



Open Letter to RCMP Commissioner Brenda Lucki

RCMP National Headquarters
73 Leikin Dr
Ottawa, Ontario K1A 0R2

October 21, 2021

Dear Commissioner Brenda Lucki:

We respectfully submit this open letter to express our most sincere concerns and resolute stand against the forced coercive medical intervention of Canadians, and against the undue discrimination experienced by those exercising their lawful right to bodily autonomy. We are not against vaccinations, but as law enforcement officers, we cannot in good conscience willingly participate in enforcing mandates that we believe go against the best interests of the people we protect.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

As Canadians, our constitutionally-protected freedoms precede the government, and may only be temporarily limited if the majority of evidence justifies such infringements as reasonable, provable, and guided by law. If presented with all available evidence in a court, we firmly believe the government implemented mandates would not hold up under scrutiny.

As experienced investigators, we look past what information is provided and focus on how the information is presented. A proper investigation should be conducted as objectively as possible, and follow the principle that it is better to have questions that cannot be answered than to have answers that cannot be questioned. A complete investigation must include full disclosure of all the facts of the case, even contradictory evidence. Why, then, is there little to no tolerance for free and open debate on this matter? Many credible medical and scientific experts are being censored. Accordingly, we rightly have concerns about “the science” we are being coerced to “follow”.

As representatives of our communities within the RCMP and representatives of the RCMP in our communities, we have never witnessed such division in our country. This sense of “Us versus Them” will be further fueled by having a police force consisting only of “vaccinated” people, while serving communities consisting of “unvaccinated” people, which goes against the community policing model the RCMP has strived to achieve.



As law enforcement officers, we already face higher levels of stress and mental illnesses due to the nature of our work. These have been compounded – considerably – by mandates that we believe are deeply unethical, threatening our livelihood, and dividing society.

As federal employees, what is being done to mitigate this stress? Moreover, what assurances are we given that the injections will not cause short or long-term side effects? What steps will be taken to ensure members are compensated for adverse side effects?

Police officers are expected to preserve the peace, uphold the law, and defend the public interest. We strongly believe that forced and coerced medical treatments undermine all three and, thus, contradict our duties and responsibilities to Canadians. We remain loyal to the Charter and Bill of Rights and ask you to send investigators to collect statements from medical professionals (and other reliable witnesses) who allege they have been silenced – putting lives at risk. Allow us to make this information publicly available to all so the public can scrutinize it and achieve informed consent.

ABOUT US

This letter was created from the collective thoughts, beliefs, and opinions of actively serving police officers of the Royal Canadian Mounted Police (RCMP) from across the country. We have a wealth of experience which includes, but is not limited to, General Duty, Federal Serious and Organized Crime, School Liaison, Prime Minister Protection Detail, Emergency Response Team, Media Relations, and Combined Forces Special Enforcement Unit. We come from various ranks, levels of experience, communities, cultural backgrounds, religious beliefs, and vaccination statuses. Together we are the Mounties for Freedom. We are individual police officers who united in the belief that citizens, including federal employees, should not be forced and coerced into taking a medical intervention.

OUR STANCE

In August 2021, Canadian Prime Minister Justin Trudeau announced, “Federal public servants need to be fully vaccinated,” and that for those without a medical exemption who choose not to be vaccinated: “There will be consequences”¹.

Since that statement, many federal employees have been told they will be sent home without pay for refusing to receive a contested medical treatment. We have united in the belief that people should not be forced or coerced into receiving the current COVID-19 treatments – it should be voluntary. We stand united against the forced and coerced medical intervention of Canadians and against the discrimination faced by those who have exercised their right to



bodily autonomy. We believe in democracy, the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms, and the Bill of Rights.

This is not about whether people should be vaccinated – that is a personal choice.

THE LAW

Our primary duty as peace officers in the RCMP is the preservation of peace². We have never witnessed the level of division in our country as we currently see from the COVID-19 pandemic. It is our responsibility, now more than ever, to make all efforts at preserving the peace in our country.

