PRE-NOL EMPLOYER VACCINE POLICY

This is a letter that you send to your employer prior to the NOL. This removes any excuse of acting in "good faith", as it provides an overview of the liability, potential risks of the vaxx and cites recent court rulings.

To use: copy and paste below into a word doc, and send it to your employer to sign. If they do not sign, that's ok, they have the information and that is what is key.

As your employee, I request that you review this document, provide the requisite information, and sign the form, in regards to your requirement that employees get a Covid-19 vaccine or suffer discriminatory consequences such as dismissal, segregation, forced PCR or Antigen testing.

1. If I agree to receive COVID-19 vaccine, does the Ontario Health Insurance Plan **(OHIP)** provide complete coverage should I experience an adverse event

2. As an employee, will you be providing **WSIB, or other resources** if I have an adverse event from a Covid-19 vaccine injection and am unable to come to work for days, weeks, or months, or if I am disabled for life?

3. As an employee, in the event that I die from receiving a Covid-19 vaccine injection does the employer take responsibility for funeral costs and to support my surviving family?

4. Because Canadians have the right to informed consent for all medical procedures will you be providing certain **vaccine-specific information** to help employees make an informed decision about vaccination[1]? Information must be specific to each authorized Covid-19 injection and are developed by the manufacturers (Pfizer/BioNTech, Moderna, and Janssen/Johnson & Johnson). They must provide information that is up-to-date on the injections and their ingredients; vaccine recipients must also receive information about adverse events. Have you read, understood, and provided me (and all other employees) with these fact sheets and current information on adverse events—and can you furnish a list of vaccine ingredients guaranteed to be complete—so that I/we can make an educated decision?

5. Have you reviewed the **material adverse events** experienced to date by people who have received Covid-19 vaccine injections, as reported to the Vaccine Adverse Event Reporting System (VAERS)[2]? Reported adverse events include death, anaphylaxis, blood clots and related complications, heart problems (myocarditis and pericarditis), neurological disorders, autoimmune disorders, other chronic and inflammatory conditions, blindness and deafness, infertility, foetal damage, miscarriage, and stillbirth.

6. To begin with, the emergency measures are based on the claim that we are experiencing a "public health emergency." There is no evidence to substantiate this claim. In fact, the evidence indicates that we are experiencing a rate of infection consistent with a normal influenza season.

7. The purported increase in "cases" is 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 this so-called pandemic. Its inventor, Kary Mullis, has clearly indicated that the PCR testing device was never created to test for coronavirus Mullis warns 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"[2].

8. In light of this warning, the current PCR test utilization, set at higher amplifications, is producing up to 97% false positives. Therefore, any imposed emergency measures that are based on PCR testing are unwarranted, unscientific, and quite possibly fraudulent. An international consortium of life science scientists has detected 10 major scientific flaws at the molecular and methodological level in a 3-peer review of the RTPCR test to detect SARS-CoV-24[4].

Court Cases Refuting the Validity of the PCR Test:

1. In November 2020, a Portuguese court ruled that PCR tests are unreliable[5].
2. 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 positive[6].
3. Feb 16, 2021, BC Health Officer, Bonnie Henry, admitted PCR tests are unreliable[7].
4. On April 8, 2021, the Austrian court ruled the PCR was unsuited for COVID testing[8].
5. 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"[9].
6. On May 8, 2021, the Swedish Public Health Agency stopped PCR Testing for the same reason[10].
7. On May 10th, 2021, Manitoba's Chief Microbiologist and Laboratory Specialist, Dr. Jared Bullard testified under cross examination in a trial before the court of Queen's Bench in Manitoba, that PCR test results do not verify infectiousness and were never intended to be used to diagnose respiratory illnesses[11].

Canada is running the amplification cycle threshold (Ct) at 45x, learn more here: https://www.canada.ca/en/public-health/services/diseases/2019-novel-coronavirus-infection/guidance-documents/polymerase-chain-reaction-cycle-threshold-values-testing.html

Resources compiled by action4canada.com

1 https://www.bitchute.com/video/nQgq0BxXfZ4f
2 https://rumble.com/vhu4rz-kary-mullis-inventor-of-the-pcr-test.html
3 https://academic.oup.com/cid/advance-article/doi/10.1093/cid/ciaa1491/5912603
4 https://cormandrostenreview.com/report/
5 https://unitynewsnetwork.co.uk/portuguese-court-rules-pcr-tests-unreliable-quarantines-unlawful-media-blackout/
6 https://principia-scientific.com/who-finally-admits-covid19-pcr-test-has-a-problem
7 https://rumble.com/vhww4d-bc-health-officer-admits-pcr-test-is-unreliable.html
8 https://greatgameindia.com/austria-court-pcr-test/
9 https://2020news.de/sensationsurteil-aus-weimar-keine-masken-kein-abstandkeine-tests-mehr-fuer-schueler/
10 https://tapnewswire.com/2021/05/sweden-stops-pcr-tests-as-covid19-diagnosis/

11 https://www.jccf.ca/manitoba-chief-microbiologist-and-laboratory-specialist-56-of-positive-cases-are-not-infectious/

LEGISLATION AND LEGAL PRECEDENTS THAT PROTECTS OUR RIGHTS AND FREEDOMS IN CANADA

1. Canadian Bill of Rights S.C. 1960, c. 44,
   Section 1(a) the right of the individual to life, liberty and security of persons, which protects the right of informed consent for medical procedures and the right to privacy.

