

ACTION4 CANADA

Protecting Faith, Family and Freedom

Notice of Liability: Medical Treatments/Procedures/Devices Post-Secondary Educational Institution



<https://action4canada.com/wp-content/uploads/liability-notice-post-secondary.pdf>

How to Serve the Notice of Liability

- Print two copies of the Notice of Liability.
- Fill in the name of the person being served in the space provided at the top of the first page - on both copies.
- Sign your name and fill in the date in the space provided on the last page - on both copies.
- Keep one copy of the Notice for your records.
- Give the second copy to the person you are serving it to. If they choose not to accept it, then leave it on the floor at their feet.
- If you are serving the Notice in person, be sure to video record yourself serving it (or audio record if video is not possible).
- **If sending by mail, you must use registered mail as that provides proof of delivery.**

Keep all information (eg. Liability Notice copy, video, mailing proof etc.) in a safe place for future use.

NOTE: You do not need a lawyer to serve a Notice of Liability and you do not need consent, or the signature of the person you are serving it to.

Disclaimer: Action4Canada accepts no responsibility or liability for any harms or losses that occur as result of serving a notice of liability. If you do not agree to these terms, then please do not use this notice. We do not make any representations or warranties about the potential consequences of serving a Notice of Liability. This information is not intended as legal or health advice.

Notice of Liability: Medical Treatments/Procedures/Devices Post-Secondary Educational Institutions

To: Heads of Trade Schools/Art Schools/Universities/Colleges, including Presidents, Executives, Directors, Deans, Instructors, Professors, Superintendents, Administrators, Student Unions/Councils, and anyone else involved in Post-Secondary Educational Institutions, Universities, Trade Schools, Colleges, and the like.

Attn: _____

Re: Mandated medical treatments, including COVID-19 injections, masks and tests, administered to students

This is an official and personal Notice of Liability.

You are unlawfully practicing medicine by prescribing, recommending, facilitating, advertising, mandating, incentivising, coercing, extorting or intimidating students, including minors to submit to ANY vaccine, including the experimental gene therapy injections for COVID-19 commonly referred to as a “vaccine” and any updated version of them, and/or any other medical device (eg. masks), testing or treatment.

Young adults/students have been exposed to unprecedented amounts of fear, instability, shaming, psychological trauma, bullying, and segregation through the COVID-19 measures and are therefore, even more susceptible to being influenced by those in authority than their developmental stage would usually permit. Educational institutions are providing students with information on the COVID-19 “vaccine”, which is politically and medically biased, putting students at great risk of harm¹.

Vaccination is voluntary in Canada². According to the Public Health Agency of Canada, Canadian National Report on Immunization, 1996:

“Vaccines are not mandatory in Canada; and they cannot be made mandatory because of the Canadian Constitution.”

If the Federal Government had invoked the **Federal Emergencies Act for COVID-19**, which it has not, even that Emergencies Act states:

AND WHEREAS the Governor in Council, in taking such special temporary measures, would be subject to the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms and the Canadian Bill of Rights and must have regard to the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, particularly with respect to those **fundamental rights that are not to be limited or abridged even in a national emergency.**

There are no provisions in any orders of any health minister, doctor, or provincial legislation, that can, nor pretend that any measures can, override Charter or other pre-Charter constitutional rights. All Statutes, Orders, By-laws, and Acts must be consistent with the Constitution...or they are of no force or effect.

Section 52(1) of **the Constitution Act**, 1982: The Constitution of Canada is the supreme law of Canada, and any law that is inconsistent with the provisions of the Constitution is, to the extent of the inconsistency, **of no force or effect.**

Under Section 7 of The Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms:

“Everyone has the right to **life, liberty, and security** of the person and the right not to be deprived thereof except in accordance with the principles of fundamental justice.”

Privacy: The Supreme Court of Canada has emphasized in many cases³, in the strongest possible terms, that a **citizen’s right to privacy** is sacrosanct and subsumed in both s. 7 and 8 of the Charter and is of paramount importance to life, liberty, and security of the person, and protects citizens from unreasonable search and seizure. Therefore, any request for personal information (medical or otherwise) to comply with government schemes such as digital id, vaccine status or vaccine passports, is an egregious violation of privacy, and any travel restrictions are in violation of Section 6 (mobility) of the Charter of Rights.