The Charter of Rights and Freedoms (the Charter) protects fundamental rights and freedoms essential to keeping Canada a free and democratic society³. The Canadian Bill of Rights adds, “... the Canadian Nation is founded upon principles that acknowledge ... the dignity and worth of the human person and the position of the family in a society of free men and free institutions.⁴” It continues to say, “Affirming also that men and institutions remain free only when freedom is founded upon respect for moral and spiritual values and the rule of law.⁵”

We believe our federal and provincial governments have failed to uphold the Charter, Bill of Rights, and Constitution and we are witnessing the erosion of democracy in Canada. As you know, the Charter does not guarantee absolute freedoms. If the government is going to limit freedoms, it must establish the limitations are reasonable given all available facts. The government must adhere to a process to prove their actions are appropriate, called the Oakes test. We firmly believe, if presented with all available evidence in a court, the government implemented mandates would not pass the Oakes test. At the time of writing this letter, the Charter’s section 33 Notwithstanding Clause has not been invoked for this pandemic.

Requiring mandatory COVID-19 treatment options is a slippery slope and allows the government to overstep its authority unchecked. It infringes on the fundamental belief in our society that the individual has the right and freedom to choose. The choice of whether to receive medical treatments has always been an individual’s right in Canada. The Canadian National Report on Immunization (1996) stated “Immunization is not mandatory in Canada; it cannot be made mandatory because of the Canadian Constitution.⁶” Section 2 of The Charter guarantees these fundamental freedoms through the freedom of conscience (subsection a) and the freedom of thought, belief, opinion, and expression (subsection b)⁷. Without individuals having the freedom to choose, we would not have a democratic society.

Though the Nuremberg Code is not a law, it is internationally accepted and falls in line with the spirit of our Charter and Bill of Rights. A key component of the Nuremberg Code is that



participants in a medical experiment need to participate voluntarily without any form of force or coercion⁸. We have obtained documentation from several Canadian doctors who have explained the current COVID-19 treatment options in Canada, being referred to as “vaccines”, were recently authorized as new drugs despite the absence of long-term data⁹. According to these accredited Canadian doctors, these treatment options did not meet the criteria of true vaccines until very recently when the definition of vaccine was changed^{10,11}. Without long-term data, these vaccines are still experimental. We believe the act of removing the rights and freedoms of citizens who refuse to participate in specific COVID-19 treatment options is a form of coercion.

The Criminal Code contains our country’s Criminal Offences and explains that a person commits an assault by intentionally applying force to someone else without that person’s consent¹². The Criminal Code further explains that consent is not obtained from a person who submits, or neglects to resist, on the grounds of authority being exercised over them¹³. How then can someone give proper consent to a COVID-19 treatment injection when doing so under the threat of losing their job, freedoms, or livelihood? Canadian courts have already ruled that medical treatment without proper informed consent is an assault¹⁴.

As law enforcement officers, we cannot in good conscience willingly participate in enforcing mandates that violate the laws of our country and breach the rights and freedoms of the people we protect.

LEST WE FORGET

Each year, on the 11th of November, we remember those who sacrificed their lives for our freedoms. From Flanders Field to Juno Beach, many Canadians have bled and died fighting tyrannical nations. We need to remember past events to prevent the repetition of history’s greatest mistakes.

On the 30th of September, we had the opportunity to reflect on such times during our first National Day for Truth and Reconciliation. Under the direction of the Government of Canada, RCMP members were once issued lawful orders to remove children from their homes and transport them to residential schools. Canada is still recovering from the impact of those decisions and actions. The RCMP has yet to regain the trust of some citizens.

There was a time when scientists believed humans were divided into racial hierarchies and that a person’s intelligence level and characteristics were determined by race¹⁵. These beliefs were not heavily contested and were widely accepted as scientific fact¹⁶. Phrenology was also widely accepted as being a legitimate scientific study¹⁷. These are not examples of science being wrong but of people conducting poor investigations or misunderstanding their findings. These are just



two of several historical examples of widely accepted scientific truths, which became ridiculed practices.

