



The Canadian Peoples' Union NFP

ThePowerShift.ca

September 30th, 2021

What Employee Unions and Businesses need to know

Which side of the law will Employee Unions, the Treasury Board of Canada, businesses, Human Rights Commissions, Associations, Health Canada, and Provincial Public Health including our Court Justices will stand on?

It's imperative that everyone understands that the RULE of LAW needs to prevail above the unnecessary vaccine mandates before we lose more lives needlessly, and that true Justice needs to be had so that Canadians, the Indigenous peoples (whom Canadians owe fiduciary duty too), and all employees who need to be protected from an agenda created to destroy our constitution and rights through illicit activities by those who pay no attention to law within the implementation of public health regulations and corporate policies without providing true and accurate scientific proof.

It is obvious that to protect everyone, Employee Unions need to protect all their members and not be easily coerced by statements made without legal foundation. Enforcing the illegal mandates without the LAW will also make Unions vulnerable to lawsuits. Unions also need to ask employers to provide legal proof of laws to justify their demands of forced vaccinations and or PCR testing as there is no LAW requiring vaccinations based on mRNA gene therapy (currently immune spike protein) which cannot be mandatory in legislation, acts or laws, as they are a medical procedure.

With the right court case, and an honest judiciary, it would be easy to shed light on the reality of this unnecessary pandemic mandates and expose the truth about the minimal dangers of SARS-CoV-2, COVID -19.

***Important questions that need to be asked and answered by employee Unions and their lawyers to employers before supporting the vaccine mandates:

1. Was SARS-CoV-2 Coronavirus COVID-19 justifiable to implement the emergency measures?
2. Was the RT-PCR test used properly before declaring that a person was infected and needed to be isolated or to classify its use of a Canada wide use of 35-45 CT thresholds to determine infectivity of SARS-CoV-2 as acceptable by law?
3. Are the mRNA gene therapy injections (currently immune spike protein) required to protect Canadians from SARS-CoV-2?
4. Were alternative treatments given to Canadians since the onset?

Given the proof that we and others have been releasing about the SARS-Cov-2 Canadian Isolation producing the COVID-19 disease and concerning the damaging Manitoba Superior Court RT-PCR testimony by Dr. Bullard and others during the hearing of May 03rd to May 13th, 2021, the answer to the above questions is a resounding NO to each of them.

As we stand in Canada:

1. Corporate policies do not supersede our International Human rights, National Charter Rights and Freedoms and Provincial Human Rights Codes.
2. The present forced mRNA vaccinations and forced masks, forced RT-PCR testing and social distancing measures by provincial or federal mandates are NOT LAW, and go against International Human Rights, National Charter Rights and Freedoms, and Provincial Human Rights Codes.

What needs to be acknowledged and immediately changed, is that everyone speaks and base their thinking as though the SARS-CoV-2 was a deadly virus for all Canadians, when it is far from that for most of the Canadian population, especially since we already have an immunity to it, and without the need for mRNA injections (currently immune spike protein) that do not prevent those injected from shedding the disease now injected into them to produce more spike proteins within the body.

Therefore, the laws listed below are being knowingly, illegally broken by all levels of Canadian Governance, Public Health, the Treasury Board of Canada, businesses, and some of our court Justices.

Many could be facing criminal contraventions under:

1. The Assisted Human Reproduction Act S.C. 2004, c. 2
2. The Genetic Non-Discrimination Act S.C. 2017, c. 3
3. The Intimidation (coercion) Criminal Code (R.S.C., 1985, c. C-46)
4. The Privacy Act (R.S.C., 1985, c. P-21)
5. The Canadian Human Rights Act (R.S.C., 1985, c. H-6)
6. other contraventions of Acts and Criminal code apply.

Please see the Court testimony by Dr. Bullard that confirms proof of RT-PCR fraud during the Manitoba hearing held May 03-13th, 2021

<https://rumble.com/vnbcjv-dr.-bullards-court-testimony-confirms-manitoba-and-canadian-pcr-test-fraud-.html>

MISINFORMATION BY WHOM?

Much misinformation is being spread through mainstream media and government agencies that illegally try to enforce mandates and to place business owners at risk of lawsuits by clients and employees, as mandates are not LAW even in emergency measures if they interfere with our Charter Rights and our other Human Rights laws.

Furthermore, Lawyers can protect employees from being subjected to forced vaccination against their will such as the genetic non-discrimination act or the fact that we have a legal principal that protects the Human Genome from intrusion and change as being done by the mRNA injection (currently immune spike protein), goes against the Assisted Human Reproduction Act S.C. 2004, c. 2., then criminal charges or civil suits can be filed against those perpetrating these crimes.

