

14/01/2014 12:03 AM

Subject: PERSONAL & CONFIDENTIAL

PERSONAL & CONFIDENTIAL

Greetings Board Members:

This e-mail is companion to that earlier sent to the Board, with Staff copied. At this time, I will not copy this to Staff.

I preface what I say below with this: I believe and have operated on a core commitment to the possibility of change/conversion in people. I believe no one is impossibly locked into behaviour patterns, actions or consequences. I therefore retain hope for myself and all that “people can change!” Glory, hallelujah! I therefore embrace the spirit of hope “that does not disappoint”. I love Romans 5:5: *And hope will never fail to satisfy our deepest need because the Holy Spirit that was given to us has flooded our hearts with God’s love (The Voice).*

Finally: I am speaking from documentation, my memories, Esther’s memories, and perceptions, etc. I make no claim to their full accuracy. Nor do I insist that anyone said/did what is below. I am open to revision. But I say emphatically: Such revision will necessitate professional mediation – to which I return at the end.

On the contrary, Barry, to your recent “Subject” line, this was not a “Happy New Year” in terms of my having felt repeatedly bullied and harassed by the Board and by Colette Squires.

I understand that I am within my rights to claim a WorkSafeBC case against the Board and against Colette Squires, of *bullying and harassment*. I do not wish to choose this course of action.

At the October 28, 2013 Board meeting *for approximately one hour* I felt verbally harassed; was lied about with words used against me like “nepotism”; and was subjected to false moralistic claims like “Why can’t you admit you made a mistake?” Neither you as Board Chair, nor anyone else stopped the verbal barrage against me. This was followed by my experience that felt like bullying and harassment of me at the November 25, 2013 Board meeting.

When I directly contacted two of the three new Board members in response to this felt abuse, to discuss any issues they evidently had with me, they both refused. One said he “avoids conflict” because “life is too short”; the other said, “I have decided to decline [the invitation to meet with me] at this time in order to maintain my unbiased objectivity on issues before the Board.”

In the first instance, that new Board member openly expressed his censure of me for my “mistake”, thereby initiating the conflict with me, then refused to discuss it! The other cast judgment on me in the Board meeting, obviously *not* “unbiased” at all and quick to judge, without *any* discussion with me. “Don’t bother me with any discussion/the facts; my

(“unbiased” – what?!) mind is made up!” is the apparent paraphrase. Or did I miss/misunderstand something?

The third new Board member astoundingly suggested I needed somehow to apologize to Colette Squires. For what?:

- her having read an e-mail whose opening content was:
Subject: PERSONAL & CONFIDENTIAL
Hi Es!

Call me at any point this afternoon, please, to discuss this!

Thanks.

Love, Wayne

- Instead, immediately upon receipt of this DRAFT (inadvertently sent by me to Colette Squires), meant only for discussion with Esther, Colette Squires immediately forwarded it to all Board members, and to Lesley Harder. Then neither she nor did any Board member, when directly asked November 25, 2013, tell me that he/she had deleted the PERSONAL & CONFIDENTIAL letter meant only for Esther. I had made the request of Colette Squires and the Board members to delete such correspondence within minutes of their having received it – and before, I venture to guess, any Board member had read it! Persons with integrity would have complied with such a request (not to mention that professional associations mandate such integrity).

Instead of demonstration of such integrity, at the November 25, 2013 Board meeting, Colette Squires launched what felt to me like an intense verbal attack against me based upon retention of that e-mail, and subsequently used it as basis for a WorkSafeBC action against me. Not one Board member challenged Colette Squires for her use of the e-mail and letter to attack me. All Board members by their silence apparently approved of Colette Squires’ strong verbal attack. One immediately at the end said that I needed first and foremost to apologize to Colette Squires! This theme was reiterated by other Board members that night as well, and later in private by Darrel Schultz.

I indicated November 25, 2013 regret that an inadvertent e-mail and letter had been sent to Colette Squires. I cannot take responsibility for Colette Squires’ decision:

- To have read a PRIVATE & CONFIDENTIAL e-mail and letter clearly intended for my wife’s eyes only;
- To have forwarded PRIVATE & CONFIDENTIAL correspondence immediately to the Board;
- To have not deleted that PRIVATE & CONFIDENTIAL correspondence when immediately requested by me;
- To have used that PRIVATE & CONFIDENTIAL correspondence for a verbal attack against me November 25, 2013 in front of the entire Board and some Staff;
- To have used that PRIVATE & CONFIDENTIAL correspondence as partial basis for her WorkSafeBC action against me;

- To have developed and demonstrated intense emotional antagonism towards me due to that PRIVATE & CONFIDENTIAL correspondence.

Not once since has any Board member, or the Board collectively, sat down to discuss the “inadvertence” with me. This eventuated instead in WorkSafeBC action against me by Colette Squires, apparently fully supported by the Board. This was the direct inversion of the scriptural injunction: “*Love... believes all things* (I Corinthians 13:7).” You, Barry, and the Board chose nefariously to follow the inverse of that injunction: by *only listening* to Colette Squires.