¹ <https://kidsboostimmunity.com/teacher-centre/lesson-plans>

² https://web.archive.org/web/20080414131846/http://www.phac-aspc.gc.ca/publicat/ccdr-rmtc/97vol23/23s4/23s4b_e.html

³ <https://action4canada.com/wp-content/uploads/constitutionally-protected-privacy-rights.pdf>

Whereas

The emergency measures were based on the claim that we were experiencing a "public health emergency" despite there being no evidence to substantiate this claim. In fact, the emerging evidence continues to indicate that we are experiencing a rate of infection consistent with normal influenza seasons⁴.

The purported increase in "cases" was a direct consequence of increased testing through the inappropriate use of the PCR instrument to diagnose so-called COVID-19. It has been well established that the PCR test was never designed or intended as a diagnostic tool and is not an acceptable instrument to measure the so-called pandemic. Its inventor, Kary Mullis, clearly indicated that the PCR testing device was never created to test for coronaviruses⁵. Mullis warned that, "the PCR Test can be used to find almost anything, in anybody. If you can amplify one single molecule, then you can find it because that molecule is nearly in every single person". An international consortium of life-science scientists also detected 10 major scientific flaws at the molecular and methodological level in a 3-peer review of the RTPCR test to detect SARS-CoV-2⁶.

Despite this warning, the PCR test utilization, purposely set at higher amplifications, was and still is producing up to 97% false positives⁷. Therefore, any imposed emergency measures that are based on PCR testing are unwarranted, unscientific, and quite possibly fraudulent.

In November 2020, a Portuguese court ruled that PCR tests are unreliable⁸. On December 14, 2020, the WHO admitted the PCR Test has a 'problem' at high amplifications as it detects dead cells from old viruses, giving a false positive⁹. Feb 16, 2021, BC Health Officer Bonnie Henry, admitted PCR tests are unreliable¹⁰. On April 8, 2021, the Austrian court ruled the PCR was unsuited for COVID testing¹¹. On April 8, 2021, a German Court ruled against PCR testing stating, "the test cannot provide any information on whether a person is infected with an active pathogen or not, because the test cannot distinguish between 'dead' matter and living matter"¹². On May 8, 2021, the Swedish Public Health Agency stopped PCR Testing for the same reason¹³. On May 10, 2021, Manitoba's Chief Microbiologist and Laboratory Specialist, Dr. Jared Bullard testified under cross-examination in a trial before the court of the Queen's Bench in Manitoba, that PCR test results do not verify infectiousness and were never intended to be used to diagnose respiratory illnesses¹⁴.

As a workaround, the government then implemented/mandated Rapid Antigen Testing, which is classed as a medical treatment. In Canada, a doctrine of informed consent regarding any medical treatment has become part of Canadian Federal law. According to Supreme Court rulings, no Canadian citizen is required to take any medical treatment without informed consent, which includes the right to refuse such treatment¹⁵. Therefore, no one has the right to force a medical treatment on anyone, as that would be in violation of their right to bodily autonomy, the Privacy Act, and the Criminal Code if extortion (s.346) or intimidation (s.423) are used. The tests also pose a health hazard to humans and pets, and have a negative impact on the environment¹⁶.

The doctrine of informed consent also applies to the experimental "vaccines". The Nuremberg Code¹⁷, to which Canada is a signatory, states that voluntary informed consent is essential before performing medical experiments on human beings. It also confirms that the person involved should have the legal capacity to give consent, without the intervention of any element of force, fraud, deceit, duress, overreaching, or other ulterior form of constraint or coercion; and should have sufficient knowledge and comprehension of the elements of the subject matter involved, to enable him/her to make an understanding and enlightened decision. This requires, before the acceptance of an affirmative decision by the experiment's subject, that there should be made known to him/her the nature, duration, and purpose of the experiment; the method and means by which it is to be conducted; all inconveniences and hazards reasonable to be expected; and the effects upon his/her health or person which may possibly come from participation in the experiment.

