

LEGAL CASES AND RELATED DOCUMENTS FOR VSB LEGAL ACTION

- Helen Ward 604-291-0088

I - SCC CASES

II - OTHER COURTS

III - POLICY & LAWS

IV- INTERNATIONAL HR AGREEMENTS

V - ARTICLES

*HW NOTE - indicates my own comments

I - SUPREME COURT OF CANADA CASES

1 - R. v. Audet 1996

[https://scc-csc.lexum.com/scc-csc/scc-csc/en/item/1387/index.do?](https://scc-csc.lexum.com/scc-csc/scc-csc/en/item/1387/index.do?r=AAAAAQAFYXVkJXQAAAAAAQ)

[r=AAAAAQAFYXVkJXQAAAAAAQ](https://scc-csc.lexum.com/scc-csc/scc-csc/en/item/1387/index.do?r=AAAAAQAFYXVkJXQAAAAAAQ)

14 yr old girl had consensual sex with a teacher during summer vacation.

Para 41 - (paraphrase) **“parents delegate”** to teachers, “entrust” children to teachers

2 - A.C. v. Manitoba (Director of Child and Family Services) 2009

<http://scc-csc.lexum.com/scc-csc/scc-csc/en/item/7795/index.do>

Minor had been taken by child services and given blood transfusion against her wishes. 14 yr old Jehovah’s Witness girl was assessed by court for her maturity and understanding of long term implications of refusing blood transfusions. Court ruled state was ok to force the transfusion in this extreme case but was required to consult her. Her maturity needed to be assessed and her opinion was to be taken into consideration but was not to be the deciding factor - state had ignored this. Cost to be paid by gov’t.

3 - 1995 B. (R.) v. Children's Aid Society of Metropolitan Toronto

<http://scc-csc.lexum.com/scc-csc/scc-csc/en/item/1220/index.do>

Infant of Jehovah’s witness was taken by child services and given blood transfusion. Court stated that “liberty” in section 7 of Charter includes parental rights, but the extremity of this situation merited a very brief stint in protective state care.

“The right to nurture a child, to care for its development, and to make decisions for it in fundamental matters such as medical care, are part of the liberty interest of a parent. The common law has long recognized that **parents are in the best position to take care of their children and make all the decisions necessary to ensure their well-being.** This recognition was based on the presumption that parents act in the best interest of their child. Although the philosophy underlying state intervention has changed over time, most contemporary statutes page 318

dealing with child protection matters, and in particular the Ontario Act, while focusing on **the best interest of the child, favour minimal intervention.** In recent years, **courts have expressed some reluctance to interfere with parental rights, and state intervention has been tolerated only when necessity was demonstrated, thereby confirming that the parental interest in bringing up, nurturing and caring for a child, including medical care and moral upbringing, is an individual interest of fundamental importance to our society.”**

4 - Kimberly Nixon v. Vancouver Rape Relief Society - and - British Columbia Human Rights Tribunal

<http://scc-csc.lexum.com/scc-csc/scc-l-csc-a/en/item/11008/index.do>

SCC refused the appeal upholding BC Crt of Appeal decision.

<http://www.canlii.org/en/bc/bcca/doc/2005/2005bcca601/2005bcca601.html>

A genetic male trans person sought to be a volunteer at the Rape Crisis Centre. VRR has a “woman-only” and “woman-only space” policy and refused. VRR’s **right as a non-profit charitable org to DEFINE what “woman” is was upheld**. VRR defines “woman” for their programs as someone who has the life experience of growing up and being female.

5 - R v Jones 1986

<http://scc-csc.lexum.com/scc-csc/scc-csc/en/item/165/index.do>

An Alberta preacher was educating his own and other children at his church and had not tried to certify the ‘school’ as required saying he did not acknowledge authority of state before God, and that the authorities would not consider an application for certification by him fairly as they did not have to follow court-like process.