So: a deliberate series of wrongful acts was committed against me by Colette Squires:

- By *immediately* (without checking with me about possible inadvertent receipt) reading PERSONAL & CONFIDENTIAL correspondence intended for another, Esther Northey so clearly indicated;
- By retaining a copy of this PERSONAL & CONFIDENTIAL correspondence against my *express request* to Colette Squires that it be deleted;
- By Colette Squires’ forwarding immediately this to others, though in the body of the DRAFT letter to Colette it stated PERSONAL & CONFIDENTIAL, quite apart from the Subject of the e-mail that read PERSONAL & CONFIDENTIAL. (All professional societies strictly censure anyone’s reading someone else’s correspondence when marked (twice!): PERSONAL & CONFIDENTIAL, *even if inadvertently received.*)

A further series of wrongful acts was committed against me by the then four Board members:

- By reading e-mail addressed to Esther Northey, with twice the indication, PERSONAL & CONFIDENTIAL;
- By refusing to delete such PERSONAL & CONFIDENTIAL e-mail correspondence intended for my wife;
- By using it as basis for supporting Colette Squires’ WorkSafeBC action against me;
- By using it as basis for a Board letter of reprimand addressed to me 19 Dec 2013;
- By reprimanding me to my face (Darrel Schultz’ action) for my response to Colette Squires’ verbal attack against me, in which I stated that the series of wrongs by Colette Squires concerning her response to my PRIVATE & CONFIDENTIAL correspondence to Esther, was a concern. According to Schultz, I had committed a wrong in the first place against Colette Squires that apparently gave her license to wrong me in return. This kind of curious justice theory has a name: “Two Wrongs Make a Right”, and constitutes adherence to strict “tit for tat” retributive justice.

The irony is this: I spoke the truth as I saw it in the letter Colette Squires inadvertently received, refused to delete or acknowledge her ethical duty to have done so, and eventually used in personal attacks against me. However, I had not intended that this letter:

- Be ever *sent* to Colette Squires;
- In that form and wording be shared with Colette Squires;
- Be shared with all the points that were concerns to me about Colette Squires’ performance. (I would have given the intended constructive performance review feedback over a longer period of time.)

As is my norm, I had intended that the letter:

- Be reviewed by Esther to help make appropriate changes, and to assist in nuancing the language;
- Be written out in advance, so that I can assure that the wording is ultimately succinct, respectful, and firm.
- Be read (after appropriate revisions) to Colette Squires face-to-face, with her (and others) holding a copy in her hand. *I have always worked thus with Staff.*

For Colette Squires to have read, to have forwarded, and to have refused to delete such correspondence is, in my view, ethical lapse. That she has turned this instead against me, and that you, Barry, and the Board, seemingly have believed her, *without having done your own investigation*, is to me reprehensible.

The three new Board members were appointed November 25, 2013, against my explicit objections. The strongest generic reason was: introducing new Board members at a time of sharp conflict (one of them beforehand having directly refused to even discuss it with me) with no background would lead to distorted perceptions. The other generic objection: there needed to be discussion with each prospective Board member about the Board Policy Manual, and willingness to abide by its terms. I was severely judged by the new Board members (see immediately below) that night, knowing I was damned if I did, damned if I did not respond to Colette Squires' unwarranted accusations. It is no surprise that one of the new Board members had already (undiscussed with me – he had refused) “objections” to the Board Policy Manual. The other two showed their disregard by immediately participating in an in-camera meeting December 18, 2013 utterly in violation of said Manual.

You, Barry, had made a clear promise to the M2/W2 membership on the night of the November 2013 AGM that there would be “close consultation” with the Executive Director about appointment of any new Board members. Despite my objections to those appointments expressed to you Barry, and to Darrel Schultz, and without any consultation initiated by you, Barry or by Darrel with me, those appointments were made November 25, 2013. Your AGM promise, Barry, proved as vacuous as your fatuous accolades of me in the AGM Report.

Finally, on December 18, 2013, against a signed Memorandum of Understanding dated November 29, 2012 between you, Barry and me, and against the Board Policy Manual, the Board blatantly violated the spirit and letter of said M.O.U. by holding an in-camera meeting about Colette Squires' specious claims against Esther Northey and me. Astoundingly, without *any* investigation through contacting Esther or me to hear our story concerning Colette Squires' false claims, you, Barry, and the Board fully accepted Colette Squires' version, and sent me a letter dated “19 Dec 2013” that outlined three “incidents” of concern with commentary. The commentary appeared to me to be one-sided judgmentalism of Esther and me.

