Regional Municipality of Waterloo

*Addendum Special Council Agenda

Monday, July 6, 2020

Closed Session: 4:00 p.m.

Open Session: Immediately following closed.

This meeting will be held electronically

1. Moment of Silence

2. Roll Call

3. Motion to go into Closed Session

That a closed meeting of Council be held on Monday, July 6, 2020 at 4:00 p.m. electronically, in accordance with Section 239 of the Municipal Act, 2001, for the purposes of considering the following subject matters:

   a) receiving of advice subject to solicitor client privilege related to a by-law

4. Motion to Reconvene Into Open Session

5. Declarations of Pecuniary Interest under the “Municipal Conflict Of Interest Act”

6. Delegations

   a) Mark Stubbs, Kitchener
   b) Trevor Strauss, Waterloo
   c) Kristopher J. Wickens, Kitchener
   d) Marissa Heisel, Waterloo
   e) Taylor Junkin, Cambridge

Should you require an alternative format please contact the Regional Clerk at Tel.: 519-575-4400, TTY: 519-575-4605, or regionalclerk@regionofwaterloo.ca
f) Albert Daigen, Kitchener

g) Richard Evers, Waterloo

h) Duncan Clemens, Kitchener

i) Stephanie Walters, Cambridge

j) Frederick Roy, Cambridge

k) Alex Taylor, President and Josh Pascoe, Vice President, Austin Air Systems (Canada Inc)

l) Ian McLean, President & CEO and Art Sinclair, Vice President, Greater Kitchener Waterloo Chamber of Commerce

m) Iora Almedia, Cambridge

n) Tim Mollison, Waterloo

o) Franklin Ramsoomair, Waterloo

* p) Spenser Kuzub, Cambridge **delegation cancelled**

q) Tino Desideri, Whitby

* r) Andrew Dixon, Waterloo

* s) Jason Thistlethwaite, Waterloo

* t) Jan d’Ailly, Waterloo

* u) Rob Shirkey, Guelph

* v) Dr. Mark Cohen, Co-National Medical Director, CEO, Vision Group Canada (LASIK MD Waterloo and TLC Waterloo locations)

* w) Kashif Pirzada, Co-Chair, Masks For Canada

*x) Kimberly Gawne, Cambridge

7. Correspondence

a) City of Kitchener Mayor Berry Vrbanovic, re: Formal Request On the Mandatory Wearing of Masks

b) Karen Wilson, re: Mask Mandate in Public Places

c) Alison Coleman, re: Masks Should Not be Mandatory
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d) Rowena Martin, re: Biking With Masks  Page 15

e) Susan Schott, re: Vulnerable are at Risk in the Region  Page 16

f) William Calberry, re: Masks in Businesses  Page 17

g) Justin Sayers, re: Mandatory Mask Order Does Not Make Sense  Page 18

h) Joseph Hickey, PhD, Executive Director, Ontario Civil Libraries Association re: Mandatory face mask policies have no scientific basis, violate civil liberties, and must be rejected  Page 19

i) Christine Rogalsky, re: Masking Law  Page 30

j) Vanessa Ricci-Thode, re: Mask bylaw  Page 31

* k) Lori Mason, re: Civil rights  Page 46

* l) Ted Parkinson re: Wearing Masks  Page 46

* m) Andrew Kish re: July 6 2020 Mandatory Mask By-Law  Page 47

* n) Sharon MacKenzie, CHCI, Special Education Department Head, re: Support Mandatory Masks  Page 47

* o) Jamie & Karen Howieson, re: Mandatory Masks in the Region of Waterloo  Page 48

* p) Laura Ramsahai, re: Mandatory Masks please  Page 48

* q) Karen Andrews, re: say no to mandatory masks  Page 49

* r) Dawn Turai, re: Mandatory masks - yes please!  Page 50

* s) MaryLou and Milne Oakes, re: Face Masks  Page 50

* t) Joanna Nairn, re: In Support of Mask Mandate  Page 51

* u) Jade Billo Managing, Director, Big Bliss Hot Yoga + Fitness re: Masks and Exercise  Page 51

* v) Terry, re: Face mask vote  Page 52

* w) Dan Tomic, re: Please vote NO to mandatory masks  Page 53

* x) Debrodniks Donuts, re: Forced Masking  Page 54

* y) Geoffrey Gartshore, re: Draft Covid Mask Bylaws  Page 55

* z) Ruston Evans, Mybodyismychoice, re: Face masks  Page 56
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* aa) Monique Krawecki, re: Mandatory Face Mask Meeting
* bb) Dawn Parker, re: Supporting the mask bylaw
* cc) Jena, re: Not making masking mandatory in Waterloo region
* dd) Tracy Morency, re: Mandatory Mask bylaw
* ee) Richard Phillips, re: Mask By-law
* ff) Raymond Hoang Re: Mandatory Masks Bylaw Comment
* gg) Carol Thorman, re: Mask bylaw
* hh) John Jackson, re: Proposed by-law re wearing masks during covid
* ii) Emily Schroeder, Ontario Civil Liberties Association re: Copy of email to all councillors re: mask bylaw
* jj) David Croft, re: Easy decision on masks. Look to Vietnam and Taiwan
* kk) Adrienne Kershaw-Gies, re: Supporting mandatory mask wearing in Waterloo Region
* ll) Monique Joy, re: Decision on Making Masks Mandatory in Waterloo Region
* mm) Sarah Robson, re: Mandatory mask vote
* nn) Lindsay Laur, re: Mandatory masks in Waterloo Region
* oo) Evelyn Bennett, re: Masks in a public places
* pp) Dolf van Arragon, re: Mandatory Facial Covering (masks) By-laws
* qq) Corliss Olson & Douglas Drake, re: In favour of mask by-law
* rr) Andrzej Jaronski, re: Should masks be mandatory?
* ss) Mark Andrews, re: Mandatory mask bylaw
* tt) Robert Graham, re: Myth - It's new we have no defence
* uu) Jaclyn Witt, re: In support of mandatory masks
* vv) Anonymous, re: mask wearing support vote- YES
* ww) Deanna Ozolins, re: Support for mandatory face masks
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8. Reports

a) **PDL-LEG-20-33**, Draft By-laws to Require Face Coverings on Grand River Transit and in Certain Enclosed Public Places

**Recommendation:**

That the Regional Municipality of Waterloo:

(a) enact a By-law to Require the Wearing of Face Coverings in Enclosed Public Places as set out in Appendix “A” to require persons to wear face coverings in certain enclosed public places and to require owners and operators of such enclosed public places to not permit persons into such enclosed public places without a face covering, with such By-law to be effective ____________, 2020;

(b) enact a By-law to amend the Code of Use By-law (13-050, as amended) as set out in Appendix “B” to require persons to wear face coverings on Grand River Transit vehicles (buses and light rail vehicles) and within bus shelters and on platforms of transit stations, with such By-law to be effective ____________, 2020; and

(c) waive its notice policy in regard to the enactment of the aforesaid by-laws pursuant to Report PDL-LEG-20-33, dated July 6, 2020.