Court ruled the state has a legitimate interest in the education of children and the requirement to certify the school was reasonable and not an infringement of religious freedom, and that”

“The court would no doubt intervene if, in exercising their functions, the school authorities sought to impose arbitrary standards or if they, in other respects, acted in a manner that was fundamentally unfair. Such would be the case with the imposition of standards extraneous to educational policy under the Act or with a failure to examine the facts or to fairly consider the appellant’s representations. »

6 - Amselem [HW NOTE: DEFINITION OF FREEDOM OF RELIGION]

<http://scc-csc.lexum.com/scc-csc/scc-csc/en/item/2161/index.do>

Jewish residents of a condominium/apartment wanted to put up ‘succoth’/tents on their balconies for a religious festival. Freedom of religion defined: “sincerely held belief” with “nexus to religion, to divine”, court should not inquire about “religious dogma”, Court only to determine individual’s sincerity of belief and related practice regardless of specific sect’s rules. Courts said allowing tents was required to accommodate religious freedom.

7 - Canadian Foundation for Children, Youth and the Law v. Canada (Attorney General) 2004

<http://scc-csc.lexum.com/scc-csc/scc-csc/en/item/2115/index.do>

Child protective services sought to revoke the provision in the criminal code that allows for ‘spanking’. Court rejected the effort, saying it would create excessive interference by the state in the family sphere, but established limits to ‘spanking’ (age, method).

8 - Chamberlain v Surrey School District

<http://scc-csc.lexum.com/scc-csc/scc-csc/en/item/2030/index.do>

James Chamberlain, kindergarten teacher, sought permission to have 3 books which portrayed same sex couples as ‘resources’ that could be optionally used in schools.

Court ruled that “highest morality” in BC School Act means “the Charter”, and that “secular” in the BC School Act means (paraphrase) “no preferential treatment for any worldview/sect” and that (paraphrase) “religiously informed belief/opinion could not be excluded from public debate.” Court ruled the Surrey School Board had erred in applying its’ policies and had not considered **“ALL”** families as required by School Act (or board policy?) in its decision to reject the books and asked the School Board to re-do their decision using proper interpretation. “The *School Act*’s insistence on secularism and nondiscrimination lies at the heart of this case. The Act’s **requirement of secularism in s. 76 does not preclude decisions motivated in whole or in part by religious considerations**, provided they are otherwise within the Board’s powers. But the Board must act in a way that promotes respect and tolerance for **all the diverse groups** that it represents and serves.

The Board's decision is unreasonable because the process through which it was made took the Board outside its mandate under the *School Act*. First, the Board violated the principles of secularism and tolerance in s. 76 of the Act. Instead of proceeding on the basis of **respect for all types of families**, the Board proceeded on an **exclusionary philosophy**, acting on the concern of certain parents about the morality of same-sex relationships, without considering the interest of same-sex parented families and the children who belong to them in receiving **equal recognition and respect in the school system**. Second, the Board departed from its own regulation with respect to how decisions on supplementary resources should be made, which required it to consider the relevance of the proposed material to curriculum objectives and the needs of children of same-sex parented families. Third, the Board applied the wrong criteria. It failed to consider the curriculum's goal that children at the K1 level be able to discuss their family models [this is not now in the BC K curriculum], and that all children be made aware of the diversity of family models in our society. Instead, the Board applied a criterion of necessity, which was inconsistent with the function of supplementary resources in enriching children's experience through the use of extra materials of local relevance. The Board erred in relying on concerns about cognitive dissonance and age-appropriateness which were **foreclosed by the curriculum** in this case. In the result, the question of whether to approve the books is remanded to the Board.'''

“The Board was authorized to approve or not to approve books for classroom use. But its authority is limited by the requirements in s. 76 of the *School Act* to conduct schools on “strictly secular and nonsectarian principles” and to inculcate “the highest morality” while avoiding the teaching of any “religious dogma or creed”. **The words “secular” and “nonsectarian” in the Act imply that no single conception of morality can be allowed to deny or exclude opposed points of view.** Disagreement with the practices and beliefs of others, while certainly permissible and perhaps inevitable in a pluralist society, does not justify denying others the opportunity for their views to be represented, or refusing to acknowledge their existence. Whatever the personal views of the Board members might have been, their responsibility to carry out their public duties in accordance with strictly secular and nonsectarian principles included an obligation to **avoid making policy decisions on the basis of exclusionary beliefs.** Section 76 does not prohibit decisions about schools governance that are informed by religious belief. **The section is aimed at fostering tolerance and diversity of views, not at shutting religion out of the arena.** It does not limit in any way the freedom of parents and Board members to adhere to a religious doctrine that condemns homosexuality but it does **prohibit the translation of such doctrine into policy decisions by the Board, to the extent that they reflect a denial of the validity of other points of view.**”

HW NOTE:

a - the right to home school and private school is not provided with equal funding. This impacts their “substantive equality” and autonomy, and inhibits their freedom of belief, religion, association, assembly, expression.