We look back at those times of racial hierarchy and wonder how something so wrong could have been so widely accepted as truth. It is just as hard for many people to conceptualize how RCMP officers could have blindly followed lawful orders that devastated so many lives. Yet now we find ourselves in dangerous waters, when RCMP officers are being forced under coercion and duress to participate in actions they believe go against the spirit of Canadian laws.

We find it ironic that an organization that preaches the honour and respect of Canadian values, and the sacrifice of their veterans, would support actions that contradict the values our veterans fought to uphold. Enforcement of identification and checkpoints was an early step in what would become the Holocaust. Canadian citizens of various backgrounds are being segregated and punished for choosing not to disclose a personal medical decision. We cannot think of a more ironic and cruel way for our governments to pay homage to the sacrifices Canadians have made worldwide to protect individual freedoms than by participating in a process that takes those freedoms away.

Today, instead of having one version of scientific “truth” during this pandemic, we have versions that contradict one another. How can some professionals be so certain their interpretation of science is correct when others give evidence to the contrary? History has already demonstrated we get things wrong even when our scientists agree.

We acknowledge there is a spectrum filled with beliefs relating to this pandemic. For the sake of simplicity, we will refer to two main schools of thought: the common narrative (those who believe the current COVID-19 treatment injections are the way through the pandemic) and those who have concerns with the COVID-19 treatment injections. It’s important to note we are not discussing “antivaxxers” in this letter. We are discussing people with various vaccination statuses who pose questions about the current COVID-19 treatment options being forced upon them.

THE SCIENCE

RCMP members are not scientists nor healthcare professionals; our profession is law enforcement. We do not pretend to be experts in medical or scientific fields, but we are experienced and professional investigators: we look for the facts. Proper investigations follow simple practices that remain consistent across most fields. These practices include but are not limited to: asking the right questions, following evidence, being aware of how biases may affect results, and allowing the evidence to point to the conclusion – not allowing the conclusion to point to the evidence. Most importantly, a proper investigation should be conducted as



objectively as possible and follow the principle that it is better to have questions that cannot be answered than to have answers that cannot be questioned. A complete investigation must include full disclosure of all the facts of the case, even contradictory evidence.

The COVID-19 pandemic has caused several scientists and medical professionals to provide us with information they described as “science”, “scientific”, or “facts”. The problem with many of these statements is that the provided information often contradicted another piece of “scientific fact” that an equally qualified professional had produced. This makes it near impossible for the average person to know what to believe and what not to believe.

As experienced investigators, we look past what information is provided and focus on how the information is presented. This allows us some insight into the credibility of the information. Some professionals make definitive statements such as “It’s safe and effective” or “This is the way”, giving little or no explanation of how they reached their conclusion. When the information provided is challenged or questioned, the response often indicates the answer is something that cannot be questioned. The CDC recently changed its definition of immunity and vaccine^{10,11}, allowing the current COVID-19 treatment injections to fit the definition. This is an example of actions taken when you allow your conclusion to point to your evidence.

Other qualified professionals have provided alternate pieces of information during this pandemic. It is not *what* their results were, but *how* they arrived at their results that we believe in. These professionals have all been able to articulate their findings quite well and are quick to admit the remaining questions they cannot answer. These professionals (from Canada¹⁸ and abroad¹⁹) have expressed warnings and concerns with the current COVID-19 treatment options condoned by the governments. Some of these concerns suggest a higher-than-average number of moderate to severe side-effects from the COVID-19 “vaccinations” compared with our traditional vaccinations¹⁹. Others have stated the current COVID-19 treatment options are proving to be less effective than initially believed^{20,21}.

We have attached several documents as appendices to this letter which contain information we believe raises reasonable concerns with the current COVID-19 vaccination mandates seen across our country. We encourage you to review the documents and the work each document references thoroughly. Though we understand we have provided a lot of material – which will take time and resources to read – we believe the fact that there is so much evidence opposing the mandatory roll-out of the current COVID-19 treatments is reason enough to take our concerns seriously.