9. Other Business

10. Questions

11. Enactment Of By-laws – First, Second & Third Readings

a) A By-law to Amend By-law 13-050, A By-law Respecting the Conduct of Persons Entering Upon Buildings, Grounds and Public Transportation Vehicles Owned or Occupied by the Regional Municipality of Waterloo

b) A By-law to Require the Wearing of Face Coverings in Enclosed Public Places During the COVID-19-Pandemic

c) A By-law to Confirm the Actions of Council – July 6, 2020

12. Adjourn
Recommended reading on why we need a mandatory mask bylaw in Waterloo Region

**Mandatory mask bylaw in Waterloo Region ‘will provide clarity,’ Redman says** *(The Record)*
Cites official statistics on marked persistence of COVID-19 in Waterloo Region:
- COVID-19 persists in Waterloo Region after peaking on April 18 (7 day moving average down from 31 new cases per day on April 18 to 8 on June 25)
- Community transmissions persist as outbreaks dwindle (3-day moving average community transmission down from peak of 11 new cases per day to 6, a decrease of less than 50%)

**A Heat Map of Coronavirus Cases in Canada** *(Maclean’s)*
Shows that Waterloo Region’s 219.7 cases of COVID-19 per 100,000 population is lower than Ontario’s (235.9) and Quebec’s (643), but higher than every other province’s. BC figure is 56. Manitoba is 23.

**Mandatory Mask Laws Are Spreading in Canada** *(CBC News)*
Cites Public Health Agency of Canada recommendation to wear a non-medical mask or face covering in public places. Cites past experience with seat-belt and bike-helmet laws as evidence why voluntary recommendations are not enough.

**Open Letter from the Medical Scientific Community** to Chief Public Health Officer of Canada Dr. Theresa Tam, Ontario Medical Officer of Health Dr. David Williams, federal Minister of Health Patty Hajdu and Ontario Minister of Health Christine Elliott
https://docs.google.com/document/d/1uUGoH0MsUwmlnOwQbbhyyRh8y4wQhG3SkFs3M-8C/EK/mobilebasic
The Ontario version of a letter that has also been sent to health officials in Alberta and Quebec and has been signed by 1530 doctors, nurses and other professionals nationwide. Cites scientific reviews and makes the case for wearing masks to prevent transmission of COVID-19.

**Refusing to Wear a Mask Is Like Driving Drunk**, opinion piece by Nicholas Kristof in *The New York Times*
Cites the scientific evidence that mandated use of face masks has prevented hundreds of thousands of COVID-19 infections in the U.S. Reports a crucial reason for Hong Kong’s success against COVID-19 (less than one death per million inhabitants, compared with 385 per million in the United States and 228 per million in Canada) is
that 97% of Hong Kong residents wear masks as a sign of courtesy and civility. “Refusing to wear a mask is no more a 'personal choice' than is drinking all evening and then stumbling into your car and heading down the road. In a time of plague, shunning a face mask is like driving drunk, putting everyone in your path in danger.”
Dave

Our commonalities include having a math background plus working for RIM for many years.

For the last 40 years or so, I have been designing and developing software, plus have a publishing background. My greatest strength lies in inventing and creating cryptographic software.

While at RIM from early 2002 to late 2009, I focused almost entirely on software development. This included encouraging developers to write BlackBerry applications, helping developers to write BlackBerry applications, editing, writing for, creating and publishing the BlackBerry Development Journal, moderating BlackBerry development forums, reworking and moderating the BlackBerry developer support site, creating BlackBerry development training programs, co-authoring books related to BlackBerry development, and inventing technology that was patented by RIM. I chose to leave RIM in the fall of 2009 to focus on software development.

I believe you will appreciate the math associated with COVID-19.

There have been 2,658 deaths associated with COVID-19 in Ontario. [https://www.covid-19canada.com/](https://www.covid-19canada.com/)

When COVID-19 deaths are reported, they are determined from these groups:

1) people who have died because of COVID-19
2) people who had COVID-19 when they died
3) people who may have had COVID-19 when they died

Of the three groups, only the first should have been listed as deaths caused by COVID-19.

The other two groups should have been properly categorized by the true cause of death.

Of people who have died because of COVID-19, many died because ventilators were used instead of oxygen. This has been repeatedly detailed and largely ignored by the media.

As you may know, 13.7 million people live in Ontario.

\[
13,700,000 / 2,658 = 5154.25131677953348382242
\]

This means that 1 out of every 5,154 people in Ontario has died from within the three groups.

Four out of five COVID-19 deaths in Canada have been linked to seniors homes, where almost 5% of seniors are in long-term care. This means that 2,126 people who reside in seniors homes in Ontario died because they may have had COVID-19, had COVID-19, or died because of COVID-19. People who live in seniors homes are seriously ill and cannot take care of themselves, or be taken care of by other family members. Many people in seniors home have dementia.
This also means that 532 people outside of seniors homes died in a manner that is attributed to COVID-19.

\[
\frac{13,700,000}{532} = 25751.87969924812030075187
\]

This means that 1 out of every 25,752 people in Ontario who do not live in a seniors home has died within the three groups.

It has been documented by health officials in a few countries that people who died because of COVID-19 constitute between 7% and 12% of all deaths attributed to COVID-19.

If we use 12%, then deaths in seniors homes:

\[
2,126 \times 0.12 = 255.12
\]

\[
\frac{13,700,000}{255} = 53725.49019607843137254901
\]

Other deaths:

\[
532 \times 0.12 = 63.84
\]

\[
\frac{13,700,000}{64} = 214062.5
\]

The death rate because of COVID-19 outside of seniors homes is 1 in 214,062 in Ontario at 12%.

The true risk of dying from COVID-19 in Ontario is extremely low for most people.

The Waterloo government is trying to push through a bylaw to force citizens to wear masks when going into stores and more.

This does not make any sense.

The diameter of the COVID-19 virus is between 0.06 and 0.14 microns.

Perfume has a diameter of 0.3 microns.

The N95 mask used in hospitals can stop 95% of 0.3 microns particles. It does this using static electricity because normal filtration cannot stop small particles.

When medical staff are fitted for a N95 mask, it is done in a closed environment where perfume or aspartame is used to determine if mask leakage occurs. If they can smell perfume, or can taste aspartame, then the mask is leaking and cannot be used.