⁴ <https://www.bitchute.com/video/nQgg0BxXfZ4f>

⁵ <https://rumble.com/vhu4rz-kary-mullis-inventor-of-the-pcr-test.html>

⁶ <https://cormandrostenreview.com/report/>

⁷ <https://academic.oup.com/cid/advance-article/doi/10.1093/cid/ciaa1491/5912603>

⁸ <https://unitynewsnetwork.co.uk/portuguese-court-rules-pcr-tests-unreliable-quarantines-unlawful-media-blackout/>

⁹ <https://principia-scientific.com/who-finally-admits-covid19-pcr-test-has-a-problem/>

¹⁰ <https://rumble.com/vhww4d-bc-health-officer-admits-pcr-test-is-unreliable.html>

¹¹ <https://greatgameindia.com/austria-court-pcr-test/>

¹² <https://2020news.de/sensationsurteil-aus-weimar-keine-masken-kein-abstand-keine-tests-mehr-fuer-schueler/>

¹³ <https://tapnewswire.com/2021/05/sweden-stops-pcr-tests-as-covid19-diagnosis/>

¹⁴ <https://www.iccf.ca/Manitoba-chief-microbiologist-and-laboratory-specialist-56-of-positive-cases-are-not-infectious/>

¹⁵ https://bottomlineresearch.ca/pdf/informed_consent.pdf

¹⁶ <https://action4canada.com/wp-content/uploads/COVID-19-Rapid-Antigen-Tests.pdf>

¹⁷ https://media.tghn.org/medialibrary/2011/04/BMJ_No_7070_Volume_313_The_Nuremberg_Code.pdf

Further, no Canadian law, contrary to misinformation spread by the WHO, allows for “implied consent.” The Mature Minor doctrine cannot override the wishes and consent of the parents outside of the emergency threat of imminent harm or death. Vaccinations do not fall under the Mature Minor doctrine¹⁸.

The treatments marketed as COVID-19 “vaccines”, were in Phase III clinical trials until 2023¹⁹, and hence a medical experiment. People taking these treatments were enrolled as test-subjects, and many were unaware that the injections are not actual vaccines as they do not contain a virus but instead an experimental gene therapy.

Vaccine development is generally a long, complex process, often lasting 10-15 years²⁰. However, the COVID-19 injections were given to the public at the same time as the trial test subjects, hence there was no short or long-term safety data available and therefore fully informed consent was/is not possible.

Emergency Use Authorization of experimental vaccines can only occur if there are no existing safe and effective treatments available. However, treatments were available, such as ivermectin and hydroxychloroquine, but the government censored their efficacy and prohibited their use^{21 22}. The emergency authorization of the COVID-19 injections was political chicanery, it was the only way they could get such a highly dubious experimental injection “approved”.

It is of critical importance to note, that no other coronavirus vaccine (i.e., MERS, SARS-1) **has ever been approved for market** due to antibody-dependent enhancement, which resulted in severe illness and death in the animal models²³ they were tested on.

At the onset, numerous doctors, scientists, and medical experts issued dire warnings about the short and long-term effects of COVID-19 injections on both adults and children, including but not limited to: death; vaccine-associated enhanced respiratory disease; blood clots; infertility; miscarriages; Bell’s Palsy; cancer; inflammatory conditions; autoimmune disease; early-onset dementia; convulsions; anaphylaxis; inflammation of the heart²⁴; weakened immunity; and antibody-dependent enhancement leading to death. Time has proven those warnings to be accurate²⁵.

Dr. Byram Bridle, a pro-vaccine Associate Professor of Viral Immunology at the University of Guelph, gave a terrifying warning of the harms of the experimental treatments in a peer reviewed scientifically published research study²⁶ on COVID-19 shots. The spike proteins, induced by the “vaccine”, get into the blood and circulate throughout the body. They then accumulate in tissues such as the spleen, bone marrow, liver, adrenal glands, testes, and the ovaries. Dr. Bridle notes that they “have known for a long time that the spike protein is a pathogenic protein, it is a toxin, and can cause damage if it gets into blood circulation”. In April 2022, it was revealed through the Pfizer FOI data release that they were fully aware and monitoring nine pages worth of adverse events during the time period 1 December 2020 through 28 February 2021²⁷.

There is also a high concentration of the spike protein getting into breast milk, and subsequent reports of suckling infants developing bleeding disorders in the gastrointestinal tract. There are further warnings that this injection will render children infertile, and that people who have been vaccinated should NOT donate blood.

As reported to the Vaccine Adverse Events Reporting System (VAERS) in the United States, there were more deaths from the COVID-19 injections in the first five months of 2021 (Dec. 2020 – May 2021) than deaths recorded in the last 23 years from all vaccines combined²⁸. It is further reported that only one percent of vaccine injuries are reported to VAERS²⁹, and that is compounded by there being a several month’s delay in uploading the adverse events to the VAERS database.

