacts of this behavior on mental health and group health and how it effects productivity, group think and agreeable people?. I'd be interested to hear his stories and experience. Regardless if they are even related or not. From what I can tell about Jim, he likes to keep his fingers crossed – typical of someone not wanting to signal their state (A spokesperson / interrogator). It would be extremely interesting watching him progress through questioning.

So it seems like it's not a far hop. I see they are buddies and worked side by side. Jean-Michel left in Aril 2019, Jim left near the end of 2019 from what I can tell. Two guys going private – one “investigator” side, one “process resolution”? Services can be logically paired. So....

“Who they gonna call? Eeach other!!” (Hums ghostbusters song... I hope this gets stuck in your heads all day)

And then what kind of suggestive narrative can be crafted by these two well respected people (or just one) against some unprotected dog out in the woods? Especially when they have substantial gain from remaining partial to Irving - financial and further SUBSTANTIAL social equity to be gained?

If you pull this Jim – you aren't heroes and you aren't unique – you are bullies for hire and you would let them use the inherit equity, your inherent value – to crush someone. Are you really okay with that? Jean-Michel? Are you just tools for hire after 30 some years of telling people you are there for them and not money!?

I guess were going to find out?

And you folks need to know – I know this may not be the same Jim - I'm fully aware that in that – this might all be useless info and seem paranoid.

But it's not – it's a logical deduction and you folks need to know that I'm ready for you on many fronts.

I told you folks I will not back down and I will not accept your narrative nor will I accept this silly little picture you think you might be coercing me into

... Just consider this. ...

If Jim is the one running this – is it at all surprising that based on his past behaviors that I would literally have to beg for my basic rights – fair representation as a human? When it's also a blatant violation of my rights?...There is a clear public answer to that..... it's to be expected, institutionally defended and not apologized for by this person!

(I'm sorry Jim – it's nothing personal – it's a good, fair and applicable question and if I don't ask it, someone will eventually - work it out now (You would ask it as a cop if you were questioning someone)

And Jordan we haven't even gotten to the technical and you folks can't even muster a respectful HR response. The best you can do is blatant intimidation, label me a possible threat to Canada? And then patronize me with "Understand these things take time". And strip me of my inherent rights? And this is what you have after 200 hours?

No Jordan – I see you. I see you so clearly.

So, Harjit, Irvings, Jim, Legal– Are we going to have a real meeting? Are we done with this? Have I made my point loud enough? Because I can keep howling, louder and louder if you'd like? I have every right to (quantified) and I will exercise that right as much as I can – One good thing about dogs is they love exercise and howling ☺

But I would really rather just fix this. And we can fix this, we are not past that point. In fact, we might be at the perfect point where an understanding can be had and certain motivations (on all sides) be made clear and understood.

Know this – I personally SWEAR this has never been provided to anyone else. I will delete any and all copies and will offer disclosure, transparency and confirmation of that. And to that - No one has read these emails or my letter.

However the resignation(s) stands! As well as Tolerance Policies, Anonymous reporting (A much better system at least), XXXXX gets a fair investigation (you need to know the full story), HR pressure training, HR flags and a clear reporting path / process to engage the government will not change. You need these things guys. You really do - a message needs to be sent. It's not something I just want – you need to send the message! It's going to be different!

And in this the Shipyard will provide a clear path for references – I don't want any special treatment or special reference but someone will be able to be directly contacted to clearly, quickly and efficiently provide a direct reference – non-expiring. I don't want special treatment, I want a clear path so I know they don't go back and screw me. That's reasonable given what occurred.

The resignation will not change unless you present a very compelling argument / story as to what occurred. I'm not unreasonable – For instance: If XXXXX was under security investigation already by the Government not just the Shipyard? It's the only thing that would have naturally explained so many bizarre factors.... Or was this all Government sanctioned and you folks are pointing the finger at each other? I don't know.

Anyways, we have until Tuesday before the \$10,000 recommendation kicks into effect – you can choose to stop this.

Again I'm being reasonable but in the end, I will not back down from this.

And I'll sign whatever you folks need me to sign – we can resolve this and I'll disregard the personal transgressions against me. And sign a testament that – it'll never resurface. But there does have to be a proper discussion and I understand the premise and content of the meeting would be confidential.

I'll even let you security physically pat me down, screen me first and meet someplace comfortable for you folks. They can even pick me up! I'll leave my phone behind! They could even strip search me if their hands are warm – Man, woman or non-binary, I don't care....I'm not a shy person just extremely ticklish.... Lol

In fact, here in writing it's my suggestion. I'm fully comfortable with that type of approach just don't tickle me.

