

Email Templates

To the Minister of Labour:

To: [Minister's email]
Cc: [Your MLA + MLA office email] (optional)

Dear Minister [Last Name],

My name is [Your Full Name], a [your age]-year-old [your job title] living in [your city / community]. I am writing regarding the handling of my WorkSafeBC claim ([Claim Number]) and to respectfully request your office's oversight.

[IF you have already contacted your MLA – keep this paragraph]
[MLA [MLA Name], MLA for [Riding], has been assisting me since [month/year] and their office has already contacted WorkSafeBC on my behalf. Despite this, key issues remain unresolved and I appear to have reached an impasse within the existing process.]

[IF you have NOT contacted your MLA – you can use this paragraph instead, or delete it entirely]
[I understand that MLAs and the Minister cannot personally adjudicate individual claims, but I am concerned that the way my claim is being handled may indicate a breakdown in the normal oversight and accountability processes.]

I have attached a short briefing note that summarizes:

- The timeline of my injury and claim
- The decisions made so far
- New medical or factual evidence that has not been fully addressed
- Specific questions that remain unanswered by WorkSafeBC

In particular, my main concerns are:

- [Example: Termination of wage-loss benefits despite ongoing medical restrictions]
- [Example: Medical evidence from my treating providers has not been addressed in decisions]
- [Example: Delays or refusals to approve reasonable diagnostic tests (such as an MRI)]
- [Example: Lack of clear written reasons answering key questions I have raised]

I am not asking you to decide my claim. Rather, I am asking for your help to ensure that:

- New and relevant evidence is properly considered
- My questions receive clear, written answers
- The processes set out in the Workers Compensation Act and WorkSafeBC policy are properly followed in my case

If it would assist your office, I can provide copies of:

- Key medical reports (for example, specialist reports, GP forms, diagnostic requisitions)
- Correspondence with WorkSafeBC and/or the Review Division
- Any prior decisions or reasons I have received

I would also appreciate the opportunity to brief a member of your staff by phone or video conference at your convenience.

My specific requests are:

1. [Example: A written confirmation from WorkSafeBC of the current status of my claim and any planned reassessment or review.]

2. [Example: A written response to the unanswered questions listed in my briefing note, including how new medical evidence has been considered.]
3. [Optional: Example: If appropriate, a management-level review to determine whether the handling of my claim has been consistent with legislation, policy, and basic fairness.]

I know your time is extremely limited, and I am grateful for any attention you or your staff are able to give this. If you would like any additional information or documentation, I can provide it within [24–48] hours.

Thank you for your time and for your service to injured workers in British Columbia.

Sincerely,
[Your Full Name]
[Your phone number]
[Your email address]
[Optional: Your home city / riding]

To your MLA:

Subject: WorkSafeBC claim [Claim Number] – request for assistance and oversight

Dear [MLA Name],

My name is [Your Full Name]. I live in [your neighbourhood / city] in the riding of [Riding Name]. I am writing to ask for your help and oversight regarding the handling of my WorkSafeBC claim ([Claim Number]).

On [date of injury], I was injured while working as a [job title, e.g., “warehouse worker,” “care aide,” “concrete cutter”]. Since then, I have been dealing with WorkSafeBC about [very short summary: e.g., wage-loss benefits, medical treatment, return to work].

At this point, I am struggling with the following issues:

- [Example: My wage-loss benefits were stopped even though my doctor still has me on restrictions.]
- [Example: Medical reports from my doctor/physiotherapist do not appear to have been properly considered or explained in the decision.]
- [Example: My employer has not cooperated with return-to-work or modified duties, and I am not sure what is being done about it.]
- [Example: I have asked clear questions in writing but received no real answers, only repeated form letters.]

I understand that you cannot personally decide my claim, and I am not asking you to override WorkSafeBC. I am asking for your help to:

- Make sure my concerns and evidence are being taken seriously, and
- Ensure that WorkSafeBC is following its own rules and obligations in my case.

If your office is able to assist, I would be grateful if you could:

1. Review a short summary of my situation and the key decisions so far; and

2. Ask WorkSafeBC, through the appropriate channels, to provide clear, written answers to the main questions I have raised.

I can provide:

- Copies of recent decision letters from WorkSafeBC
- Key medical reports (for example, my doctor's current restrictions)
- A short timeline of what has happened so far

If someone from your office could speak with me by phone or email, I would appreciate the chance to explain my situation in a bit more detail.