All paper and cloth masks do not provide protection from inhaling or exhaling COVID-19 viruses. The viruses are far too small to be filtered by these types of masks. Most people wear masks that have a loose fit, a lack of seal, and provide inadequate filtration. Cloth masks have a very loose fit, do not seal, and have completely inadequate filtration.

If a person wearing a mask can smell anything, then they have close to no protection from inhaling or exhaling COVID-19 viruses.
When someone is showing signs of COVID-19, they can expel 40,000 droplets when sneezing or coughing. The droplets contain several billion COVID-19 viruses.

Claims have been made that a properly fitted paper mask is 75% effective against COVID-19. This means they are 25% ineffective. If a low value of 2 billion COVID-19 viruses is emitted when someone sneezes or coughs, then 500 million COVID-19 viruses will be transferred through a well fitted paper mask.

Wearing a paper or cloth mask cannot stop the spread of COVID-19.

People who wear masks a lot make their masks moist and clogged over time, which reduces air passage. Wearing a mask gradually reduces oxygen levels and increases carbon dioxide levels. This is made worse if the person has shallow breaths. Shallow breaths lead to pockets of carbon dioxide in the mask that gets inhaled and exhaled.

When oxygen drops and carbon dioxide levels rises, the person will suffer from an elevated heart rate and mental confusion, and will experience other serious symptoms. If the person exercises while wearing a mask, or if they wear a mask for extended periods when driving a car, they can seriously injure themselves and others. This has happened, and will continue to happen, as long as healthy people keep wearing masks for extended periods of time.

Dave, I believe I have made a solid case not to force people in Waterloo to wear masks.

I can back up every claim I have made if required.

If the town still moves forward to enact a bylaw that forces people to wear masks, then it is a political motivated move, or a move for legal reasons.

Both reasons are invalid.

If a shop wants to avoid future legal liability, then they can set policy for clients to wear a mask to enter their store. The town does not have to do it for them.

Costco has taken this route for legal reasons. Their staff asks people to wear masks, but does not force them to do it. Costco records video of people when they enter their stores to capture their choice to wear a mask or not. They do this in preparation for future legal problems that are associated with a client having caught COVID-19 and attempting to sue Costco. Costco did not impose their mask policy for health reasons. Like McDonalds and other companies that remained open during the economic shutdown, many are currently being sued by people who claim to have caught COVID-19 due to the company they are suing. I can understand why companies want to reduce legal liabilities. The town of Waterloo does not need to help these companies to reduce their legal liabilities.

If the town pushes through the bylaw for political reasons, then it will end badly for the town.

Businesses do not have to operate in Waterloo, and many people do not have to live in Waterloo.
Please make the right decision to allow businesses to determine their own policies. The town has no need to pass a bylaw that many people will legitimately oppose.

Thanks,

Richard Evers
Dear Dr. Wang,

Over the past three months, our community and our world have been dealing with the challenges of the COVID-19 pandemic emergency. Thank you for your steady public health leadership during this time. We recognize that you have a difficult role and we appreciate your frequent communication as well as the partnership that your team has built with City of Kitchener staff as we collectively navigate this unprecedented public health challenge together.

As the world continues to deal with the important task of preventing the spread of the COVID-19 virus, there is growing evidence that people transmit COVID-19 through respiratory droplets when breathing, sneezing, coughing or talking. With this evidence, it is clear that wearing masks will help to reduce the spread of the virus where physical distancing measures are hard to enforce or not possible. The purpose of this letter is to express our support for measures that you could implement to mandate the wearing of face coverings (non-medical masks) in public settings where physical distancing may not be possible.

An increasing number of Canadian municipalities are mandating the use of face masks by the public under certain circumstances. These actions are in keeping with the Ontario Ministry of Health and Public Health Ontario recommendations regarding the use of a face covering (non-medical mask) to reduce the risk of transmission of COVID-19 when physical distancing may be challenging or not possible. This includes settings such as on public transit, in smaller grocery stores or pharmacies or when receiving essential services. We are seeing more and more public transit operators mandate the use of face masks by their passengers and employees within the Province of Ontario and beyond. Wellington-Dufferin-Guelph Public Health was the first health unit locally to mandate the use of face masks within stores/businesses and others are considering following their approach. A growing body of international research suggests that these rules could be beneficial.

Our community has taken a number of proactive steps throughout the pandemic emergency which have proven, in retrospect, to be wise and timely actions. We should not wait for the Province to mandate the wearing of masks when we have the ability to show local leadership to continue to flatten the curve within Waterloo Region. In your interview with the Waterloo Region Record on June 12, you stated that we have a collective responsibility to protect each other and that you want the vast majority of people to wear masks whenever they are in close proximity to others, especially in indoor settings and on public transit. Experience to date would indicate that far too few people are voluntarily complying with your expectations. The time has come to mandate this expectation. We believe that an order under section 22 of the Health Protection and Promotion Act is the most effective way
in which to achieve this. While we recognize and respect that this is a determination that you alone must make in your statutory role as Acting Medical Officer of Health, please know that you would have our full support for any such decision. If no order is issued under section 22 of the Health Protection and Promotion Act, we would ask that Regional Council consider adopting a by-law to mandate the use of face coverings to ensure consistency across the region. Should neither of those actions be taken, the City of Kitchener will convene a public meeting next week to consider moving forward with the tools available to it, in order to mandate the use of face coverings within the City of Kitchener.

Again, thank you for your leadership during these challenging times and for giving careful consideration to the public health benefits of mandating the use of masks under certain circumstances. We remain committed to our collective efforts to reduce the transmission of COVID-19 within our community, and to position ourselves for a strong recovery.

Sincerely,

Berry Vrbanovic
Mayor

Scott Davey
Councillor ~ Ward 1

Dave Schnider
Councillor ~ Ward 2

John Gazzola
Councillor ~ Ward 3

Christine Michaud
Councillor ~ Ward 4

Kelly Galloway-Sealock
Councillor ~ Ward 5

Paul Singh
Councillor ~ Ward 6

Bil Ioannidis
Councillor ~ Ward 7

Margaret Johnston
Councillor ~ Ward 8

Debbie Chapman
Councillor ~ Ward 9

Sarah Marsh
Councillor ~ Ward 10

cc:
Karen Redman, Regional Chair, Regional Municipality of Waterloo
Regional Councillors, Regional Municipality of Waterloo
Mike Murray, Chief Administrative Officer, Regional Municipality of Waterloo
Dan Chapman, Chief Administrative Officer, City of Kitchener
Please. We're begging you. Read the material from other countries. Understand what is going on here. People are NOT wearing masks. We know this contributes to spread. Encouraging and recommending DOES NOT WORK. Stop wasting time talking about policing and enforcing - This is not a concern. Just making the mandate will automatically ensure “the majority” of people will follow the rules. And that's what we want. Critical mass. Delaying this because of concerns for these outliers is putting the entire community at risk.