And all because - I'd like to go live my life as I'm sure all of you would. But I need answers. And we know there is an easy way and a hard way to get them.

And this is a great solution for everyone! And it stops more fuel from being added.

But this offer does have an expiration date. Confirmation By Tuesday January 21 5PM AST

And remember this and hear it very LOUD because I don't want there to be any confusion or for you folks to misinterpret me ever again:

This is not a sign of fatigue or me waning from my resolve - if you push this further folks then I will push back. I have an actual playbook at this time.

So - if this goes further – the Shipyard is choosing to attack me. Even given, another reasonable way to resolve this.

Harjit:

“

Good day sir!

I'd also assume you are aware of this by now? I sent two emails to:

DND_MND@forces.gc.ca

Asking for assistance.

First on November 22 2019

Second December 7 2019

I received no reply and did not expect to. And to this, I didn't send this out broadly because I thought I would be a hypocrite if I in anyway used the Shipyards state just like XXXXXX did. I had justified reasons but still – the Shipyards process needs a chance to see how it will respond and I wanted to remain as fair as possible. I know what I can prove it was just.... Do I carry this?

And to that sir – I have stuck with them – gave them proper time to reply and time to respond.

I do not believe my response to be inappropriate or disproportionate.

My complaints are valid as are my concerns regarding the violations of rights after the fact.

And I do not believe I had to disclose to the Shipyard that I sent my letter to that address and I still believe I have no legal obligation or ethical obligation to have let them known. And this was out of concern for the Shipyard and still is. This system without a substantial amount of eyes on it – can never change, it gets reinforced.

And I tried to report this (So where do I go from there) - I watched the failure occur – it was quantified. I watched what they thought they could get away with when no one was watching.

Hence my persistence - They need to know someone sees them, all of them.

If not it's just a bunch of kids on the playground with money blowing in the wind! Not a respectful defense project.

^^

Irvings:

"I get you folks know how to run businesses, I don't doubt that and I bet your good at it and you've seen a lot more than I have.

But folks, I've seen a lot and been around also. It might not be quite from your perspective – but sometimes – that's what you need.

And you did not need this person – their overall presence in my opinion create a substantial negative net effect and you folks didn't have the tools or people in place, or the perspective to see it.

To be honest – what would you have done if someone sued you over them? Would you just expect me to lie? I would not have lied, no matter my position! They would have a really valid case! I'm sure if a lawyer seen what I had, what I went through and known there were others - he would tackle me, tie

me to a chair and tape my mouth shut while he took this to court. (Your folks tried to do the same for the opposite reason?)

That's not a threat – that's a legitimate, quantified statement. XXXXXX was 100% ethically compromised – if he made a big mistake – with all this behind him, and then others jumped on because they have valid reasons – what would that do to the integrity of the Shipyard? This could have been so much worse.

And there were other serious concerns about his direct technical competencies. As a service amalgamator, I'm sure he functioned generally fine and I can see how his personality type may help with that. But he could not provide any generative content. And that includes corrective content. And thus he could not educate his team! The large majority was just take – no educate!

Now, I would walk around the office, the lunch halls – outdoors (I can program in my head, I wasn't wasting time seriously – it's like an OCD thing in my head – you probably get that by now). And I would talk to a lot of people, I would just sit and listen sometimes – you would hear people vent, talk freely – not really judgmental but freely. Like their opinion. Not just "oh I hate it here" but like... its good here "but".

And do you know the pattern I heard, over and over? it was the same feeling – there is no accountability so nothing matters. This wasn't regarding a single topic or department or group of people – but like some culturally agreed consensus?

The majority of people I heard, had no faith in you folks to be accountable. And I personally don't think that bothers you as much as it should.

You are our National Ship Builder and the very Canadians working for you have no faith in your ability to be accountable and were sickened by your actions. And to be honest, from everything I seen – and what we see on the news with delays. I would back that statement 100%.

Now I can't and I won't speak for anyone else – I was only there 6 months an even though I'm a friendly person – I only really know the technical side of what I did – so that's what I'm speaking to.

And I personally watched it happen to me, catastrophically, I watched you folks dodge accountability for something very serious. And the technical quality was poor.

None of you would ever have tolerated how this person spoke to me especially given how wrong they were. If you folks had to deal with it, you would have fired him and not gave a very nice reference. Almost guaranteed. And then If you found out about the history?

But people spent years dealing with it and they should just be happy for it?!

I would have helped if you just talked to me – no hiding – real talking. I could have signed something to not talk about it?

Instead you made me guess what's happening and leave XXXXXX in Authority for what? So you don't look weak?