Before requiring forced vaccinations for the SARS-CoV-2 coronavirus COVID-19, the Canadian Government should have declared a National Emergency, especially when 10 provinces declared their emergencies and infringed on the rights of the Canadian and Indigenous peoples of Canada.

Once a national emergency was declared by Canada, then the proper step for the Prime Minister was to legally justify to the courts, as well as to the International Human Rights Commission, his actions for the need to derogate from some of our International Human Rights, National Charter Rights and Provincial Human Rights Codes during emergency measures of which Municipalities are also bound by.

Under International Law, Canada, including the Provinces and Municipalities are bound by the Non-Derogation of Human Rights agreed to by Canada during COVID-19 or even in times as extreme as WAR.

The International Human Rights Commission was explicit in its document regarding the steps that could and could not be taken under any circumstances within the Non-Derogation of Human Rights. It formed the basis that was required to be followed by all 123 countries that included Canada as signatories to its requirements.

Canada avoided to do so by subverting their obligations in only declaring emergencies under the Quarantine Act, and the Aviation Act. Common sense dictates that 10 provinces making emergency declarations constitute a national emergency which would have triggered the justification required before derogation was permitted in certain areas.

Canadian Human Rights Commissions Malfeasance by not protecting the rights of the Canadian citizens regarding the emergency measures and infringement of Human Rights Law.

The Canadian and Provincial Governments including our Canadian courts were to follow the directives implemented by the International Human Rights Commission.

For the Canadian Human Rights or any of the Provincial Human Rights Commissions to be misleading Canadians as to their full rights as did the Ontario Human Rights Commission by using play on words when using the word creed and singular beliefs are derogatory. Their actions need to be reported as malfeasance since they created a false information statement by leaving out valuable information pertaining to the Code under Creed which is incomprehensible.

The citizens in each province are also protected under "Freedom of Conscience" and religion under S2(b) of the Canadian Charter and the International human rights.

The Ontario Human Rights commission, stated Friday September 24th, 2021, in the Toronto Star that:

People who choose not to get the COVID-19 vaccine due to personal preferences or “singular beliefs” do not have a right to accommodations under Ontario’s human rights law, the province’s rights watchdog says.

The decision to get vaccinated is voluntary, and a “person who chooses not to be vaccinated based on personal preference does not have the right to accommodation under the (Human Rights Code),” the Ontario Human Rights Commission said this week in a policy paper discussing the limits of vaccine mandates and proof-of-vaccination requirements.

While human rights law prohibits discrimination based on creed — someone’s religion, or a non-religious belief system that shapes their identity, world view and way of life — personal preferences or singular beliefs do not amount to a creed, the commission said, adding it “is not aware of any tribunal or court decision that found a singular belief against vaccinations or masks amounted to a creed within the meaning of the Code.”

https://www.thestar.com/news/gta/2021/09/24/anti-vaxxers-dont-have-a-right-to-accommodations-ontario-human-rights-watchdog-says.html?li_source=LI&li_medium=star_web_ymbii

These statements made by the Ontario Human Rights Commission, purposely misrepresented what is written and stated under “creed” in the CODE.

<http://www.ohrc.on.ca/en/policy-preventing-discrimination-based-creed/4-creed>.

The malfeasance undertaken by the Ontario and Canadian Human Rights Commission, all levels of our governments and some of the justices who are breaking our own laws and withholding evidence by subverting our rights based on the SARS-CoV-2 COVID -19 could never be justified for doing so in a true court of law due to the fact that the SARS-CoV-2 Isolation could not warrant or be classified as a highly infectious disease (HCID) determined by the UK and other countries on march 19, 2020.

<https://www.gov.uk/guidance/high-consequence-infectious-diseases-hcid?fbclid=IwAR1GOPqEiFJZgIvHbqMZkHdIFw67qeWV833MztE7jzd2bENPOhvbNMxys-E#status-of-covid-19>

Steps required for implementing laws: the Minister of Health to be allowed to instate an ACT to become law, the same principals and procedures via parliamentary approval and royal assent must be met.

There is also the fact that employment lawyers and all others need to be reminded about our protection under International Human rights laws as also specified under the International Labor Organization (ILO) which are to be protected and not neglected as being done in Canada which

would have required the Canadian government to remind the provinces to not derogate from our human rights even during COVID-19 or war.