   Section 1(b) the right of the individual to equality before the law and the protection of the law.

   These violations render the vaccine passport regulations to be of no force or effect of law because they violate the CBR
   https://laws-lois.justice.gc.ca/eng/acts/c-12.3/page-1.html

2. Case law implied bill of rights:
   Summary: The Credit of Alberta Regulation Act; and the Accurate News and Information Act, SCR 100, 1938
   Summary: The Supreme Court of Canada ruled on the Reference re Alberta Statutes. It found that the Accurate News and Information Act, along with the others submitted to it for evaluation, was ultra vires (beyond the powers of) the Alberta government. In the case of the Accurate News and Information Act, the court found that the Canadian constitution included an "implied bill of rights" that protected freedom of speech as being critical to a parliamentary democracy. **This determined that the provinces cannot override fundamental rights.**
   https://www.canlii.org/en/ca/scc/doc/1938/1938canlii1/1938canlii1.html

3. Case law light to sue for breach of privacy:
   Jones v. Tsige, 2012
   Summary: The Ontario Court of Appeal declared that the common law in Canada recognizes a right to personal privacy, more specifically identified as a "tort of intrusion upon seclusion", as well as considering that appropriation of personality is already recognized as a tort in Ontario law. This allows individuals to sue for breach of privacy.
   https://www.canlii.org/en/on/onca/doc/2012/2012onca32/2012onca32.html

4. Personal Information Protection and Electronic Documents Act 2000 (PIPEDA).

5. Personal Health Information Protection Act 2004 (PHIPA). (Ontario)

6. Occupational Health and Safety Act R.S.O.1990,c.0.1. (Ontario)
   Section 63
   Information Confidential:
   (1) Except for the purposes of this Act and the regulations or as required by law,

PRE-NOL EMPLOYER VACCINE POLICY

(a) an inspector, a person accompanying an inspector or a person who, at the request of an inspector, makes an examination, test or inquiry, shall not publish, disclose or communicate to any person any information, material, statement, report or result of any examination, test or inquiry acquired, furnished, obtained, made or received under the powers conferred under this Act or the regulations;
(c) no person shall publish, disclose or communicate to any person any secret manufacturing process or trade secret acquired, furnished, obtained, made or received under the provisions of this Act or the regulations;
(e) no person to whom information is communicated under this Act and the regulations shall divulge the name of the informant to any person; and
(f) no person shall disclose any information obtained in any medical examination, test or x-ray of a worker made or taken under this Act except in a form calculated to prevent the information from being identified with a particular person or case. R.S.O. 1990, c. O.1, s. 63 (1); 1992, c. 14, s. 2 (2, 3).

Employer Access to Health Records:
(2) No employer shall seek to gain access, except by an order of the court or other tribunal or in order to comply with another statute, to a health record concerning a worker without the worker's written consent. R.S.O. 1990, c. O.1, s. 63 (2).
(f) No person shall disclose any information obtained in any medical examination, test or x-ray of a worker made or taken under this Act except in a form calculated to prevent the information from being identified with a particular person or case

Section 25, Duties of the Employer:
Subsection (1) An employer shall ensure that,
(h) take every precaution reasonable in the circumstances for the protection of a worker;

Subsection 28, Duties of the Worker:
Subsection (3) Consent to medical surveillance
A worker is not required to participate in a prescribed medical surveillance program unless the worker consents to do so

Section 50, No discipline, dismissal, etc., by employer:
Subsection (1) No employer or person acting on behalf of an employer shall,
(a) dismiss or threaten to dismiss a worker;
(b) discipline or suspend or threaten to discipline or suspend a worker;
(c) impose any penalty upon a worker; or
(d) intimidate or coerce a worker,

Section 66, Penalties:
Subsection (1) Every person who contravenes or fails to comply with,
(a) a provision of this Act or the regulations;
(b) an order or requirement of an inspector or a Director; or
(c) an order of the Minister,
is guilty of an offence and on conviction is liable to a fine of not more than $100,000 or to imprisonment for a term of not more than twelve months, or to both. R.S.O. 1990, c. O.1, s. 66 (1); 2017, c. 34, Sched. 30, s. 4 (1).

https://www.ontario.ca/laws/statute/90o01

7. Case law upholding medical privacy under OHSA/Collective Agreement:
   Summary: Employer (long-term care home) breached OHSA, collective agreement by sharing employee's medical information with another employer This case illustrates the increasing importance of privacy – particularly of medical information – in the workplace, and that privacy obligations can come from unexpected places, including the OHSA.
   https://www.occupationalhealthandsafetylaw.com/employer-breached-ohsa-collective-agreement-by-sharing-employees-medical-information-with-another-employer/