¹⁸ <https://www.bitchute.com/video/W5qSPiv1onXt/>

¹⁹ <https://clinicaltrials.gov/ct2/show/NCT04368728?term=NCT04368728&draw=2&rank=1>

²⁰ <https://www.historyofvaccines.org/content/articles/vaccine-development-testing-and-regulation>

²¹ <https://www.washingtonexaminer.com/news/study-finds-84-fewer-hospitalizations-for-patients-treated-with-controversial-drug-hydroxychloroquine>

²² <https://aethonews.com/2021/05/26/five-recently-published-randomized-controlled-trials-confirm-major-statistically-significant-benefits-of-ivermectin-against-covid-19/>

²³ <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/21645515.2016.1177688>

²⁴ <https://www.nbcconnecticut.com/news/coronavirus/connecticut-confirms-at-least-18-cases-of-apparent-heart-problems-in-young-peopleafter-covid-19-vaccination/2494534/>

²⁵ <https://childrenshealthdefense.org/defender/cdc-errors-kids-covid-vaccine-injuries-vaers/>

²⁶ <https://podcasts.apple.com/ca/podcast/new-peer-reviewed-study-on-covid-19-vaccines-suggests/id1318830191?i=1000523346577>

²⁷ <https://phmp.org/wp-content/uploads/2021/11/5.3.6-postmarketing-experience.pdf>

²⁸ <https://vaccineimpact.com/2021/cdc-death-toll-following-experimental-covid-injections-now-at-4863-more-than-23-previous-years-of-recorded-vaccine-deaths-according-to-vaers/>

²⁹ https://www.lewrockwell.com/2019/10/no_author/harvard-medical-school-professors-uncover-a-hard-to-swallow-truth-about-vaccines/

On October 28th 2022, VAERS data release for the period December 2020 to October 21th 2022, showed **1,447,520 adverse event** reports following COVID-19 injections, including 31,696 deaths and 263,462 serious injuries. Of that total, 5,027 reports were of miscarriage or premature birth; 16,555 reported cases of Bell's Palsy; 43,699 reports of blood-clotting disorders; 10,100 reports of anaphylaxis; and 24,438 cases of myocarditis and pericarditis³⁰.

Canada's equivalent to VAERS, the Adverse Events Following Immunization (AEFI), is a passive reporting system that is not widely promoted to the public. It is extremely time-consuming for physicians to use and hence, many adverse events are going unreported there. The College of Physicians and health officials are also discouraging physicians from using this system by threatening revocation of their medical licence³¹.

Early on, Dr. McCullough, a highly cited internist, cardiologist, and epidemiologist, came to the shocking conclusion that the government was *"...scrubbing unprecedented numbers of injection-related-deaths"*. He further added, *"...with a typical new drug at about five deaths, unexplained deaths, we get a black-box warning, your listeners would see it on TV, saying it may cause death. And then at about 50 deaths it's pulled off the market"*³².

In 2021 it was already being reported that people under the age of 30 were at a very low risk of contracting or transmitting COVID-19. Risk of death for the age group 15-24 was 1 in 218,399 according to David Spiegelhalter of the University of Cambridge and Office of National Statistics (ONS) UK, referenced on Page 8 of "An Assessment of Covid-19"³³. Per the American Council on Science and Health, as well as the National Institutes of Health (NIH), "the estimated age-specific Infection Fatality Rate (IFR) was, and remains, very low for children and younger adults (e.g., 0.002% at age 10 and 0.01% at age 25) which translates to a survivability rate of 99.99% to 99.998%, whereas the IFR is 0.4% at age 55 and 1.4% at 65 translating to a survivability rate of 99.6% to 98.6% respectively^{34 35}. Minors are at nearly zero percent risk of contracting or transmitting respiratory illnesses and are, instead, buffers which help others build their immune system. Despite these facts, the government continues to mandate the now proven harmful COVID-19 injections, and the updated version of them, to this age group.

Not only are the COVID-19 injections causing severe injury and death, they are also proving to be ineffective against all variants.

As far back as May 2021, Health Canada's Summary Basis of Decision³⁶, revealed that the trials did not prevent infection or transmission. In addition, the Summary reported that both Moderna and Pfizer identified six areas of missing (limited/no clinical data) information: "use in paediatric (age 0-18)", "use in pregnant and breastfeeding women", "long-term safety", "long-term efficacy" including "real-world use", "safety and immunogenicity in subjects with immune-suppression", and "concomitant administration of non-COVID vaccines".