Thank you for taking the time to read this and for the work you do on behalf of people in our community.

Sincerely,

[Your Full Name]

[Your phone number]

[Your email address]

[Optional: Your home address or at least city/postal code so they can confirm you're in the riding]

Email to the Entire Legislature

Subject: Formal report to all Members – systemic concerns regarding [Agency Name]

Dear Honourable Members,

I am writing to you as a citizen providing a formal report on what I believe to be an operational failure of [Agency Name]. My case (File/Claim #[File or Claim Number]) is offered as a case study in how legislation, policy, and principles of administrative justice can be undermined in practice.

The attached file contains [brief description: e.g., “a complete email thread between myself, my elected representative’s office, and [Agency Name]” / “a summary of decisions and correspondence to date”]. It serves as real-time, documented evidence of the systemic issues outlined below.

1. [Heading for Issue Area #1 – e.g., “Evidence Handling and Decision-Making”]

- [Bullet 1 – short, factual description of what happened in this theme]
- [Bullet 2 – another key fact or pattern]
- [Bullet 3 – how this behaviour conflicts with law/policy/fairness, in your view]

2. [Heading for Issue Area #2 – e.g., “Procedural Fairness and Process”]

- [Bullet 1 – arbitrary/contradictory decisions, lack of investigation, etc.]
- [Bullet 2 – failures to follow their own procedures or timelines]
- [Bullet 3 – examples of non-answers or ignored questions]

3. [Heading for Issue Area #3 – e.g., “Oversight and Transparency”]

- [Bullet 1 – inaccurate or incomplete information given to an elected office, if applicable]
- [Bullet 2 – how advocacy through an MLA/MP/etc. was neutralized or redirected into a “void”]
- [Bullet 3 – problems with access to records, FOI, internal notes, or audit logs, if relevant]

The Implications for All [Residents/Workers/Constituents] & for This Legislature

If [Agency Name] can:

- [Short line summarizing Issue Area #1 – e.g., “Disregard or minimize treating/primary evidence”],
- [Short line summarizing Issue Area #2 – e.g., “Make contradictory decisions without investigation or explanation”],
- [Short line summarizing Issue Area #3 – e.g., “Provide inaccurate or non-responsive information to elected offices”],
- [Optional extra line – e.g., “Restrict oversight using internal ‘scope’ rules that it controls itself”],

then no [worker/constituent] is secure, and the mechanisms of democratic accountability are weakened.

This is not a dispute over [single outcome or diagnosis].

It is a demonstration that the system’s checks and balances are failing in practice.

The attached material is not just my story; it is a preview of what any Member may encounter when attempting to oversee this agency on behalf of their constituents.

I am available to provide any further documentation that may assist. My complete file is available to any Member who wishes to verify this report.

Respectfully,

[Your Full Name]
 [City / Community]
 File/Claim #[File or Claim Number]
 [Phone Number]
 [Email Address]

Email to the Speaker

Subject: For the Speaker’s attention – concerns regarding oversight and [Agency Name]

Dear Honourable Speaker [Last Name],

I am writing to you in your capacity as Speaker of the [Name of Legislature], to report issues I have encountered in how [Agency Name] interacts with Members’ offices and, by extension, with the Legislature’s oversight function.

My case (File/Claim #[File or Claim Number]) is offered as a case study in systemic patterns, not as a request for adjudication of my individual matter.

1. [Heading #1 – e.g., “Information Provided to Members”]

- [Brief factual example of incomplete or incorrect information given to an MLA/MP office]

- [Explanation that the Member relied on this information to decide how to proceed]
- [Short line on how this undermines their ability to scrutinize the agency]

2. [Heading #2 – e.g., “Neutralization of Oversight Efforts”]

- [Example of specific, substantive questions raised through a Member’s office]
- [Description of generic, non-responsive, or “out of scope” replies from the agency]
- [Short line on how this channels oversight into narrow, agency-controlled pathways]

3. [Heading #3 – e.g., “Implications for the Legislature”]

- [Short statement about how these practices affect all Members’ ability to assist constituents]
- [Short statement about risk to the Legislature’s scrutiny and accountability role]
- [Optional: link to any particular committee/mandate if you know it, or leave general]

Taken together, these patterns suggest that [Agency Name] can, in practice:

- Provide incomplete or inaccurate information to Members’ offices;
- Limit or avoid meaningful responses to oversight questions; and
- Shape the scope of Member involvement through internal rules that it controls.