There have also been scientific papers that suggest natural immunity is a better form of protection than what the COVID-19 vaccination can give²¹⁻²⁴. Why is antibody testing not being discussed as a potential option for RCMP members?



Here is a list of the documents we've attached to this letter. These documents are a sample of what is available and were written by people (or groups) of scientific or medical professionals in fields directly related to the COVID-19 pandemic. We defer to their expertise.

- [Appendix A](#) – This is an open letter from Dr. Eric Payne, a pediatric neurologist in Alberta, to the College of Physicians and Surgeons of Alberta. In his letter, Dr. Payne highlights several inconsistencies he has found with the common narrative. Dr. Payne provides several sources from around the world throughout his letter.
- [Appendix B](#) – This is the Canadian Covid Care Alliance Declaration. This heavily sourced document provides information on the current pandemic and makes recommendations based on their findings.
- [Appendix C](#) – This is a letter from Dr. Byram Bridle, a viral immunologist in Ontario, to the President of the University of Guelph. Dr. Bridle uses his extensive experience and qualifications to explain his concerns with the common narrative surrounding the COVID-19 treatment injections. Dr. Bridle also articulates his concerns with the COVID-19 health mandates.
- [Appendix D](#) – This is an open letter from Health Professionals United to the Alberta Health Services. The letter outlines reasons why several frontline healthcare workers in Alberta heavily oppose mandatory COVID-19 vaccination mandates.
- [Appendix E](#) – This is an open letter from frontline healthcare workers in British Columbia to Dr. Bonnie Henry, Adrian Dix, and Premier John Horgan. The author(s) state their experiences and expertise are being ignored and ask that the vaccination mandates be revoked.
- [Appendix F](#) – This is a report from Dr. Tess Lawrie from the United Kingdom. Dr. Lawrie demonstrates the abnormal number of reported adverse effects from the current COVID-19 treatment injections.
- [Appendix G](#) – This is a comprehensive report comparing natural immunity to COVID-19 vs Vaccine-Induced Immunity. It was comprised from several scientists from Ontario and British Columbia.

CENSORSHIP

We are not against vaccinations, and we are trying to aid our country through this pandemic. We want to participate in a way that is safe for both our physical and mental well-being. We believe it is essential for people to participate with full informed consent by understanding all the risks of what they are being asked (or in this case forced) to participate in.

As experienced police officers, we have become accustomed to the media portraying us negatively or experienced the media misrepresenting the outcome of a police incident. It would



be little to no surprise for us to hear that a media agency misreported an incident. However, it was surprising for us to learn that several of these scientists and doctors, who questioned the information fueling the COVID-19 treatment mandates, also spoke of censorship²⁵⁻²⁷.

As experienced investigators, we know it is our responsibility to present all available facts to the public – by proxy of the courts. It is not our place to decide what the outcome of an investigation should be. Our job is to collect all available facts so that the public (the courts) can make an informed decision. We have learned from past mistakes that presenting evidence that only supports one side, while ignoring or refusing to acknowledge evidence from another side, is wrong and tarnishes an investigation. We cannot provide evidence from witnesses who agree on one story while ignoring or hiding the witnesses who agree on a different account of an incident.

It would be unthinkable that RCMP members would blatantly disregard witnesses in an investigation to mislead the courts. The investigation would lose all integrity and the members would be criticized. Why then are we allowing this same behaviour to occur by other public figures? There are accredited medical professionals from our own country who are desperately trying to have their findings heard. Instead of allowing these professionals to speak freely and discuss their results publicly, they are being silenced by governing bodies²⁵⁻²⁷.

Our experience in law enforcement and as investigators have allowed us to see how crucial it is that these professionals be allowed to speak openly and publicly. Without the information being included in discussions, we believe the citizens of Canada (including RCMP members) are not receiving the information they need to make an informed decision. This is contrary to our laws and beliefs, and we do not support it.