“120 What of the interaction between what is parentally determined to be in the “best interests” of their children and the *Charter*? In *Young, supra*, L’Heureux-Dubé J. stated that custodial **parents have a duty to ensure, protect and promote the “best interests” of their children.** **With regard to the content of that duty, L’Heureux-Dubé J. claimed, at p. 38: “That duty includes the sole and primary responsibility to oversee all aspects of day to day life and long-term well-being, as well as major decisions with regard to education, religion, health and well-being.”** This is consonant with the more general discussion above about the privileged parental role in the upbringing of their children, whether rooted in [ss. 2\(a\)](#) or [7](#) of the *Charter*.”

9 - Moore v BC Education 2012

<http://scc-csc.lexum.com/scc-csc/scc-csc/en/item/12680/index.do>

<http://www.ccdonline.ca/en/humanrights/litigation/Moore-Case-Key-Findings-9Nov2012>

Boy with learning disability had his special public school educ program cut and went to private school. Importance of equal opportunity for “ALL” students stressed. Huge costs incurred to gov to address disability needs.

“Adequate special education is not a dispensable luxury,” Judge Abella said for a 9-0 majority. “For those with severe learning disabilities, it is the ramp that provides access to the statutory commitment to education made to all children in British Columbia.”

10 - Ross v. New Brunswick School District No. 15

<http://scc-csc.lexum.com/scc-csc/scc-csc/en/item/1367/index.do>

A teacher made very public anti-Semitic comments in his off duty time. This went to court and to judicial review. **“Poisoned” school environment** was issue and how to deal with it. SCC upheld his being fired or given non-teaching position but not permanent ban.

“a reasonable inference is sufficient in this case to support a finding that R's continued employment impaired the educational environment generally in creating the "poisoned" environment. R's offduty conduct impacted upon the educational environment in which he taught. . R's offduty conduct impacted upon the educational environment in which he taught. **Public school teachers assume a position of influence and trust over their students and must be seen to be impartial and tolerant. By their conduct, teachers, as "medium" of the educational message (the values, beliefs and knowledge sought to be transmitted by the school system), must be perceived as upholding that message. A teacher's conduct is evaluated on the basis of his or her position, rather than whether the conduct occurs within or outside the classroom. A school board has a duty to maintain a positive school environment for all persons served by it and it must be ever vigilant of anything that might interfere with this duty.** It is not sufficient for a school board to take a passive role. Here, the Board found that **the School Board failed to maintain a positive environment** and concluded that the School Board had discriminated in its failure to take a **proactive approach to the controversy surrounding R, thus suggesting the acceptance of R's views and of a discriminatory learning environment.**

... This involves a close attention to context. Here, the educational context must be considered when **balancing R's freedom to make discriminatory statements against the right of the children in the School Board to be educated in a school system that is free from bias, prejudice and intolerance; relevant to this particular context is the vulnerability of young children to messages conveyed by their teachers.** The employment context is also relevant to the extent that the state, as employer, has a duty to ensure that the fulfilment of public functions is undertaken in a manner **that does not undermine public trust and confidence.** Teachers are also employees of a school board and a **teacher's freedoms must be balanced** against the school board's right to operate according to its own mandate. The anti-Semitism context is relevant as well because the Board's order was made to remedy the discrimination within the public school system that targeted Jews. In its order, the Board balanced R's freedoms against the ability of the School Board to provide a discriminationfree environment and against the interests of Jewish students; it may therefore be entitled to greater deference. An attenuated level of s. 1 justification is appropriate in this case in light of the nature of the rights allegedly infringed by the order. The expression sought to be protected is at best tenuously connected to the core values of freedom of expression. R's religious belief, which denigrates and defames the religious beliefs of others, erodes the very basis

of the guarantee in [s. 2 \(a\)](#) of the [Charter](#). **R's religious views serve to deny Jews respect for dignity and equality.**

... While the evidence did not establish a direct link between the poisoned educational environment and R's anti-Semitic views, it is sufficient that the **Board found it "reasonable to anticipate" that there was a causal relationship between R's conduct and the harm.** R's removal from his teaching position was thus necessary to ensure that **no influence of this kind is exerted by him upon his students and to ensure that the educational services are discrimination-free.**"

HW NOTE: "Harm" evidence is in the thousands of students avoiding public schools, and the parents' opposition. This shows "eroded trust". Many teachers and politicians etc are taking a public stand highly critical of some parents'/children's beliefs. This shows "bias" in the system.