Please make it mandatory. I have parents in LTC and the people who work in those homes are exposed every day to people on transit and in stores, not wearing masks. It's a recipe for disaster.

The few people who are worried about their civil liberties are not our concern. They were the same people who fought wearing seat belts. I want to contribute to the businesses in my own region. Currently I will not do that. I'm driving to Guelph and spending my money there. We've encouraged a lot more people to do the same. Not mandating masks is bad for health AND for our local economy.

https://www.guelphmercury.com/opinion-story/10040069-authorities-across-ontario-should-follow-guelph-s-move-and-mandate-masks/?fbclid=iwar01r8exrmjnij7l3jzffkeenrudfl3ldeudyhoo2go1kkk2litopwcv

Thank you - we hope this ends quickly and our local government stops being concerned about policing and starts being concerned about public health. Make the right choice for us - mandate what needs done instead of counting on people to do the right thing.

Karen Wilson karenwilson@rogers.com
Dear Council Members,

Given that there are clear public health guidelines by both the Region of Ontario and the Province of Ontario which outline when and where it is recommended to wear a mask, it is unnecessary to implement a by-law or policy adding stricter regulations that dictated by regional and provincial health experts by making masks mandatory. Moreover it increases confusion amongst citizens and undermines the scientific authority of our public health units and public health officers when individual regional councils create their own health guidelines as opposed to following the ones developed by the province and supported by Waterloo region public health. Using guidelines rather than by-laws allows Council to rapidly adapt to scientific advice as it becomes available, ensuring Waterloo regional citizens are well protected from both a CoVID 19, but also mental health perspective.

In addition, the recent publication by Sick Kids Hospital clearly outlines that masks are not appropriate for children and that there is a risk to their mental health due to mandatory social distancing and mask wearing. They state that the ability to see people’s faces is an important part of childhood development and communication skills.

As opposed to a by-law or policy, an education and awareness campaign on mask best practices would be more valuable in gaining citizen support and ensuring safe and proper use of mask (inappropriate use of masks is a large health risk)

For these reasons, it important for mask wearing to remain as a strong recommendation as opposed to a policy or by-law in the Waterloo region.

Thank you for your concern about our regions safety, but currently our health experts are doing an excellent job and there is non need for added regulations.

Alison Coleman
We have a group of super seniors 70++ who’s main exercise is biking. However we find it very hard to wear masks.
We could easily put it up when within 5 M of others.
Could there be some consideration given?
Thanks
Rowena Martin
I am extremely upset by the lack of concern for the vulnerable in our region especially by some of the larger stores. I am a senior with an immune compromised husband so I am very careful. To begin with, curbside pickup was a life saver for these companies at the height of the pandemic. Now curbside pickup which makes the vulnerable feel safe takes a back seat to in store shopping. It takes 2 weeks to a month to get notified that the order is ready or most often no longer available. The worst offender is Lowes. If we chat in person there is more to this situation that is too long for this email. In short, the vulnerable are forced to into the stores or have to wait unreasonable times for curbside pickup.

The second example is Zehrs. I went in to buy groceries and hardly any staff wore masks. There were 3 staff members chatting & blocking an aisle without masks & within a few feet of each other. This forced customers to share an alternate aisle not allowing for distancing. Several staff would rushed past me closely with no concern for distancing (not wearing masks). Also they were not cleaning the self checkout between customers. I asked it to for it to be cleaned and had to wait a long time for someone to angrily clean it. I did try to do delivery order with Zehrs but everything was full price - no sales honoured.

Last is my experience in Walmart today. Again nobody is cleaning self checkouts between customers. (There is more to this situation too.) When I talked to a manager, they said they only clean the stations every half an hour. A lot of people can touch those screens in half an hour.

I wear a mask and keep my distance.

Now to be fair some store's like pharmacies and Sobeys have been great and I feel safe.

For these other stores, I feel like the seniors and vulnerable are once again forgotten as we open up and businesses want to make money again. These practices will increase risk of second wave. Some stores are getting lax in procedures.

Sue Schott
As a Tax paying citizen and property owner in the Region of Waterloo, I oppose any bylaw that removes the choice of its citizens as to whether or not they will wear a mask in businesses. I also implore all council members to stop imposing any bylaws that they cannot show to have majority support among their constituents.

William Calberry
With the recent announcements this morning of GTA mayors making masks "mandatory" for public indoor settings I really hope that the city of Waterloo does NOT follow this example of poor decision making. I have lived in Waterloo (I own a house on Bridgeport) for the past 10 years and never have I taken time out of my day to get involved in municipal politics.

I understand that if there are outbreaks in an area or region that there could be a short term surgical approach to stopping the spread of the virus by asking citizens to use face coverings for a finite amount of time. I even understand putting in a rule about requiring masks for large indoor gatherings if/when they are ever allowed again. But in my opinion having a blanket rule for our region to require everyone to wear masks indefinitely at all times indoors is outrageous and not needed. The outbreak is largely contained in Canada at this point with the exception of a cluster of migrant workers in the Windsor area.

This is what happens when the world follows the lead of a communist country that does not allow its citizens freedoms to make their own decisions. My grand father fought in world war 2 so that citizens of this great country will not have our freedoms restricted by a government that claims to know what is best for us all.

We have already isolated our senior citizens in long term care residences by essentially putting them in jail and nobody is talking about a better way to handle their situation. What is the next step? There needs to be more thought and consultation from government with its citizens around these kind of decisions going forward. I really hope that there is an ask from public officials about what the public wants on this issue and any other time the government decides to restrict the freedom of people to make their own decision.

Concerned resident,

Justin Sayers
June 27, 2020

By Email

Mr. Barry Vrbanovic
Mayor of Kitchener and Member of Waterloo Regional Council

CC: Members of Waterloo Regional Council; Made public

RE: Mandatory face mask policies have no scientific basis, violate civil liberties, and must be rejected

Mr. Vrbanovic:

The Ontario Civil Liberties Association (OCLA) has recently learned of your intention to impose mandatory face masks in your municipality.¹

We urge you not to adopt any policy that imposes face masks on the general public and to retract any such recommendation or advisory, because:

- There is no reliable scientific evidence that face masks have any effect in preventing transmission of viral respiratory illnesses.
- The use of face masks in the general population entails many potential health risks.
- Arbitrarily applying state power by imposing such unjust and baseless laws violates civil rights and personal dignity and harms the very fabric of society.