It is the international human rights laws that also protect our rights and keeps this country whole as they have, with the cessation of Quebec Supreme Court judgement. So, in essence, at International Law, it is the people as a collective that are to make decisions and not governments when it comes to our Political and Civil Rights that concern us even if Canada, the Provinces and Municipalities try to ignore it. These are facts based in Law. Our rights can be well debated with National and International court precedents.

There is enough evidence of misconduct such as bad faith, abuse of power, negligence, or willful blindness in respect of constitutional obligations and the International human rights non derogation agreement that until we file a constitutional challenge, those infringements will persist.

Unity is important to protect one and all including the future of our country. As specified before, although employers need to secure a safe work environment that does not include the health of its employees through forced vaccinations. There are no requirements for employers to enforce things like mental health examinations let alone forced vaccinations of healthy people.

Forcing people to do things to their bodies against their will without enough information available or knowing that there could be a chance for harm with the mRNA injections could send someone into distress which will be more harmful in the long run.

*Brian Bird**

(2020) 98 S.C.L.R. (2d) 111 - 143

Part II Freedom of Conscience and Religion

Supreme Court Law Review

A person's career "is an essential component of his or her sense of identity, self-worth and emotional well- being."

Indeed, a person mired in a professional crisis of conscience has two unenviable choices: violate her conscience and injure her integrity and identity (and potentially experience harm) or retreat from the professional situation that threatens her conscience. While retreat may seem viable in the abstract, the value of being able to pursue one's desired profession should not be overlooked. A person's career plays a significant role in the make-up of her identity.

Chief Justice Dickson of the Supreme Court of Canada described work in Reference Re Public Service Employee Relations Act (Alberta) as "one of the most fundamental aspects in a person's life, providing the individual with a means of financial support and, as importantly, a contributory role in society." A person's career "is an essential component of his or her sense of identity, self-worth and emotional well- being."

Conscience is "an essential part of our understanding of what kind of person we are, and this is taken to be a reason for warranting protection of conscience and conscientious objection" in various contexts.

Recent Court Precedents:

Carter v Canada (Attorney General), [2015] SCJ No 5

At 67: The law has long protected patient autonomy in medical decision-making. In *A.C. v. Manitoba (Director of Child and Family Services)*, 2009 SCC 30, [2009] 2 S.C.R. 181, a majority of this Court, per Abella J. (the dissent not disagreeing on this point), endorsed the "tenacious relevance in our legal system of the principle that competent individuals are -- and should be -- free to make decisions about their bodily integrity" (para. 39). This right to "decide one's own fate" entitles adults to direct the course of their own medical care (para. 40): it is this principle that underlies the concept of "informed consent" and is protected by s. 7's guarantee of liberty and security of the person (para. 100; see also *R. v. Parker* (2000), 49 O.R. (3d) 481 (C.A.)). As noted in *Fleming v. Reid* (1991), 4 O.R. (3d) 74 (C.A.), the right of medical self-determination is not vitiated by the fact that serious risks or consequences, including death, may flow from the patient's decision. It is this same principle that is at work in the cases dealing with the right to refuse consent to medical treatment, or to demand that treatment be withdrawn or discontinued: see, e.g., *Ciarlariello v. Schacter*, [1993] 2 S.C.R. 119; *Malette v. Shulman* (1990), 72 O.R. (2d) 417 (C.A.); and *Nancy B. v. Hôtel-Dieu de Québec* (1992), 86 D.L.R. (4th) 385 (Que. Sup. Ct.).

Carter v Canada (Attorney General), [2015] 1 SCR 331

ss. 241(b) and 14 of the Criminal Code deprive these adults of their right to life, liberty and security of the person under s. 7 of the Charter. The right to life is engaged where the law or state action imposes death or an increased risk of death on a person, either directly or indirectly.

I trust that this information will find itself useful and that it has given you much to consider considering the decisions needing to be made by all regarding choosing what is best for yourselves and your employees and Union members and clients that will be affected by your decisions. Can you risk having to live with a heavy conscience?

We know we can't, and it is why we will stand up for all Canadians and employees who are in fact, not only employees, but also as Canadians and Indigenous peoples, the true shareholders of the Crown of Canada.

Should you want to do the right thing for all Canadians, then we look forward to hearing from you so that we can all work together in cleaning the mess our Governance has made.



Nicole Lebrasseur

The Canadian Peoples' Union NFP
 A Political and Civil Rights Citizens Union.
nicole@canadianpeoplesunion.com
 Tel: (226) 777-5580
thepowershift.ca