This did not stop the Canadian Government from enthusiastically recommending it to pregnant and breastfeeding mothers, with devastating results.

Under the *Crimes Against Humanity and War Crimes Act of Canada*³⁷, a crime against humanity means, among other things, murder, any other inhumane act or omission that is committed against any civilian population or any identifiable group and that, at the time and in the place of its commission, constitutes a crime against humanity according to customary international law, conventional international law, or by virtue of its being criminal according to the general principles of law are recognized by the community of nations, whether or not it constitutes a contravention of the law in force at the time and in the place of its commission. The Act also confirms that every person who conspires or attempts to commit, **is an accessory after the fact**, in relation to, or councils in relation to, a crime against humanity, is guilty of an offence and liable to imprisonment for life.

³⁰ <https://childrenshealthdefense.org/defender/deaths-adverse-events-updated-covid-booster-shots-vaers/>

³¹ <https://action4canada.com/bc-doctors-open-letter-regarding-vaccine-adverse-reactions/>

³² <https://leohohmann.com/2021/04/30/highly-cited-covid-doctor-comes-to-stunning-conclusion-govt-scrubbing-unprecedented-numbers-of-injection-related-deaths/>

³³ <https://ghorganisation.com/wp-content/uploads/2021/07/GHO-updated-pdf.pdf>

³⁴ <https://www.acsh.org/news/2020/11/18/covid-infection-fatality-rates-sex-and-age-15163>

³⁵ <https://clinicaltrials.gov/ct2/show/NCT04368728?term=NCT04368728&draw=2&rank=1>

³⁶ <https://action4canada.com/wp-content/uploads/Summary-Basis-of-Decision-COVID-19-Vaccine-Moderna-Health-Canada.pdf>

³⁷ <https://laws-lois.justice.gc.ca/eng/acts/c-45.9/page-1.html>

Under sections 265 and 266 of the *Criminal Code of Canada*³⁸, a person commits an assault when, without the consent of another person, he applies force intentionally to that other person, directly or indirectly. Everyone who commits an assault is guilty of an indictable offence and liable to imprisonment for a term not exceeding five years, or an offence punishable on summary conviction.

Based on the *Genetic Non-Discrimination Act, Bill S-201*³⁹, it is an indictable offence to force anyone to take a DNA/RNA test or deny any service, employment, or education opportunity to anyone who refuses to take such a test. The punishment is a fine not exceeding \$1,000,000 or imprisonment for a term not exceeding five years, or both⁴⁰.

In 1986, the Supreme Court of Canada ruled in *E. (Mrs.) v. Eve*, 1986 CanLII 36 (SCC), [1986] 2 S.C.R. 388⁴¹, that forced medical testing violates the inviolability of the body and is unlawful. The Court upheld this ruling in *Engel v. Salyn* 1993 CanLII 152 (SCC), [1993] 1 SCR 306⁴².

It is a further violation of the *Canadian Criminal Code*⁴³, to endanger the life of another person. Sections 216, 217, 217.1 and 221.

Duty of persons undertaking acts dangerous to life

Sec. 216: Everyone who undertakes to administer surgical or medical treatment to another person or to do any other lawful act that may endanger the life of another person is, except in cases of necessity, under a legal duty to have and to use reasonable knowledge, skill and care in so doing.

R.S., c. C-34, s. 198

Duty of persons undertaking acts

Sec. 217: Everyone who undertakes to do an act is under a legal duty to do it if an omission to do the act is or may be dangerous to life.

Duty of persons directing work

Sec. 217.1: Everyone who undertakes, or has the authority, to direct how another person does work or performs a task is under a legal duty to take reasonable steps to prevent bodily harm to that person, or any other person, arising from that work or task.

Causing bodily harm by criminal negligence

Sec. 221: Every person who by criminal negligence causes bodily harm to another person is guilty of

(a) an indictable offence and liable to imprisonment for a term of not more than 10 years; or,

(b) an offence punishable on summary conviction.

Domestically, in the seminal decision of *Hopp v Lepp*, [1980] 2 SCR 192⁴⁴, the Supreme Court of Canada determined that cases of non-disclosure of risks and medical information fall under the law of negligence. Hopp also clarified the standard of informed consent and held that, even if a certain risk is only a slight possibility which ordinarily would not be disclosed, but which carries serious consequences, such as paralysis or death, the material risk must be revealed to the patient.