These grave concerns are explained in detail in our 21 June 2020 letter to Dr. Tedros Adhanom Ghebreyesus, Director General of the World Health Organization (WHO), which was sent to all MPs and all Ontario MPPs, and which has been shared and discussed widely online and in the media.² The English version is attached for your convenience.

We ask you not to adopt any mandatory mask policies in your municipality, and to immediately repeal any such policies that have already been implemented.

Please provide us with your response so that we can inform our members and the public.

Sincerely,

Joseph Hickey, PhD
Executive Director
Ontario Civil Liberties Association (OCLA) http://ocla.ca
613-252-6148 (c)
joseph.hickey@ocla.ca

Encl.: OCLA’s 21 June 2020 letter to WHO
June 21, 2020

Dr Tedros Adhanom Ghebreyesus  
Director General  
World Health Organization  
WHO Headquarters in Geneva  
Avenue Appia 20  
1211 Geneva  
c/o New York Office: whonewyork@who.int

CC: weu@who.int, afrgocom@who.int, phedoc@who.int, senkoroh@qa.afro.who.int, guerrere@paho.org, she@emro.who.int, eurohealthycities@who.int, yoosufa@searo.who.int, ogawah@wpro.who.int, mercados@wkc.who.int, mediainquiries@who.int

RE: WHO advising the use of masks in the general population to prevent COVID-19 transmission

Director General:

The Ontario Civil Liberties Association (OCLA) requests that the WHO retract its recommendation to decision makers advising the use of face masks in the general population (“the WHO recommendation”).

The said WHO recommendation is detailed in the WHO’s “interim guidance” document entitled “Advice on the use of masks in the context of COVID-19”, which is dated 5 June 2020:

WHO Reference Number: WHO/2019-nCov/IPC_Masks/2020.4

The document is presently published on this page:  

You have personally promoted the WHO recommendation on twitter:
We believe that the WHO recommendation is harmful to public health, and harmful to the very fabric of society. The recommendation is used by governments as a ready-made justification to impose mask use in the general population. The resulting legislative dictates and policies of coercion broadly violate civil, political and human rights. We ask that your ill-conceived recommendation be retracted immediately.

The context is one where:

1. Viral respiratory diseases, based on rapid mutations, have co-evolved with powerful, complex, and adaptive immune systems of breathing animals for some 300 million years and with human ancestors for some 5 million years, in the absence of vaccines.
2. There was no statistically significant increase in winter-burden all-cause mortality in 2019-2020, compared to the last many decades of reliable data for Northern mid-latitude nations.
3. A sharp peak in all-cause mortality by week occurred synchronously in several jurisdictions, across continents and oceans, immediately following the WHO declaration of the pandemic.
4. The said peak can be attributed to government preparedness response to COVID-19, impacting immune-vulnerable institutionalized persons in those jurisdictions.

In your document, you state (at p. 6):

At the present time, the widespread use of masks by healthy people in the community setting is not yet supported by high quality or direct scientific

---

evidence and there are potential benefits and harms to consider (see below).

Even this introductory statement of yours has two problems.

First, it contains the palpable bias that “there must be benefits”.

Second, more importantly, you fail to mention that several randomized controlled trials with verified outcomes (infections) were specifically designed to detect a benefit, and did not find any measurable benefit, for any viral respiratory disease. This includes the many randomized controlled trials that find no difference between open-sided surgical masks and respirators. 2

---

(["Although mechanistic studies support the potential effect of hand hygiene or face masks, evidence from 14 randomized controlled trials of these measures did not support a substantial effect on transmission of laboratory-confirmed influenza. We similarly found limited evidence on the effectiveness of improved hygiene and environmental cleaning."])
(["A total of six RCTs involving 9 171 participants were included. There were no statistically significant differences in preventing laboratory-confirmed influenza, laboratory-confirmed respiratory viral infections, laboratory-confirmed respiratory infection and influenzalike illness using N95 respirators and surgical masks. Meta-analysis indicated a protective effect of N95 respirators against laboratory-confirmed bacterial colonization."])
(["Four RCTs were meta-analyzed adjusting for clustering. Compared with N95 respirators; the use of medical masks did not increase laboratory-confirmed viral (including coronaviruses) respiratory infection or clinical respiratory illness."])
(["Among 2862 randomized participants, 2371 completed the study and accounted for 5180 HCW-seasons. … Among outpatient health care personnel, N95 respirators vs medical masks as worn by participants in this trial resulted in no significant difference in the incidence of laboratory-confirmed influenza."])
(["Self-reported assessment of clinical outcomes was prone to bias. Evidence of a protective effect of masks or respirators against verified respiratory infection (VRI) was not statistically significant”; as per their Figure 2c]
You failed to mention that such results set a probabilistic upper limit on mask effectiveness, and you failed to calculate this upper limit. Instead, you repeat the misleading notion that reliable evidence has "not yet" been found to confirm your adopted bias.

In other words, if masks were even moderately effective at reducing the risk of infection, then a benefit would have been statistically detected in one or more of the many reliable trials that have already been made.

More fundamentally, a major problem with your document is that you wrongly rely on substandard scientific reports as constituting usable "evidence". With public policy, especially health policy having draconian consequences, there must be a standards threshold below which a given report cannot be used as an indicator of reality. The reason that science requires randomized controlled trials with verified outcomes is precisely because other study designs are susceptible to bias.

The context of a new disease and of a publicized pandemic is one in which all reporting (media, political, and scientific) is susceptible to large bias. The mechanisms of the biases are well known and anticipated, such as: political posturing, partisan conflicts, career advancement, publication-record padding, "discovery" recognition, public-interest and public-support mining, institutional and personal reputational enhancement, funding opportunities, corporate interests, and so on.

Group bias is not an uncommon phenomenon. Large numbers of bias-susceptible studies that agree are of little value. Any study that does not apply the established scientific tools

["We identified 6 clinical studies ... In the meta-analysis of the clinical studies, we found no significant difference between N95 respirators and surgical masks in associated risk of (a) laboratory-confirmed respiratory infection, (b) influenza-like illness, or (c) reported work-place absenteeism."]


["There were 17 eligible studies. ... None of the studies established a conclusive relationship between mask/respirator use and protection against influenza infection."]


[None of the studies reviewed showed a benefit from wearing a mask, in either HCW or community members in households (H). See summary Tables 1 and 2 therein.]


[N95-masked health-care workers (HCW) were significantly more likely to experience headaches. Face mask use in HCW was not demonstrated to provide benefit in terms of cold symptoms or getting colds.]
for avoiding observational bias should be presumed to be biased, in any draconian policy context.