8. Municipal Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act, R.S.O. 1990, c.M.56.

9. Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act of Ontario (FOIPOP)

10. Freedom of Information Act (FOIA)

11. Employment contract law and precedents.

12. Criminal Code of Canada:
    Enforcement of this bylaw/mandate is a crime under the following criminal codes:
    - Section 265 (1), (3) - regarding no consent medical treatment is assault.
    - Section 346(1) - Extortion to take the test/vaccine or...
    - Section 264.1(1) - Uttering threats, do the test or take the vaccine or...
    - Section 319(1) - Public Incitement of Hate by asking for a vaccine status in public.
    - Section 216 - Every one 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.
    - Section 217.1 - Every one 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.

    https://laws-lois.justice.gc.ca/eng/acts/c-46/section-264.1.html

13. Bill S-201, Genetic Non-Discrimination Act, 2020 SCC 17 (GND):
    It is a criminal offence in Canada to use a genetic test to discriminate under Bill S-201. Section 2 of the *Act* defines a genetic test as "a test that analyzes DNA, RNA or chromosomes for purposes such as the prediction of disease or vertical transmission risks, or monitoring, diagnosis or prognosis".

    Sections 3, 4 and 5 establish prohibitions relating to genetic tests: individuals and corporations cannot force individuals to take genetic tests or disclose genetic test results as a condition of obtaining access to goods, services and contracts; cannot refuse an individual access to goods, services and contracts because they have refused to take a genetic test or refused to disclose the results of a genetic test; and

cannot use individuals' genetic test results without their written consent in the areas of contracting and the provision of goods and services.
https://lop.parl.ca/sites/PublicWebsite/default/en_CA/ResearchPublications/LegislativeSummaries/421S201E

14. Genetic Non-Discrimination Act, SC 2017, c 3:
An Act to prohibit and prevent genetic discrimination
https://www.canlii.org/en/ca/laws/astat/sc-2017-c-3/latest/sc-2017-c-3.html

15. Case law on Bill S-201, 2020
Summary: Supreme Court of Ontario upheld Bill S-201 and that it is a criminal offense to discriminate based on genetic test results.
https://www.canlii.org/en/ca/scc/doc/2020/2020scc17/2020scc17.html

16. The following case law for informed consent:
Parmley vs Parmley, 1945
Page 645
Summary: Informed consent medical. Consent must be made freely and information about the risks must be given.
https://www.canlii.org/en/ca/scc/doc/1945/1945canlii13/1945canlii13.html

Hopp vs Lepp, 1980
Page 196
Summary: Informed consent medical. Consent must be made freely and information about the risks must be given.
https://scc-csc.lexum.com/scc-csc/scc-csc/en/item/2553/index.do

R vs Ewanchuk, 1999
If no consent, then assault
Summary: Where there is a threat of harm or reprisal or pressure from an authority there is no consent and therefore the act is assault.
https://scc-csc.lexum.com/scc-csc/scc-csc/en/item/1684/index.do

NO LIABILITY PROTECTION FOR EMPLOYERS WHO ARE INFORMED OF THE LEGAL ISSUES

Whereas pharmaceutical companies that manufacture vaccines have been protected from liability related to injuries or deaths caused by vaccines. **Companies and all other institutions or individuals who mandate vaccines on any human being are not protected from liability.** Are you aware that you do not enjoy such liability protection?

IN CANADA ANYONE HAS THE RIGHT TO SUE ANYONE WHO VIOLATES THEIR RIGHT TO PRIVACY ACCORDING TO THE SUPREME COURT OF ONTARIO

Are you aware that employees could file a **civil suit** against you should they suffer an adverse event, death, or termination from their place of employment if the employee does not consent freely to treatment?

PRE-NOL EMPLOYER VACCINE POLICY

SIGNATURE TO CONFIRM LIABILITY FOR CONSEQUENCE OF FORCED VACCINATION

As the legally authorized officer of the employer/company, I have read all of the above information, have provided my employees with all of the information that the is legally required to be provided to recipients of the Covid-19 injections, and do hereby agree to assumed 100% financial responsibility for covering any and all expenses from adverse events, including death, through insurance coverage or directly. In addition, I affirm that the employee will not be subjected to the loss of their job should they decline to receive a Covid-19 injection or any other alternative measures such as participating in educational training sessions and ongoing testing of Covid-19..

Print and Sign below

Authorized officer of company requiring injection	Company	Date
_____	_____	_____
Employer	Company	Date
_____	_____	_____
Witness	Company	Date

REMOVE THE CONTENT BELOW BEFORE SENDING

THIS FORM WAS DESIGNED BY STAND4THEE.ca compiled this information with some material from action4canada. Stand4thee is working to address unethical and unlawful mask, testing, and vaccine mandates through private collections and court actions for remedy. Resources for employees include a Notice of Liability created by licensed volunteers (“Notice of Liability '') that compulsory Covid-19 vaccination imposed by employers on employees violates federal and provincial law and are contrary to common law precedents. You can find the Notices of Liability that follow this consent form should your employer not cooperate in removing the mandate to require you to reveal your vaccine status. https://stand4thee.ca.