The duty of disclosure for informed consent is rooted in an individual's right to bodily autonomy. In other words, a person has the right to understand the consequences of medical treatment regardless of whether those consequences are deemed improbable, and have determined that, although medical opinion can be divided as to the level of disclosure required, the standard is simple, "A Reasonable Person Would Want to Know the Serious Risks, Even if Remote." *Hopp v Lepp*, supra; *Bryan v Hicks*, 1995 CanLII 172 (BCCA); *British Columbia Women's Hospital Center*, 2013 SCC 30⁴⁵.

³⁸ <https://www.laws-lois.justice.gc.ca/eng/acts/c-46/section-265.html>

³⁹ <https://www.parl.ca/DocumentViewer/en/42-1/bill/S-201/royal-assent>

⁴⁰ <https://laws-lois.justice.gc.ca/eng/acts/G-2.5/index.html>

⁴¹ <https://www.canlii.org/en/ca/scc/doc/1986/1986canlii36/1986canlii36.html?searchUrlHash=AAAAAQAWRS4gKE1vcy4pIHYuIEV2ZSwgMTk4NgAAAAAB&resultIndex=1>

⁴² <https://www.canlii.org/en/ca/scc/doc/1993/1993canlii152/1993canlii152.html?searchUrlHash=AAAAQARYm9keSAvcyBpbnZpb2xhdGUAAAAAQ&resultIndex=1>

⁴³ <https://laws-lois.justice.gc.ca/eng/acts/c-46/FullText.html>

⁴⁴ <https://scc-csc.lexum.com/scc-csc/scc-csc/en/item/2553/index.do>

⁴⁵ <https://www.canlii.org/en/ca/scc/doc/1980/1980canlii14/1980canlii14.html>

Vaccines are not mandatory, therefore, any government mandates or enforcement of vaccines are moot. Any individual who is attempting to impose ANY vaccine including the COVID-19 injections on students, including minors are in violation of the Constitution, Criminal Code and human rights, and are putting themselves personally at risk of potential imprisonment and a civil lawsuit for damages. Canadian law has long recognized that individuals have the right to control what happens to their bodies, this would include testing and mask wearing. In point of fact, there is no law in Canada legislating mask wearing, because no one has the authority to interfere with an individual's right to breathe freely.

In summary, the citizens of Canada are protected under the medical and legal ethics of express informed consent, and are entitled to the full protections guaranteed under:

- **Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms⁴⁶ (1982) Section 2a, 2b, 6, 7, 8, 9, 15.**
- **Bill of Rights**
- **Canadian Criminal Code**
- **Universal Declaration on Bioethics and Human Rights⁴⁷ (2005)**
- **Nuremberg Code⁴⁸ (1947)**
- **Helsinki Declaration⁴⁹ (1964, Revised 2013) Article 25, 26**

Extortion; committing tort; privacy violations; malicious or willful misconduct; gross negligence; assault and battery; and acting in bad faith are serious indictable criminal code offences.

Presidents, deans, professors, instructors, administrators, board executives or other persons in authority who are attempting to coerce or impose ANY vaccine including the COVID-19 injections, or interfering with someone's guaranteed rights (eg essential and non-essential services, gathering, activities) are in violation of the Constitution, Criminal Code and human rights, and are personally not protected under any Act, Order or Statute that is in violation of them.

If you persist in recommending, encouraging, advertising, mandating, facilitating, incentivising, coercing, ANY vaccine including the COVID-19 injection, testing, masking or any other medical treatment, you can be held personally, civilly, and/or criminally liable. Your actions may further constitute breach of trust and deception.

It is the duty of every Canadian citizen, no matter their position or title, to uphold the law and respect the Constitution and Charter Rights. Should you choose to not desist, this NOL may be used as evidence against you in future actions. You have been duly warned.

It is the responsibility of adult individual students and the parents/legal guardians of those students who are minors, not presidents, deans, professors, instructors, administrators, board executives or other persons in authority, to make medical decisions for students.

Name: _____

Date: _____

Signature: _____

⁴⁶ <https://www.canada.ca/en/canadian-heritage/services/how-rights-protected/guide-canadian-charter-rights-freedoms.html>

⁴⁷ <https://en.unesco.org/themes/ethics-science-and-technology/bioethics-and-human-rights>

⁴⁸ <http://www.cirp.org/library/ethics/nuremberg/>

⁴⁹ <https://www.wma.net/what-we-do/medical-ethics/declaration-of-helsinki/>