11 - Board of School Trustees of School District No. 44 (North Vancouver) v. Jubran

and BC HRT 2005

<http://scc-csc.lexum.com/scc-csc/scc-l-csc-a/en/item/12398/index.do>

Appeal dismissed with costs to Jubran.

BC Court of Appeal Jubran case

<http://www.canlii.org/en/bc/bcca/doc/2005/2005bcca201/2005bcca201.html>

Jubran was bullied for 5 years in high school including anti-homosexual slurs though neither he nor his bullies identified him as homosexual. Jubran criminally assaulted one attacker in school. School dealt with bullies but more would always appear. BC HRT said **School District was responsible for harassment/discrimination-free environment.** Schools became legally required to 'cover their legal asses' with 'codes of conduct' and 'programs' that feature BC Human rights code categories. Supreme Ct of BC said no because he was not actually homosexual, Appeal Court upheld BC HRT. SCC upheld Appeal crt.

HW NOTE:

a - Schools can do **REASONABLE MEASURES** to keep students safe but in the end **REASONABLE MEASURES ARE INSUFFICIENT** and **CANNOT GUARANTEE SAFETY OF STUDENT IN OR OUT OF SCHOOL** - esp with **CYBER BULLYING**, allergies, disabilities and mental health issues.

Yet students have the right to security of person. **NEED MORE WAYS TO ACCOMMODATE THIS RIGHT.** The **School environment itself create the conditions of vulnerability to attack.**

b - BC HR Code does not cover many 'categories' that students are attacked/harassed with: 'slut', 'douche bag', 'jerk', 'idiot', 'ugly', 'loser', 'stupid', overweight/underweight, etc. Thus some kids are not protected.

c - Privacy Rights: students should not have to discuss/disclose their own or their family members' sexual/gender issues /identity or any other information to get protection from bullying.

d - Schools protect themselves from legal action by following these measures **BUT** students are not protected. Out of school and cyber-bullying are not schools' legal concern.

e - The inability of schools to admit their inability to protect students, and their lack of provision for accommodation to address, and their passive acceptance of forced attendance in the face of bullying and unsafety demonstrates that **THIS IS NOT ABOUT SAFETY OF STUDENTS.**

f - Does anyone know or care about what actually happened to Azmi Jubran? Where/how is he

now? Why did no one allow him to stay out of school and have alternate delivery /accommodation? Did anyone tell his parents about home schooling options? Funding?

II - OTHER COURTS

1 - Chris Kempling v BCCT

<http://www.courts.gov.bc.ca/jdb-txt/ca/05/03/2005bccca0327err1.htm>

SCC denied application to appeal. Teacher/counsellor was reprimanded by BCCT for his statements critical of 'homosexuality' in media which was found to be "stereotypical." He fought based on freedom of expression and religion. Court said issue was importance of "**ensuring a tolerant and discrimination-free environment, and restoring and upholding the integrity of the school system.**"^[11] The Court determined that, as Kempling had not introduced evidence to identify his religion or establish its tenets, no violation of his right to freedom of religion could be established.

HW NOTE: The importance of a PUBLIC CONFIDENCE IN the PUB SCHOOL SYSTEM and non-DISRUPTED, INCLUSIVE SCHOOL ENVIRONMENT IS PARAMOUNT.

"Para 3 - ...*Ross v. New Brunswick School District No. 15*, [1996] 1 S.C.R. 825 at para. 44, as indicative of the consequences to be inferred:

The reason why **off-the-job conduct may amount to misconduct is that a teacher holds a position of trust, confidence and responsibility.** If he or she acts in an improper way, on or off the job, there may be a **loss of public confidence in the teacher and in the public school system, a loss of respect by students for the teacher involved,** and other teachers generally, and there may be controversy within the school and within the community which disrupts the proper carrying on of the education system."