These medical professionals have tried to stand up and support their country. We are now standing up and supporting them. They must be allowed to share their information publicly to maintain people's faith in the government. If the people believe the government is continuing to censor experts, the country will fall into instability. This is common around the world in countries whose tyrannical governments censor information from their people.

DISCRIMINATION

We strongly oppose the discrimination that has already begun to create segregation in our country. It has divided families, ended friendships, torn apart spouses, and entered the RCMP workplace. We believe the current messaging being put out by our provincial and federal governments is promoting the creation of an in-group referred to as "Vaccinated" and an out-group as "Unvaccinated". Even worse, the out-group has been labelled "Anti-vaxxers," a term used out of context in a negative and derogatory way. The messaging from our governments is



causing the dehumanization of the “Unvaccinated” group. By dehumanizing the out-group, an institution creates a greater divide between them and the in-group.²⁸

Police agencies across Canada pride themselves in their efforts to hire officers reflective of the communities they serve. This allows community members to relate to their officers and see them as part of the community. We are representatives of our communities within the RCMP and representatives of the RCMP in our communities. Having a police force consisting only of “vaccinated” people while serving communities consisting of “unvaccinated” people will tear down some of the similarities RCMP members share with their communities. This will create a greater sense of “Us versus Them” between communities and police, which contradicts the community policing model the RCMP has strived to achieve for decades. We anticipate that unless this is corrected soon, it will continue to increase the divide in our country.

Dehumanizing individuals is challenging. It is easier to attach a label and stigma to a group. That way, anyone or anything that comes from the group can be written off²⁸. The term “Anti-vaxxer” is currently being used to mislabel and group people into a category to take away their credibility. This has allowed things to be written and said against this group that would be intolerable if written or said about any other group.

On August 26th, 2021, the Toronto Star ran an article that read in large bold letters, “I have no empathy left for the willfully unvaccinated. Let them die. I honestly don’t care if they die from COVID. Not even a little bit. Unvaccinated patients do not deserve ICU beds. At this point, who cares. Stick the unvaccinated in a tent outside and tend to them when the staff has time.^{29,30}” If “willfully unvaccinated” was replaced with “Black”, “Gay”, or “willfully Muslim”, this would have been labelled a Hate Crime. How then can we allow such things to be said about people who choose not to receive a medical intervention? Should we allow the same messaging for those who choose not to get a flu shot one season?

The boldness of this statement being printed in a major newspaper shows how acceptable it is in our society to treat people as a lower class of citizens. As RCMP members, we must preserve peace in our communities and put a stop to this.

PHYSICAL AND MENTAL HEALTH

This pandemic has increasingly made people feel isolated from their friends, families, and peers. RCMP members already face higher levels of stress and mental illnesses due to the nature of our work. Members affected by the double-vaccination mandate have faced greater stress and isolation as they have watched their status as citizens and regular members begin to diminish. There is currently insufficient support for these members, and there does not seem to be a plan in sight to provide adequate support.



The recent vaccination update has left some people feeling more isolated than ever. In times like this, people need support from a community, and our membership is no different. We fear there are more members afraid to speak up about these recent updates for fear of being targeted. Many members may be trying to stick this out on their own, or worse, suffering in silence. We ask that you attempt to reach out in partnership with the NPF to all members who may be negatively affected by these mandates and let them know their employer and governments support them.

Though most people seem to have little to no side effects from the COVID-19 treatment injections, an abnormal number of moderate to severe adverse reactions have included death³¹. What assurances are we given that the injections will not cause short or long-term side effects? Studies show that stress and sleep can play a huge factor in whether a vaccine is effective or not^{32,33}. Are you ensuring RCMP members are provided with the appropriate amount of rest before an injection? What steps will the RCMP take to ensure members are compensated for adverse side effects?