Well, how do you look now? Does this make you look strong?

No it doesn't! And what's changed? Accountability!

Employees need to see the system fix its self. You need to give them their pride – they go to HR because it's one place they feel safe and express themselves!

You took the idea of safety away from employees! By taking steps that clearly and blatantly degraded confidence in the HR department!

Employees need to know the system is capable, accountable and is there for their safety! And they need healthy reminders of that!

Canada needs to know the system is capable and accountable!

I need to know the system is capable and accountable!

You folks need to start caring being about being accountable and present with your Employees.

They need to know and Canada needs to know!

I'm not lecturing or telling you to do anything, I haven't run a billion dollar company.

But I've met a lot of people and I know what it's like down here.

So it's just my opinion. I thought I'd share it.

”

Legal:

“So what now - You're going to sue me now so you don't face this? Now that all my rights are spelled out and clearly violated? You see how they screwed me and abandoned me, violated my rights, intimidated me, refuse fair representation, refuse a contact for the government, refuse resources, they refuse to verify identity, never in any quantifiable way confirmed the status or confirmation of any actual HR investigation, they knew 100% the person “right at the top” has a CLEAR history of sanctioned harassment and has VERY clear motive in this to silence me / affect my life (And the resources to absolutely do it) and they had already done it, there is actual proof and facts!! – But they left me exposed – intentionally and negligently. They haven't Followed Nova Scotia guidelines, and are stating they do not have to provide me with my HR record – which I'm entitled to! And on top of this, look at my extremely fair argument for violating the Charter of rights? They definitely did!

And what about this mess with Jim? Sloppy!

And then you try to go and Sue me on top of all this? Are you ready to defend I've been unreasonable? Are you willing to bring everyone else into this – do you know how bad this could turn out even for yourselves?

So if you want to sue me - Please come on – let's go talk to a Judge, better yet a Jury of my peers. I think they would be really interested in this whole story – especially the other massive chunk we haven't even gotten around to.

No – its time you folks do Canada a Favor – Remove this person “right at the top” immediately - you have the tools and justification. When I prove everything and I will – how will this look that you

protected them so long? Are you saying their protection is not a conflict of interest in regards to the Shipyard's main objective and purpose with the Government of Canada and Canadians in general? And their actions have not clearly jeopardized that relationship and it's Integrity? The have!

And you'll argue this person hasn't caused a massive breach of trust? They literally abused and sanctioned abuse of Canadians. Then lied about it, tried to pretend like it wasn't substantial and then tried to hide it.

As I see it – you folks are personally breaking the law (Or right on the edge at this time) by protecting their personal interests especially if they were ever privileged to your assistance during this investigation. You may have literally coached them on how to victimize me further! They would have tricked you – did you report it? And now I bet you are still sitting around planning on how to protect this abusing and compromising behavior!?

Which is exactly the disease that I'm talking about!

At what point, does it tip into accessory? There is a darn good argument for complacency at this time.

So - When do you assume culpability?

It has to stop folks!

This will tumble so quick you might miss it. You may have already missed it and don't know it. And I'm not going to stop.

And why should you even wonder about all this? – Just remove them. Done – everyone is better for it. Including the Shipyard.

Every notch is another piece of evidence for personal interests and at this point – what is your argument for not clearly knowing that? Do you think you are at a point that you can't reason what I've laid out? You can try but... it's laid out nice here – so now what?

I'm giving them another try. Knowing this and how this has been mishandled – You know what this means.

The only other address I sent my letter to was to DND_MND@forces.gc.ca. That's it – I swear! I'm at full absolute disclosure.

You need to ensure the integrity of the Shipyard and I am not your enemy.

I do not want to hurt the Shipyards Integrity, so please don't make me keep doing this!

It's time to pick a side.

If not, it's very likely you will be nudged into a side - awkwardly and uncomfortably where you are left to defend certain actions or inactions.

Would you rather partial control or chaos?

I'm offering you cooperation and a way to resolve this.

Remove this person “right at the top” before this gets too loud.

And please get a real meeting going – you know what I mean”

Jim

“I hope there are no hard feelings and I hope you know, in a lot of ways I actually look forward to meeting you. I’d like to be questioned – see what pressure you can apply – can you get me – can I get you (not that it’s a game, but to see the skill). I’d like to see what you have, and let you come at me and id’ let you given the right scenario – but seriously man – please don’t try to ruin my life for these people – I would do everything I could to protect you from them and I am not your enemy – I promise and my disposition is not to inherently disrespect you – I’ve got to seriously protect myself, I’ve had to protect myself most of my life and in that, the best defense I have is my intelligence. And I have to use it as efficiently and effectively as I can.”