That is why the WHO cannot collect and rely on potentially biased studies to make recommendations that can have devastating effects (see below) on the lives of literally billions. Rather, the WHO must apply a stringent standards threshold, and accept only randomized controlled trials with verified outcomes. In this application, the mere fact that several such quality studies have not ever confirmed the positive effects reported in bias-susceptible reports should be a red flag.

For example, two amply promoted recent studies that do not satisfy the standards threshold, and that, in our opinion, have a palpable risk of large bias are the following.

The study of Renyi Zhang et al.:

“Identifying airborne transmission as the dominant route for the spread of COVID-19” by Zhang, Renyi et al., Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences, 11 June 2020, 202009637; DOI: 10.1073/pnas.2009637117,

which was not used in your document, presumably because it was published later.

The Zhang study applies concocted linear extrapolations of non-linear epidemiological curves to conclude that mask-imposition policies must have worked. The work appears to be squarely contradicted by Sajadi et al. who rigorously showed that the COVID-19 outbreaks of high-transmission centers were restricted to a narrow band of latitude, temperature and absolute humidity, irrespective of any considerations of social-distancing impositions, including masks, as would be expected for known viral respiratory diseases.3

And, the study of DK Chu et al.:


which is your reference 42.

The Chu study was funded by the WHO. It contains no randomized controlled trials, but rather uses a hodgepodge of data about associations of ill-defined factors. DK Chu et al.’s own appraisal of “certainty” regarding their conclusion about masks is “LOW” meaning “our confidence in the effect estimate is limited; the true effect could be

---

substantially different from the estimate of the effect” (their Table 2), yet such a result is a basis for your recommendation to governments.

In your document, having made the recommendation for the use of masks in the general population (your Table 2), you go on to describe “benefits” and “harms” of such applications.

Under the “Potential benefits/advantages” section (p. 7), you incorrectly claim that “likely advantages” include “reduced potential exposure risk from infected persons before they develop symptoms”. How this can be a “likely” advantage, in a total absence of reliable data, is beyond comprehension.

Your other “likely advantages” include:

- reduced potential stigmatization of individuals wearing masks to prevent infecting others …;
- making people feel they can play a role in contributing to stopping spread of the virus;
- reminding people to be compliant with other measures (e.g., hand hygiene, not touching nose and mouth) …;
- potential social and economic benefits. Amidst the global shortage of surgical masks and PPE, encouraging the public to create their own fabric masks may promote individual enterprise and community integration. Moreover, the production of non-medical masks may offer a source of income for those able to manufacture masks within their communities. Fabric masks can also be a form of cultural expression, encouraging public acceptance of protection measures in general…

Your document next has the section entitled “Potential harms/disadvantages”, in which you state:

The likely disadvantages of the use of mask by healthy people in the general public include:

- potential increased risk of self-contamination due to the manipulation of a face mask and subsequently touching eyes with contaminated hands;
- potential self-contamination that can occur if non-medical masks are not changed when wet or soiled. This can create favourable conditions for microorganism to amplify;
- potential headache and/or breathing difficulties, depending on type of mask used;
- potential development of facial skin lesions, irritant dermatitis or worsening acne, when used frequently for long hours;
- difficulty with communicating clearly;
- …
waste management issues; improper mask disposal leading to increased litter in public places, risk of contamination to street cleaners and environment hazard; …

On their face, the harms that you describe are more severe than the benefits. Therefore, we are all the more perplexed by your recommendation, which has no basis in reliable scientific results.

You are correct to point out that masks are collectors and concentrators of pathogen-laden substances and materials, in close proximity to the mouth, nose and eyes, such that one might expect contact transmission to occur by way of the said concentration.

A day of collecting pathogens on the mask by inhalation, accompanied by mask touching, and followed by mask removal and disposal or storage, indeed does not sound like a good idea. Can the general public realistically be expected to learn and follow medical protocols of mask safety? Most reliable trials have been made with professional health-care workers, and found no measurable benefit of masks. Would masks make things worse in a general population? We don’t know, but virtually the entire public health establishment including the WHO used to think so.

Furthermore, you have omitted important foreseeable harms, which include the following.

1. On the medical side, directly attributable to masks, unanswered questions include: Are large droplets captured by a mask atomized or aerosolized into breathable components? Do virions escape an evaporating droplet stuck to a mask fiber? How do pathogen-laden droplets interact with environmental dust and aerosols captured on the mask, including in polluted environments? Do new, used and cleaned or recycled masks shed fibres or substances that are harmful? What are long-term health effects of constrained and modified breathing from prolonged mask use, both with health care workers and the general public?

2. Does imposed or socially coerced mask use induce or contribute to a psychological state of fear and stress, in part or most of the targeted population? Psychological stress is proven to be a factor that can measurably depress the immune system and induce diseases, including: immune response dysfunction, depression, cardiovascular disease and cancer. 4

3. There is a body of reliable scientific work establishing that a dominant path of transmission of viral respiratory diseases is the smallest size fraction of aerosol particles, that these particles are suspended in the fluid air under conditions of low absolute humidity, that this is the reason for winter seasonality of these diseases, and that transmission occurs indoors (homes, hospitals, shopping centers, daycare centers, airplanes, …) where high densities of the aerosol particles are

---

suspended in the air in the winters of mid-latitude regions. Therefore, policies of imposed (ineffective) mask wearing provide a cover for corporations and governments to evade their duty of care, which would be to effectively manage the indoor air environments such as not to constitute centres of transmission.

4. The WHO recommendation in-effect is “propaganda by policy” that promotes the undemonstrated view that global central planning can significantly and safely mitigate seasonal and pandemic viral respiratory diseases, which have been with us since breathing animals walked on earth, and which co-adapt with our complex immune system. This, in a context where science posturing is malleable, there are billions to be made every season from vaccine sales, vaccine harm liability has been socialized, and reparation for vaccine injury has been made increasingly difficult to access. And, what are the long-term effects of constant large-scale interference with the human immune response to viral respiratory diseases? One cannot fail to notice that your focus is on limiting transmission between healthy individuals and universal artificial immunity programs, rather than on integrated study of immune vulnerability and its determining factors, focusing on those actually at risk.

5. Are there detrimental effects on society itself, and the quality and depth of social connection and cohesion, in a society that is masked and distanced? Does the nuclear family or the lone individual become dangerously isolated from the social environment? Our primary schools have been made into nightmares. The promoted distancing is a social experiment of dystopia on a global scale, across cultures and peoples, planned to become routine.