We also believe enough evidence has been presented to question whether our governments' actions in this pandemic are the most appropriate. This is causing moral and ethical stressors for some members as they no longer believe their role as police officers is reflective of the democracy Canada claims to be. Mental health and stress levels will have an impact on how members interact with the public.

PARALLELING DOMESTIC VIOLENCE

The RCMP has taught us the importance and severity of domestic violence. Domestic violence is centred around power and control between an abuser and a victim. One of the biggest problems with domestic violence is there is often an escalation in the severity of abuse. RCMP members have been taught how to identify the signs that someone is involved in an abusive relationship. There are different types of abuse the abuser may engage in to keep control over their victim: Physical, Financial, and Emotional.

Emotional abuse is quite complex and will often include a variety of tactics such as socially distancing the victim from friends and family, discrediting the victim so they have difficulty obtaining support from others, and making the victim believe that their thoughts and beliefs are wrong – to the point the victim thinks they must be insane. When it comes to finances, an abuser will withhold money and assets from the victim. This ensures the victim cannot survive without remaining in the abusive relationship with the abuser. When an abuser feels they are losing control over their victim, it is quite common for them to escalate their tactics to maintain control.



The federal government is currently displaying several of those traits with its own employees, including the RCMP³⁴.

Commissioner Lucki, we understand your position is appointed, and we are concerned that you too may be subject to a similar relationship with the Prime Minister. Though you, as our top Mountie, should be impartial, you may be forced into supporting some of these actions out of duress. We ask that you do what we ask our domestic violence victims to do – to take a stand against the abuser. This country needs strong and supportive people in positions of authority. Please show Canadians that the RCMP will remain impartial to political agendas and true to the Charter and our Bill of Rights.

PUBLIC INTEREST

Lastly, we want to draw attention to the public safety issues that will arise if these COVID-19 mandates are upheld.

Pierre Elliot Trudeau once said, “There’s no place for the state in the bedrooms of the nation.”³⁵ How is it our federal government is now saying it will be mandatory for employees working from home to receive the COVID-19 treatment injections?³⁶

Regardless of their vaccination statuses, there are RCMP members who feel the steps taken by the federal and provincial governments are too extreme and do not have the best interest of Canadian citizens. Forcing these mandates will cause several RCMP officers to lose faith in the federal government’s commitment to the Charter. These RCMP officers will not participate in actions they believe contradict their morals, ethics, and Canadian laws. These RCMP officers believe it is their responsibility to challenge the federal government in court if necessary.

The RCMP, which is already understaffed, will have additional gaps to fill across the country when these members are not working. Communities will have lost healthy and experienced officers, causing a decrease in available resources. There will also be an increase in taxpayers’ spending as the federal government attempts to fill these gaps. Being short-staffed will have a trickle-down effect causing fewer RCMP bodies to be available to properly recruit, assess, and conduct adequate background checks on potential cadets.

Our experience in law enforcement and as investigators have allowed us to see how crucial it is that professionals be allowed to speak openly and publicly. Without including their information in discussions, we believe the citizens of Canada (including RCMP members) are not receiving the information they need to make an informed decision. This is contrary to our laws and beliefs, and we do not support it.



We want to reiterate a point stated earlier in this letter, so it is remembered. If the people believe the government is continuing to censor experts, the country will fall into instability. We are experts in law enforcement and investigations. We are losing faith in the motives of our government, and we will not willingly participate in actions against people whose Charter rights and freedoms are being violated.

CALL TO ACTION

Commissioner Lucki, we ask that you represent the best image of the RCMP by remaining loyal to the Charter and Bill of Rights and not to any particular public figure. Our job as Mounties is to preserve the peace. If we continue down this road of segregation and discrimination, we risk repeating past mistakes. The divide in our society is quickly leaning toward a level of national security. We ask that you open an investigation to ensure no criminal acts were committed in the dissemination of information from federal and provincial health authorities or public figures in positions of trust. We ask you to send investigators to collect statements from medical professionals (and other reliable witnesses) who allege they had been silenced – putting lives at risk. Allow us to make this information publicly available to all so the public can scrutinize it and achieve informed consent. As Canada's national police force, we are unique in our ability to conduct a large-scale cross-country investigation, which must be transparent to regain trust in the government.