2 - BCTF v BCPSEA 2013

<http://www.bcpsea.bc.ca/documents/Publications-@Issue/2013%20BCCA%20241%20British%20Columbia%20Teachers%20Federation%20v%20%20British%20Columbia%20%20%20%20.pdf>

Appeal Crt ruled that it is OK for teachers to distribute BCTF political policy materials in parent-teacher interviews, post BCTF posters at school, and wear BCTF slogan buttons - these actions are allowable under CHARTER freedom of expression and do not compromise education BUT there is a need to further define or limit this freedom in future court cases so that EDUCATIONAL ENVIRONMENT is not harmed. The right of students to be educated in an environment FREE FROM BIAS was at issue.

*HW NOTE: It did this because it made an inappropriate analogy using a case related to advertising in elections: more-or-less equally powerful/well-funded groups were able to mount that legal challenge. Now teachers are emboldened to discuss BCTF positions and issues with students in class time (eg about the job action 2010-2011 and strike 2014) in elementary and high school.

63 - "I see no reason why **students should receive less protection from the monopolization of the discourse of a societal issue than adults** who are subjected to a flood of discourse on an electoral issue by proponents of one side to that issue. In the **case of the students, the monopolization on the issue may deprive them of their right to be educated in a school system that is free from bias.**"

HW NOTE: the decision took no account of the POWER IMBALANCE between teachers and students and parents, ie that teachers have recourse to Union and professional org protection and funding for legal cases and their clients do not. Therefore quasi- “monopolization” is quite easy to effect.

Judge cited:

“[57] In *Ross v. New Brunswick School District No. 15*, [1996] 1 S.C.R. 825, Mr. Justice La Forest described a school at 856 – 857 as:

... a **communication centre for a whole range of values** and aspirations of a society. In large part, it defines the values that transcend society through the educational medium. The school is an arena for the exchange of ideas and must, therefore, be premised upon principles of tolerance and impartiality so that **all persons within the school environment feel equally free to participate**. As the Board of Inquiry stated, a school board has a duty to **maintain a positive** school environment for **all** persons served by it.”

HW NOTE “FEEL EQUALLY FREE”; “FEEL”, “ALL”: all students (and parents) do not feel equally free, despite the rules that indicate that they are ‘equal’. This is why many leave the public school system at very significant cost.

“[58] One cannot argue with the proposition that open communication and debate about public, political issues is a hallmark of the free and democratic society that the *Charter* is designed to protect. But at 874 Mr. Justice La Forest also described:

... the right of the children in the **School Board “to be educated in a school system that is free from bias, prejudice and intolerance”**, a right that is underscored by s. 5(1) of the [*Human Rights Act*, R.S.N.B. 1973, c. H-11] and entrenched in s. 15 of the *Charter*. [Emphasis added.]”

3 - British Columbia Teachers’ Federation v. British Columbia, 2014

BCTF went to BC Appeal Court over contract issues and based argument successfully on Charter FREEDOM OF ASSOCIATION.

<http://www.bcpsea.bc.ca/documents/Publications-@Issue/2013%20BCCA%20241%20British%20Columbia%20Teachers%20Federation%20v%20%20British%20Columbia%20%20%20%20.pdf>

HW NOTE: The BCTF and BCPSEA have huge financial resources to fight legal battles unlike parents and students (education system clients). There is almost no “freedom of association” in public schools for clients.

III - OTHER POLICY & LAWS

1 - STATISTICS CANADA

Does not allow minors to participate or be involved in surveys or studies (eg teacher responses about students) without written parental consent. Does not allow “passive consent” for data collection and research as BC does. (I have an email from Stats Can explaining this.)

2 - INFANT's ACT BC - Mature Minor consent|

http://www.bclaws.ca/civix/document/id/complete/statreg/96223_01#section17

Consent of infant to medical treatment

17 (1) In this section:

"health care" means anything that is done for a therapeutic, preventive, palliative, diagnostic, cosmetic or other health related purpose, and includes a course of health care;

HW NOTE: this is so broadly defined it is nearly all inclusive.

"health care provider" includes a person licensed, certified or registered in British Columbia to provide health care.

HW NOTE: overly broadly defined esp due to above def of "health care".