This raises concerns not only for my own situation, but for the institution’s ability to hold public bodies to account.

I respectfully request that your office:

- Consider whether the issues described here may warrant attention through any appropriate parliamentary mechanism (such as referral to a committee or other process you deem suitable); and
- Consider ways to ensure that Members are able to obtain accurate, complete information from [Agency Name] when carrying out their representative and oversight duties.

I have attached a short summary and relevant correspondence between myself, my representative’s office, and [Agency Name]. I am willing to provide my complete file and any additional documentation that may assist.

Thank you for your consideration and for your role in safeguarding the integrity of the Legislature.

Respectfully,

[Your Full Name]
[City / Community]
File/Claim #[File or Claim Number]
[Phone Number]
[Email Address]

Email to the Premier:

Subject: Request for attention – systemic concerns regarding [Agency Name] and oversight

Dear Premier [Last Name],

My name is [Your Full Name], and I live in [City / Community]. I am writing to bring to your attention systemic concerns about how [Agency Name] is operating and how it responds to oversight from elected representatives.

I am not asking you to decide my individual file. I am asking you, as head of government, to ensure that public bodies under your government's responsibility are acting lawfully, fairly, and in line with your stated commitments to [e.g., fairness, accountability, worker protection, etc.].

Using my case (File/Claim # [File or Claim Number]) as an example, I have observed three main areas of concern:

1. [Heading #1 – e.g., “Evidence and Decision-Making”]

- [Brief description of how decisions appear inconsistent with treating/primary evidence]
- [Example of internal opinions being preferred without clear reasoning]
- [Note that requests for explanation produced generic or incomplete responses]

2. [Heading #2 – e.g., “Procedural Fairness and Duties”]

- [Example of contradictory decisions, unclear processes, missed timelines, etc.]
- [Description of how duties owed by other parties (e.g., employers, service providers) do not seem to be enforced]
- [Short line on limited opportunity to respond to new information or errors]

3. [Heading #3 – e.g., “Oversight and Communication with Elected Offices”]

- [Example of incomplete or inaccurate information being given to a representative’s office]
- [Example of substantive questions being labelled “out of scope” or answered in a non-responsive way]
- [Short line about how this neutralizes the representative’s ability to assist and to scrutinize]

If [Agency Name] can:

- Minimize or ignore treating/primary evidence,
- Make contradictory or poorly explained decisions,
- Fail to enforce duties owed under its governing framework, and
- Provide non-responsive or inaccurate information to Members’ offices without effective correction,

then both individual citizens and the broader system of democratic accountability are at risk.

My requests to your office are:

1. That you ensure the responsible Minister and ministry are made aware of these documented concerns and review them;
2. That you seek assurances that [Agency Name] will:
 - Improve how it handles evidence, explains decisions, and enforces duties; and
 - Review how it communicates with Members’ offices and responds to oversight questions; and
3. That you consider whether any broader review, directive, or other response is needed to align [Agency Name]’s practices with your government’s commitments.

I have attached a short summary and key correspondence (including communications with my representative's office and [Agency Name]). I am prepared to provide my complete file and any further documentation your staff may require.

Thank you for your time and for your service to [Jurisdiction].

Respectfully,

[Your Full Name]
[City / Community]
File/Claim #[File or Claim Number]
[Phone Number]
[Email Address]

Strategy & Pressure Points: **How to Push Back When the System Goes Sideways**

This page is all about **leverage**.

- What are your **rights**?
- What are **their duties**?
- And where, exactly, can you press when they're not doing what they're supposed to?

Think of this as a **playbook** for pushing back on WorkSafeBC, employers, and even MLAs — without having to be a lawyer.

How to Use This Page

You don't need to use all of this at once.

A simple way to work with it:

1. Scroll through the pressure points.
2. Ask yourself: "**Where has this happened to me?**"
3. Copy the phrases that match your situation.
4. Paste them into your emails to:
 - WorkSafeBC
 - Your employer
 - Your MLA

- The Minister of Labour's office
- The Speaker
- The Legislature
- The Premiers Office

This isn't legal advice and it won't magically fix a broken system.

But it will help you:

- Speak the language of **duties** and **oversight**
- Hit the spots where institutions are **actually vulnerable**
- Document their responses (or non-responses) in a way you can use later

If you're building a record, this is how you make it **sharp**.

1. Know Who Owes You What

Before you push, you need to know **who has duties** in your situation.