6. When State power is applied in an absence of a valid scientific basis, and with little parliamentary debate, it constitutes arbitrarily applied power. Imposing masks is such a coercive power. What are the long-term societal consequences of habituation to arbitrarily applied State power? The recent scientific study of Hickey and Davidsen (2019) provides a theoretical foundation that such habituation is part of a progressive degradation towards a totalitarian state, depending on the degree of authoritarianism (whether individual contestation is effective) and the degree of violence (magnitude of the penalty for disobeying). 5

7. Of great concern to the Ontario Civil Liberties Association are the direct and pernicious violations of civil rights and personal dignity, which forced masking embodies. These violations are multi-faceted.

i. In a free and democratic society, the individual has a presumed right to make their own evaluation of personal risk when acting in the world. Individuals evaluate risk, as a deeply personal matter that integrates experience, knowledge, personality, and culture, when they decide to walk outside, ride a

---

car, train, bus or bicycle, take a particular route, eat a particular food, take a particular medication, accept a particular treatment, wear or not wear a particular garment, express or not express any image of themselves, have particular social interactions, adopt a work or pastime, and so on.

ii. It is an unjustified authoritarian imposition, and a fundamental indignity, to have the State impose its evaluation of risk on the individual, one which has no basis in science, and which is smaller than a multitude of risks that are both common and often created or condoned by the State.

iii. In a free and democratic society, corporations and institutions cannot impose individual behaviours that are irrelevant to the nature of the individual's dealings with the corporations or institutions, whether the individual is a consumer or a client of a service. These bodies cannot impose dress codes or visible symbols of compliance or membership on consumers, and thus discriminate or deny services.

Our association receives complaints and requests for help, such that we are acutely aware of the harm caused by the WHO's recommendations that are actuated by municipal, provincial and federal governments in Canada, despite our warnings.  

The WHO's pronouncements, unfortunately, have a disproportionate influence on our easily corralled governments. 

In view of the above, we conclude that your recent reversal on masks is, at best, reckless and irresponsible. Please retract the recommendation immediately. If not, we would appreciate your explanations that we can communicate to our members and the public.

Sincerely,

JOSEPH HICKEY, B.Sc., M.Sc., Ph.D.  
Executive Director,  
Ontario Civil Liberties Association  

joseph.hickey@ocla.ca

DENIS RANCOURT, B.Sc., M.Sc., Ph.D.  
Researcher,  
Ontario Civil Liberties Association  
denis.rancourt@alumni.utoronto.ca

7 “Mandatory mask laws are spreading in Canada: Mostly targeted at transportation so far, but calls are growing for more widespread application”, by Emily Chung, CBC News, 17 June 2020.  
Dear Members of Council,

I am hoping that the Region of Waterloo will follow the lead of other municipalities and enact a mandatory mask law, as public compliance with masking requests is very low. However, I would like to request that young children who are old enough to safely wear a mask, but too young in practical terms be omitted from the requirement. This would be following the lead of institutions like Sick Kids, which only masks children 6 and up, recognising that younger children have a hard time understanding the need to wear a mask, or applying that understanding to actually wearing one.

Thank you,
Christine Rogalsky
Waterloo
Hello!
I'm writing to urge the entire council to support a bylaw mandating the use of face masks in public settings, particularly indoors. This should not be the burden of businesses. Furthermore, I believe an education campaign on the proper use of masks, much like the one for using traffic circles, should be circulated widely. My family has been using non-medical facemasks for over two months now, and I believe it's time for the entire community to do its part to keep everyone safe. There is far too much evidence supporting the benefits of widespread mask use during this pandemic for the region to ignore the issue any longer.
Thank you,
Vanessa Ricci-Thode, Waterloo
Region of Waterloo
Planning Development and Legislative Services
Legal Services

To: Chair Karen Redman and Members of Regional Council

Date: July 6, 2020    File Code: C01-01

Subject: Draft By-laws to Require Face Coverings on Grand River Transit and in Certain Enclosed Public Places

Recommendation:

That the Regional Municipality of Waterloo:

(a) enact a By-law to Require the Wearing of Face Coverings in Enclosed Public Places as set out in Appendix “A” to require persons to wear face coverings in certain enclosed public places and to require owners and operators of such enclosed public places to not permit persons into such enclosed public places without a face covering, with such By-law to be effective ____________, 2020;

(b) enact a By-law to amend the Code of Use By-law (13-050, as amended) as set out in Appendix “B” to require persons to wear face coverings on Grand River Transit vehicles (buses and light rail vehicles) and within bus shelters and on platforms of transit stations, with such By-law to be effective ____________, 2020; and

(c) waive its notice policy in regard to the enactment of the aforesaid by-laws pursuant to Report PDL-LEG-20-33, dated July 6, 2020.

Summary: Nil.

Report:

1) Introduction

On June 24, 2020, Council passed the following resolution relating to the wearing of
face coverings during the COVID-19 pandemic:

“Be It Resolved that Regional Staff be instructed to develop a mandatory mask bylaw within the Region of Waterloo and that such bylaw be brought forward to Regional Council at a Special Council meeting on July 6, 2020 for consideration.”

The purpose of this Report is to present draft by-laws requiring the wearing of face coverings in prescribed enclosed public places as well as in public areas of Regional facilities and Grand River Transit (GRT) transit vehicles (buses and light rail vehicles), bus shelters and platforms of transit stations for Council’s consideration. This Report also includes information from Public Health regarding the wearing of face coverings as well as about the public education campaign that staff would carry out if the draft by-laws are enacted.

2) Legislative Authority

The Municipal Act, 2001 provides general authority for municipalities to pass by-laws for the “health, safety and well-being of persons” in Section 11 of that Act. This section has been successfully used by municipalities, to pass by-laws for such matters as the regulation of pesticides using the “precautionary principle”. This would be the legislative authority for a by-law requiring face coverings in enclosed public places.

In 2013, the Region enacted its Code of Use By-law that regulates the public’s use of Regional facilities. The Region enacted this By-law pursuant to its natural person powers under the Municipal Act, 2001 and its express authority to govern its affairs and to protect its public assets. These provisions of the Municipal Act, 2001 would be the legislative authority for an amendment to the Code of Use By-law requiring face coverings in public areas of the Regional facilities and on GRT vehicles.

3) Public Health Information

Public Health and Emergency Services staff has provided the following key points regarding the wearing of masks during a COVID-19 pandemic:

- The Acting Medical Officer of Health for the Region of Waterloo is supportive of policies, which include bylaws, that promote the widespread adoption of non-medical masks/face coverings in enclosed, indoor settings or on public transit where physical distancing can be difficult to maintain.

- Although currently there is not strong evidence regarding the wearing of masks by the general public\(^1\), the science on masks continues to evolve. Expert opinion

supports the wearing of face coverings in such settings, and Waterloo Region remains at risk for a resurgence of COVID-19 infections. The adoption of this practice by those who can wear masks would not represent a significant burden in terms of behavior change and could have the effect of decreasing the overall risk of community transmission of COVID-19.