Can I Please get a response by Tuesday January 21 5PM AST?

Thank you and have a great day!

Now, the following is a personal statement so you know me – not as any type of leverage:

From my perspective, being part of a non-visible underrepresented group in regards to “Word of mouth”, “stop and checks”, “Behind closed doors decisions”, “Police Intentions”

I have seen firsthand what occurs behind “closed” doors. I’ve seen the face people put on to get the “likes” and “approval” or “stature” - you know “Puff that big chest out” and I see patterns of behavior in people based on my unique experiences – you folks don’t know. And then I see the raw bigotry and hypocrisy when they think no one’s looking or that nobody is good enough to be able to see them. And then these big men (and women) try to come on to me like I’m some object. All while telling the world “those people should be shot, killed or tortured” or spit at them, teach their kids to hate them and try to turn systems against them... They get what they want and then throw you away like garbage in the end...when you need and want to feel safe. Something basic to human decency.

And you know, I’ve been told I’m lucky.... with my particular flavor of disposition I can integrate very well. It’s not usually suspected and in that I’ve got to see the world from many sides whether its business, the rich, the privileged or as “one of the boys” and I’ve seen what word of mouth can do to a person first hand. And I can tell you Jordan – these people most often think they are heroes for doing it. They often believe people deserved it – for who they are – it’s a form of narcissism, they think they are doing everyone else a favor because they think everybody actually thinks like them or they know best. But some of them rot with the regret inside them for years...And why? It’s just to make them feel better about their own fears and shortcomings. A temporary fix for a complex problem. It’s a whole other but similar disease to the one were currently dealing with.

And to this - I see racism, homophobia and hate and I've tried to deal with it in a lot of ways- quite typically head on - I've seen it in our police force and it is still quite alive in this Province – And there are very real issues with trust with these individuals (Police) – whom literally have a history of just that.

Selectively targeting groups and people who can't protect themselves – just because they don't like them **or were challenged by them**. This is important.

Literally there is well recorded history of this exact behavior.

Now this is not some police hate talk or disrespect. Nor is it to be suggestive of Jim's core character or capabilities especially based on my limited data. Nor is it to suggest the system is not changing – I do believe it's getting better – but only because people are fighting for their rights.

That's why I love Canada so much! We try to do better and we will be better! But we have to acknowledge what went wrong – that's our strength – seeing the failure not just as a negative but as a way of solidifying the core of who we are, answering the hard questions – that is worth something big. It's what we'll pass on to your Kids and Grandkids. And if we do it right - it could mean something really big for the rest of the world.

And I have the utmost respect for the police and the services and safety they provide our communities. And I certainly respect the danger they place themselves in everyday just to make a horrible wage, especially in comparison to what they deal with, and then have people quick to judge them or make them a target of their hate – generalizing them just as others don't want to be generalized.

All while they are responding to horrible accidents and events that would challenge even the strongest minds.

Take a look at Police suicide rates, it's sad and it's scary for them – quite obviously. All while we sit at a desk writing words?

When done appropriately - Policing is highly respectable but unfortunately it's massively underappreciated by a lot of the same people who directly benefit from that very safety and resource that these individuals offer.

They have my inherent respect.

And to this,

I haven't even been arrested or ever named in anything!?! I never even had to give a statement! And to that, just so you know - within my community – I completely respect the help from our police force – especially them helping out with our community events and appreciate the value that even their “presence” brings. They come over, help out and talk with people and bring their families to support their communities in their free time when locals – who get the most advantage would just sit home on their couch and judge. And to that Jordan – at multiple times in my life I have considered becoming involved in law enforcement but due to issues with clearly illogical conditions I had some serious hesitations. Inside of that system – I cannot talk freely about social issues, or laws that don't really make sense because I would be fighting myself the whole time – how would you get ahead if you took a hard stance – no to street checks. No – to prosecution for Cannabis (conditionally). No – to the use of Force unless to absolutely defend, NO- to the ways officers use of force and common logic in responding to

Mental Health issues(We can have an educated discussion about my mother and what you folks did right and did very wrong). No – to the way addicts are just being imprisoned. No – to systemic abuse of minority groups - I don't just agree with blanket solutions, I agree with human rights, discussion, perspective, science, policy– Repeat.

And inside of that, I figure as long as I remain informed, apply logic and volunteer then I can still help that system and our country – based on facts - and I can use that voice to speak freely to help educate. And in that way I can help contribute more broadly, freely and respectfully (to the groups effected)

(For what it's worth to you folks...)