There is a longstanding Western Criminal Law principle of presumption of innocence. My experience from this Board's handling of Colette Squires' false claims against me was presumption of Esther's and my guilt without even pretence to check out our story. *This is execrable.*

Colette Squires and the Board by your attacks have consequently made being in the presence of Colette Squires or any Board member *unsafe and dangerous* for me. Despite a promise made by Darrel Schultz to me prior to the November 25, 2013 Board meeting to prevent harassment, I was once again verbally harassed by Colette Squires *in a totally inappropriate forum* that the Board Chairpersons, and other Board members by their silence, then judgmental comments, gave full assent to. This is unfathomable to me! In Restorative Justice circles, such a “non-forum” would be terminated immediately, and be seen as a standards violation, and worthy of professional reprimand.

In light of this:

- I have been advised to discuss nothing with Board or Staff until my official retirement date, March 31, 2014. The only exception is if my lawyer is party to such exchange.
- I have been advised to not enter the M2/W2 office premises if any member of the Board or Colette Squires is in the office. I have been instructed to leave the office premises immediately should any member of the Board or Colette Squires enter the office.
- I therefore will only do my work from home unless my safety from bullying and harassment is assured according to bullet two.

There is a passage that goes: “*They sow the wind and reap the whirlwind.*” (Hosea 8:7, *The Voice*) I would encourage reading the whole chapter, with the warning: *Let the reader beware.*

For three and a half years under your leadership, Barry, I have felt at best generally threatened and demeaned by you in front of others, and by numerous harmful actions against me by the Board under your leadership. I have never felt supported by you; instead invariably the contrary. When you most recently wrote for the AGM Report, it was clear that you were writing not to me (never had you affirmed me in person) but for the “crowd”: agency membership. This scripture immediately came to mind: “*A person who offers constructive criticism will, in the end, be appreciated more than a person who engages in empty flattery* (Proverbs 28:23, *The Voice*).” My experience of you has been of one who has only offered and delivered *destructive* criticism, and otherwise *empty flattery*. This latter in the AGM Report felt to me to be as specious and deceitful as your promise, again to the “crowd” at the AGM, that the Executive Director would be “fully consulted” in the appointment of new Board members.

[section deleted]

I have often felt over the years that under your leadership, Barry, there has been a game played at M2/W2 called “*Get Wayne!*” Initially under your leadership, I did not know there was even such a game played, one in which I have observed only one (collective) rule: *Harm Wayne*. The masquerade rule appears to be *The Good of The Ministry*. I for one refuse to play any game, rather I remain committed to authenticity and integrity, compassion, mercy, restorative justice, and neighbour/enemy love – which are part of the biblical *Perfect Law of Liberty*.

So where does one go from here? As said: I do not believe the Board or Colette Squires are destined to remain locked in to what to me has felt like your harmful ways towards me, that from you, Barry, I have experienced for the past three and a half years. But for the time being, this is where I go:

- I commit to continue to faithfully serve this agency until my official retirement, March 31, 2014;
- I commit to the people for whom this ministry is about. Under your leadership, Barry, you and the Board have repeatedly and seriously compromised my – and Staff’s – ability to perform this God-mandated ministry, due to your actions that have forced me – and Staff – to participate to varying degrees in sustained rearguard action to protect ourselves from the most consistent, greatest danger there has been to this ministry in the past three and a half years: you, and the Board to which you give leadership. The inordinate multiple hours of Staff discussions; the financial expense I personally incurred to seek professional defence against your and the Board’s routine attacks throughout 2012, and renewed attacks in late 2013 to now; etc. are highly concerning.
- Over the three and a half years of your seeming “Get Wayne Northey!” siege, I have observed the impact upon Staff, besides me. It is their choice whether they will describe to you in detail and to your Board, the emotional harm, the disempowerment, the disincentive to continue working in this agency, the severe demotivation to work under such a Board and Board Chair, etc. Their choice.
The workplace has become unsafe for me due to Colette Squires’ presence. The Board has also become unsafe for me at the individual and collective level.

Consequently, I put on record: Given the damaging mischief of Colette Squires’ recent false claims against Esther Northey and against me; given her previous refusal to be held accountable for having made false claims about my relationship to Staff, two of whom were specifically named – Bernie Martens and Luminita Dudas; and given my general observation that Colette Squires is not a “team player” (on the contrary) so needed in this agency, indeed so the core ethos of this ministry, I oppose the hiring/appointment of Colette Squires as Executive Director.

- I put on record further: I request that the current Board do some serious internal soul-searching of its antagonism and judgmentalism towards me, most recent instance of which is its uninvestigated acceptance of Colette Squires’ claims about Esther Northey and about me.
- I put on record finally: I recommend that mediator Alan Simpson be re-engaged to *fully* mediate the multiple issues that obtain between Board and Staff, with a view, hope, and ultimate goal of full reconciliation. If not undertaken, I believe that our agency loses its ethical right and compass to continue to offer the services of this ministry.

I began with hope. I end with hope “that does not disappoint”.

I have been advised to send this to the Board. Again: *Let the reader beware.*

Wayne Northey

Executive Director