We also ask that you challenge the Federal Government's decision to send Mounties home without pay for decisions they've made on beliefs protected by Canadian laws. Neither the RCMP, nor the communities they serve, can endure the loss of experienced police officers.

We await your response and your plan of action.

Respectfully,

Mounties for Freedom

cc.

The Honourable Bill Blair, Minister of Public Safety and Emergency Preparedness
The Honourable Jean-Yves Duclos, President of the Treasury Board of Canada
Brian Sauvé, President of the National Police Federation





END NOTES

1. Connolly, Amanda, “Notice Offering Options for Federal Workers Who Refuse Vaccines Was ‘Erroneous’: Trudeau,” Global News (2021). Accessed September 30, 2021, <https://globalnews.ca/news/8118913/canada-mandatory-vaccines-federal-workers/>.
2. Government of Canada, “Duties,” Royal Canadian Mounted Police Act (R.S.C., 1985, c. R-10). Accessed October 19, 2021, <https://laws-lois.justice.gc.ca/eng/acts/r-10/page-3.html>.
3. ———. “Learn about the Charter,” Accessed October 19, 2021. <https://www.justice.gc.ca/eng/csjsjc/rfc-dlc/ccrf-ccdl/learn-apprend.html>.
4. ———. “Bill of Rights,” Canadian Bill of Rights (S.C. 1960, c. 44). Accessed October 19, 2021. <https://laws-lois.justice.gc.ca/eng/acts/c-12.3/page-1.html>.
5. Ibid.
6. Public Health Agency of Canada, “Canadian National Report on Immunization – 1996,” Accessed October 19, 2021, https://web.archive.org/web/20080414131846/http://www.phacaspc.gc.ca/publicat/ccd_r-rmtc/97vol23/23s4/23s4b_e.html
7. Government of Canada, “Guide to the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms – Section 2,” Accessed October 19, 2021, <https://www.canada.ca/en/canadian-heritage/services/how-rightsprotected/guide-canadian-charter-rights-freedoms.html#a2b>.
8. National Institutes of Health, “The Nuremberg Code,” Accessed September 30, 2021, <https://history.nih.gov/display/history/Nuremberg+Code>.
9. Canadian Covid Care Alliance, “Canadian Covid Care Alliance Declaration,” (September 24, 2021), p. 18, par. 3. [Appendix B](#).
10. Payne, Eric, “RE: Mandatory mRNA Vaccine Mandate for Alberta Physicians,” (September 14, 2021), p. 1, par 1. [Appendix A](#).
11. Centers for Disease and Control Prevention, “Immunization: The Basics,” Accessed October 19, 2021, <https://www.cdc.gov/vaccines/vac-gen/imz-basics.htm>.
12. Government of Canada, “Assault,” Criminal Code (R.S.C., 1985, c. C-46), S. 265 (1)(a). Accessed October 20, 2021, <https://laws-lois.justice.gc.ca/eng/acts/c-46/FullText.html>.
13. ———. “Assault,” Criminal Code (R.S.C., 1985, c. C-46), S. 265 (3)(d). Accessed October 20, 2021, <https://laws-lois.justice.gc.ca/eng/acts/c-46/FullText.html>.
14. Supreme Court of Canada, “Hopp v. Lepp,” 1980 CanLII 14 (SCC), [1980] 2 SCR 192. Accessed October 20, 2021, <https://www.canlii.org/en/ca/scc/doc/1980/1980canlii14/1980canlii14.html>.
15. Bryson, Bill, *The Body*, narrated by Bill Bryson (New York, NY: Random House Audio, 2019), Audible audio ed., 14 hrs., 4 min.