(2) Subject to subsection (3), an infant may consent to health care whether or not that health care would, in the absence of consent, constitute a trespass to the infant's person, and if **an infant provides that consent, the consent is effective and it is not necessary to obtain a consent to the health care from the infant's parent or guardian.**

(3) A request for or consent, agreement or acquiescence to health care by an infant does not constitute consent to the health care for the purposes of subsection (2) unless the health care provider providing the health care

(a) has **explained to the infant and has been satisfied that the infant understands the nature and consequences and the reasonably foreseeable benefits and risks of the health care,** and

(b) has made reasonable efforts to determine and has concluded that **the health care is in the infant's best interests.**

HW NOTE:

a - The societal impact - harm to parent/child family relationships - of empowering minors - ie with letting it be known that you can just ignore your parents and get what you want - needs to be considered. Reena Virk was murdered by peers who told her she could get her parents out of her life and get a foster parent.

b - There is a lack of 'checks and balances' in application of this policy. All manner of 'health' related personnel have noticed it and are very loosely interpreting it with no oversight, paperwork, vigilance, eg school counsellors - who are not 'health care providers'.

c - Parents cannot afford the time and cost of law suits and do not know the law.

d - In all the concern for children's consent and empowerment, minors' wishes are easily overruled by authorities when they want to.

e - the infants is not provided with follow up by the health care provider - ie - their name, contact info, info regarding how to take legal action if something goes wrong as a result of their 'consent'.

f - there is no requirement to document the infant's ability to understand and foresee, or even to obtain their signature. There is no minimum amount of time a health care provider must spend to ascertain the maturity and knowledge of the infant.

3 - BC CENTRE FOR DISEASE CONTROL VIDEO ON PROCEDURE to USE TO OBTAIN MATURE MINOR CONSENT in school vaccine programs

<http://www.bccdc.ca/imm->

[vac/ForHealthProfessionals/InformedConsentVideos/InformedConsentMatureMinor.htm](http://www.bccdc.ca/imm-vac/ForHealthProfessionals/InformedConsentVideos/InformedConsentMatureMinor.htm)

HW NOTE: this procedure is not being used though it is supposed to be. Health care providers do not take this much time to talk to infants in obtaining consent. They do not ask these questions. etc

4 - BC PARENTAL LIABILITY ACT

http://www.bclaws.ca/Recon/document/ID/freeside/00_01045_01

Parents have legal liability for their children's illegal behaviour.

ALL GOV'T TYPE CARE PROVIDERS ARE SPECIFICALLY EXEMPTED. See

"Definitions" - parent - 'does not include' - f

HW NOTE: Liability = responsibility = need authority. Only parents have legal liability for child so only parents have authority over upbringing, with only justifiable limits.

IV - INTERNATIONAL HUMAN RIGHTS AGREEMENTS

1 - Article 26 - 3 of the UN Declaration of Universal Human Rights: parents have a "PRIOR RIGHT" to choose their children's education.

2 - see attached version of the UN Convention on the Rights of the Child with my highlights of parent-right/duty related and parent-honouring articles.

3 - see Declaration on the Authority of Parents in Children's Education - see especially the "supplement" which quotes and LISTS INTERNATIONAL AGREEMENTS upholding parental authority over education.

<http://www.ccrl.ca/index.php?id=5197>

V - ARTICLES

1 - This article has helpful sections on **parents and children's rights** in Canada

lawjournal.mcgill.ca/userfiles/other/6662744-1224869620_Sykes.pdf

2 - BC School Counsellors Association - article: "Ethical Dilemmas: OBTAINING CONSENT FROM CHILDREN" Fall 2009

<http://www.nxtbook.com/nxtbooks/naylor/BCOT0309/index.php?startid=19#/18>

Alternate link - easy to read

<http://webcache.googleusercontent.com/search?q=cache:PfiZD->

[ebNjEJ:www.naylornetwork.com/bco-nwl/assets/ethical](http://www.naylornetwork.com/bco-nwl/assets/ethical)

[%2520dilemmas.pdf+%&cd=2&hl=en&ct=clnk&gl=ca&client=firefox-a](http://www.naylornetwork.com/bco-nwl/assets/ethical%2520dilemmas.pdf+%&cd=2&hl=en&ct=clnk&gl=ca&client=firefox-a)

"To my knowledge, **this has never been challenged in court, but I know there are cases where access to counselling services without parental knowledge has been an issue....**

Keep in mind that the above legal opinion applies to counsellors in

private practice. As school counsellors, we are governed by BCTF Code of ethics,

and our BCSCA code of ethics. **Best practice is to work with the child and family**

together, involving all stakeholders in the counselling process. **If that is not possible,**

for example, in cases of suicidal ideation, abuse or neglect, **most districts have**

protocols to follow regarding the steps to be taken **regarding informing administration and parents."**