WorkSafeBC's basic duties

WorkSafeBC must:

- **Gather and weigh evidence**, not just pick what's convenient
- **Explain decisions** in a way that makes sense
- **Apply the law and policy fairly**
- **Keep accurate records** and not misrepresent basic facts

They don't have to agree with you.

But they **do** have to:

- Look at the whole picture
- Deal with conflicting evidence
- Give reasons that actually match the evidence

Employers' basic duties (in workers' comp land)

Employers must:

- **Report injuries** and cooperate with WorkSafeBC
- **Work with you and WorkSafeBC on return-to-work**
- **Not punish you** for reporting an injury, asking for safety, or filing a claim (that's retaliation / "prohibited action")

MLAs & the Legislature

MLAs aren't just there to fix potholes and send birthday letters.

They have three big roles:

1. **Make laws**
2. **Represent constituents**
3. **Exercise oversight** over ministries and agencies (like WorkSafeBC)

That oversight role means they **can ask questions** when something looks off. "Oversight" is not "interfering in a claim." It's their job.

2. Pressure Point #1 – Evidence & Reasons

What this pressure point is

Anytime WorkSafeBC:

- Ignores your doctor or physio
- Leans only on a "Board doctor" you've never met
- Declares your injury "resolved" while your reports say otherwise
- Refuses to explain **why** they believed one piece of evidence and ignored another

...you've hit a **fairness pressure point**.

What you're entitled to (in plain language)

You're entitled to:

- Have **relevant evidence considered**
- Know **what evidence** they relied on
- Know **why** they preferred one opinion over another

You're *not* guaranteed they'll agree with your doctor.

You are entitled to a **real explanation**.

Phrases you can use

You can ask, in writing:

- “What evidence did you rely on to decide that my condition is resolved?”
- “How did you resolve the difference between your medical advisor’s opinion and my treating doctor’s opinion?”
- “Can you please list the medical reports you considered, and explain the weight you gave to each?”

If they just reply, “We’ve *already sent you our decision letter*,” that’s not an answer. That becomes something you can:

- Use in a Review or WCAT appeal
- Show an MLA / Minister as an **example of non-responsive decision-making**

3. Pressure Point #2 – Return-to-Work & Employer Cooperation

What this pressure point is

You’re injured. You want (or need) to go back to work. Instead, you get:

- An employer ignoring your restrictions
- No modified duties offered
- Hostility or subtle punishment for being injured
- WorkSafeBC doing nothing while your RTW falls apart

That's not just "unfortunate." There are **duties** here.

What you can expect (in principle)

In general:

- Employers are expected to **cooperate** in returning you to work
- WorkSafeBC is supposed to **step in** when an employer clearly isn't playing ball
- A RTW plan isn't just "show up when you're better" — it should actually **match your medical restrictions**

Phrases you can use

When pushing WorkSafeBC:

- "What specific steps have been taken to work with my employer on a return-to-work plan?"
- "Has my employer been reminded of their duty to cooperate in returning me to work?"
- "Can I see the documented return-to-work plan you've agreed on with my employer?"

When pushing your MLA or Minister:

- "I am asking what oversight exists when an employer refuses to cooperate with return-to-work, and WorkSafeBC takes no meaningful action."

You're not asking them to declare you disabled.

You're asking, "*Who is enforcing the rules you say exist?*"

That's the pressure point.

4. Pressure Point #3 – Retaliation / Prohibited Action

What this pressure point is

Examples:

- You report an injury, and suddenly your hours are cut.
- You complain about safety, then your job disappears.

- You file a claim, and your boss starts icing you out or threatening you.

That's not just "workplace drama."

Workers' comp systems have specific rules against **retaliation** (often called "prohibited action").

What should happen

If you say, "I think I'm being punished for using my health and safety rights or filing a claim," WorkSafeBC should:

- Treat that as a **prohibited action complaint** (or tell you how to file one)
- Give you a **complaint number**
- Investigate or route it properly, not just ignore it

Phrases you can use

To WorkSafeBC:

- "I believe I am experiencing retaliation related to my injury/claim. Has this been logged as a prohibited action complaint? If so, what is the complaint number?"
- "If it has not been logged, please confirm how I can file a prohibited action complaint and whether your office will do so based on the information I've already provided."

To your MLA:

- "I am asking you to ensure WorkSafeBC is treating my situation as a possible prohibited action, not just a private workplace dispute."