MOUNTIES FOR FREEDOM

16. Ibid.
17. Encyclopedia.com, "Phrenology in Nineteenth-Century Britain and America," Accessed October 19, 2021, <https://www.encyclopedia.com/science/encyclopedias-almanacs-transcripts-andmaps/phrenology-nineteenth-century-britain-and-america>.
18. Canadian Covid Care Alliance, "Canadian Covid Care Alliance Declaration," (September 24, 2021), p. 2, par. 1. [Appendix B](#).
19. Dolan, Mark, and Lawrie, Tess, "16 July 2021," YouTube, July 16, 2021, Interview, 14:56 min. Accessed on October 19, 2021, <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=PgsXVe9IXco&t=2s>.
20. Lawrie, Tess, "RE: Urgent preliminary report of Yellow Card data up to 26th May 2021," (June 9, 2021), p. 6, par. 4. [Appendix F](#).
21. Bridle, Byram, "COVID-19 Vaccines and Children: A Scientist's Guide for Parents," (June 15, 2021), p. 2, par. 2. Accessed October 20, 2020, https://www.canadiancovidcarealliance.org/wpcontent/uploads/2021/06/2021-06-15-children_and_covid-19_vaccines_full_guide.pdf.
22. Canadian Covid Care Alliance, "Canadian Covid Care Alliance Declaration," (September 24, 2021), p. 2-3. [Appendix B](#).
23. Bridle, Byram, "An Open Letter to the President of the University of Guelph," (September 17, 2021), p. 2. [Appendix C](#).
24. Mallard, Bonnie, et al., "Which is better for future COVID-19 prevention: Immunity Following Natural Infection or Vaccine-Induced Immunity?" (October 8, 2021), p. 2, par. 3. [Appendix G](#).
25. Payne, Eric, "RE: Mandatory mRNA Vaccine Mandate for Alberta Physicians," (September 14, 2021), p. 1-14. [Appendix A](#).
26. Dzsurdzsa, Cosmin, "Derek Sloan Hosts Press Conference with Censored Doctors," True North News. Accessed October 20, <https://tnc.news/2021/06/17/derek-sloan-hosts-press-conference-withcensored-doctors/>.
27. Sloan, Derek, "Censorship in Canada," Vimeo, June 17, 2021, CPAC Parliamentary Press Conference, 3:15. Accessed on October 20, 2021, <https://standupcanada.solutions/censorship-in-canada>.
28. Wilkerson, Isabel, Caste, narrated by Robin Miles (New York, NY: Random House Audio, 2020), Audible audio ed., 14 hrs., 26 min.
29. Slapinski, Mark, "'Hate Speech': The Toronto Star Slammed for Headline Wishing Death on the Unvaccinated," Toronto 99. Accessed October 20, 2021, <https://www.toronto99.com/2021/08/26/hate-speech-the-toronto-star-slammed-for-headlinewishing-death-on-the-unvaccinated/>.



MOUNTIES FOR FREEDOM

30. Bridle, Byram, “An Open Letter to the President of the University of Guelph,” (September 17, 2021), p. 5. Appendix C.
31. Dolan, Mark, and Lawrie, Tess, “16 July 2021,” YouTube, July 16, 2021, Interview, 14:56 min. Accessed on October 20, 2021, <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=PgsXVe9IXco&t=2s>.
32. Walker, Matthew, *Why We Sleep*, narrated by Steve West (New York, NY: Simon and Schuster Audio, 2017), Audible audio ed., 13 hrs., 52 min.
33. Ibid.
34. Sauv , Brian, “Members who do not complete an attestation to being fully vaccinated can expect to be put on administrative Leave Without Pay,” National Police Federation (October 7, 2021). Email broadcast to NPF members.
35. CBC Archives, “Trudeau: There’s no place for the state in the bedrooms of the nation,” CBC News (1967). Accessed October 20, 2021, <https://www.cbc.ca/archives/entry/omnibus-bill-theres-noplace-for-the-state-in-the-bedrooms-of-the-nation>.
36. Johnson, Gail, “Declare Your Covid-19 Vaccination Status,” RCMP NOC News. Email broadcast to RCMP members.