If WorkSafeBC insists **nothing has been logged**, even after you've raised it, that's now a **documented oversight failure** you can use later.

5. Pressure Point #4 – "Your Records Are Wrong"

What this pressure point is

You hear lines like:

- "Our records show you haven't contacted [office]."
- "Our records don't show that you raised that complaint."

- “There is no record of that email / call.”

But you **have**:

- Screenshots
- Emails
- Voicemails
- Call logs

That's a pressure point.

Why it matters

If they can rewrite history on small things (“you didn’t call”), they can do it on bigger things too.

Correcting the record isn’t just petty — it’s about:

- Re-establishing **what actually happened**
- Showing a pattern if similar “errors” keep happening
- Giving MLAs and Ministers solid proof that something is off

Phrases you can use

When you know their record is wrong:

“Your records appear to be incorrect. On [date], [office/person] contacted me / I contacted them. Attached is [Screenshot/voicemail/email] showing this.

Please:

1. Confirm that your records will be corrected; and
2. Explain how this discrepancy occurred.”

If the wrong info was passed to an MLA:

“Providing inaccurate information to an MLA’s office undermines their ability to oversee WorkSafeBC. I am asking you to correct the record in writing and confirm that the MLA has been updated.”

Now it's not just "fix my file."
It's "**you misled a legislator; fix it.**"
Very different level of pressure.

6. Pressure Point #5 – “We Don’t Do Oversight”

What this pressure point is

You contact an MLA or another office and hear:

- “We can’t interfere with WorkSafeBC.”
- “We don’t get involved in those cases.”
- “That’s another MLA’s casework, we can’t touch it.”

It sounds reasonable on the surface.

Underneath, it can be a way to **duck their oversight role.**

The distinction that matters

There are two very different things:

1. **Casework** – helping *you* get forms, phone calls, explanations.
2. **Oversight** – asking whether **WorkSafeBC itself** is acting lawfully, honestly, and fairly.

You might not be asking, “Fix my claim.”

You might be saying, “Look at how this agency behaves. Is this okay?”

That second one is **squarely in oversight territory.**

Phrases you can use

To an MLA or Minister’s office:

- “I am not asking you to personally adjudicate my claim. I am reporting behaviour by WorkSafeBC that appears systemic (e.g., non-answers, inaccurate information, refusal to address evidence).”
- “This is not only a constituency service issue; it is an oversight issue. I am asking whether you will exercise your oversight role over a provincial agency.”

If they still say, “We can’t interfere”:

- “So that I understand clearly: is it your office’s position that reports of possible systemic misconduct or misleading information from WorkSafeBC fall outside your oversight role? I would like to record your position accurately.”

You’re not being rude.

You’re putting them **on record** about what they think their job is.

That alone creates pressure.

7. Pressure Point #6 – Broken Promises & “Legitimate Expectations”

What this pressure point is

You’re told things like:

- “We’ve requested a full reassessment of your case.”
- “We’ll follow up with WorkSafeBC and get back to you.”
- “We’re escalating this.”

Then: silence.

Or: “It was out of scope, so we dropped it,” with no explanation.

Why it matters

When an office promises a specific procedural step:

- You now have a **reasonable expectation** that they will either:
 - Do it; or
 - Honestly explain why they changed course.

If they just ghost you or quietly abandon it, that’s:

- A fairness issue
- A credibility issue
- And another pressure point

Phrases you can use

When an MLA, WorkSafeBC, or another office promised something:

"On [date], your office wrote that [quote the promise: e.g., 'we have requested a full reassessment of your case'].

That created a clear expectation that this process would go ahead.

Could you please:

- Confirm whether this action was completed;
- If not, explain when and why the decision was changed; and
- Indicate whether the action will be resubmitted, escalated, or formally withdrawn?"

You're not shouting.

You're asking for **accountability for their own words**.

8. Advanced Move – Turning Your Case Into a “Systemic Alert”

This is optional, for workers who want to go beyond their own file.

The idea

Instead of:

"Help me, my claim is unfair,"

you can frame it as:

"Here is a documented case study showing breaches in:

- evidence handling
- fairness
- record-keeping
- honesty with MLAs

If this is happening to me, it can happen in any riding."

You can:

- Write to **all MLAs** or a specific committee, framing it as a **formal report**, not just a complaint.
- Offer **documentation** (claim file, email chains, call logs).
- Spell out the **implications for workers and for legislative oversight**.

You're moving your story from **private pain to public risk**.