- COVID-19 spreads mainly from person-to-person through respiratory droplets when an infected person coughs, sneezes, or talks. Droplets can travel up to 2 metres (6 feet) so wearing a face covering that covers one’s mouth, nose, and chin will help prevent respiratory droplets from reaching others or landing on surfaces.

- Wearing a face covering protects others from one’s respiratory droplets. This can serve as an additional layer of protection in situations where physical distancing can be a challenge.

- The use of non-medical masks or face coverings is recommended by the Chief Medical Officer of Health of Ontario\(^2\), the Chief Public Health Officer of Canada and the Council of Chief Medical Officers of Health of Canada\(^3\) in situations where physical distancing is difficult to maintain. The US Centers for Disease Control (CDC) also recommends cloth face coverings, especially in areas where there is significant community-based transmission.\(^4\)

- The appropriate use of face coverings\(^5\) should be used in combination with the practices of physical distancing whenever possible, good hand hygiene, and self-isolating and getting tested if one develops symptoms.

- People for whom masks are not recommended include those who are under 2 years of age, would have trouble breathing with a mask, or would be unable to independently remove a mask if needed.

4) **Draft By-law: Enclosed Public Places**

---


\(^5\) If inappropriately used, or combined with improper hand hygiene, wearing a mask may increase the risk of infection through contamination
The draft by-law to require the wearing of face coverings in certain enclosed public places within buildings is set out in Appendix “A”.

A “face covering” is defined as: “a medical or non-medical mask or other face covering, including a bandana, scarf or other fabric that covers the nose, mouth and chin to create a barrier to limit the transmission of respiratory droplets.”

The draft by-law recommended by staff places the onus on both persons who are in such places to comply with the requirement to wear a face covering and also on owners and operators of enclosed public places to not permit persons into such places without wearing a face covering. Staff is of the opinion that this approach provides balanced responsibility for ensuring that face coverings are worn while in enclosed public places.

The draft by-law targets “enclosed” places based on the scientific evidence that the risk of spreading COVID-19 is higher in indoor places than outdoor spaces. The draft by-law targets those places within buildings where the “public” is more likely to be in close proximity through inadvertence such as when shopping, entering / exiting a high traffic area, waiting for service, etc. The “public” places do not include “employee only” areas such as offices, storage areas, etc. that are not open to the general public because there is more control of the area by the owner / employer. Lastly, the draft by-law targets public places that are currently open pursuant to Stage 2 of the Province’s emergency orders but also those that may open at a later date pursuant to a Stage 3 or 4. This was done to avoid the need to amend the potential by-law each time Waterloo Region moves to another Stage of openings.

Examples of places prescribed in the draft by-law are as follows:

- Places where goods are sold to the general public which could include grocery stores, pharmacies and clothing stores where persons tend to peruse and mill about;
- Places where services are provided to the general public which could include a law office, a car rental outlet and barbershop where persons may congregate in waiting areas and/or at service counters;
- Restaurants and bars, if permitted to re-open by the Province of Ontario, with the exception of seating areas where patrons will need to remove any face covering to eat or drink;
- Hotels and motels, with the exception of the rented room, where persons may congregate in the lobby and/or at front desks; and
- Places of worship where persons may come into close contact while entering and exiting.

Examples of places not prescribed in the draft by-law are as follows:

- Day care centres, day camps, hospitals, independent health facilities, offices of
regulated health professionals, homes for the elderly and homes for the care of persons with disabilities;
- Schools, universities and colleges; and
- Provincial and Federal government buildings.

These places were excluded because they have significant government oversight and regulation or, as government or quasi-government entities, have the ability to set appropriate internal requirements.

Staff will bring forward recommended amendments as and when appropriate including to address situations or circumstances that require further legislative consideration and as the Province of Ontario evolves through the re-opening stages of recovery from the COVID-19 pandemic and enacts, amends and repeals related emergency orders.

Enforcement of this By-law would be pursuant to the Provincial Offences Act commenced by way of a Summons or, if set fine approval is obtained, through issuance of Provincial Offence Notices (commonly referred to as “tickets”).

5) Draft By-law: Regional Facilities and GRT Vehicles (Buses and Light Rail Vehicles)

The draft by-law to require the wearing of face coverings in Regional facilities and GRT vehicles (buses and light rail vehicles) as well as bus shelters and platforms at transit stations is set out in Appendix “B”. This is premised on the scientific evidence and concern that these are enclosed spaces that can become crowded with little or no social distancing. There is a further requirement in relation to platforms at transit stations based on the concern that persons congregate when entering and exiting GRT vehicles.

The draft by-law governs the public areas of Regional facilities. This would include the lobby of Regional headquarters; it would not include the office areas on upper floors.

The draft by-law would amend the Region’s Code of Use By-law 13-050 and, as such, there is existing set fine approval for enforcement officers to issue a Provincial Offences Notices (commonly referred to as “tickets”) with a set fine of $240. The Code of Use By-law also provides the mechanism by which the Trespass to Property Act may be used with respect to any persons not complying with the By-law including the requirement to wear a face covering.

6) Required Signage

In order to ensure that persons are well informed of the enclosed public places in which face coverings must be worn, the face covering by-law will require every person who is the owner or operator of an enclosed public place to post clearly visible signage conspicuously at all entrances to their enclosed public place. Ready-to-print posters will be available on the Region’s website at www.regionofwaterloo.ca and hard copies will
be made available from Chambers of Commerce or local municipal administrative buildings. Signage must contain the following text in large font (minimum 24 or larger):

Protect each other.

Wear a face covering

Cover your nose, mouth and chin.

Required by the Face Covering By-law

Does not apply to children under the age of five and those who are unable to wear a face covering as a result of a medical condition or a disability.

7) Public Education

Public education and buy-in will be an important part of compliance with these by-laws. If approved, Regional staff will work to educate residents about the by-laws by undertaking a communications campaign that will include:

- Signage posted on transit vehicles, around transit stations and shelters, etc.
- Distribution of free masks to GRT/ION riders at transit stations.
- Face Covering By-law decals distributed to local businesses through Chambers of Commerce, BIAs, Explore Waterloo Region and local property managers.
- Social media messaging about by-law requirements and face covering education.
- Detailed information posted to the Region’s website (regionofwaterloo.ca) and Grand River Transit’s website (GRT.ca).
  - Printable signs for businesses will be available on our websites.
- Information shared through our media partners, including updates at media briefings.
- If directed, a phased multi-media advertising campaign. This campaign could begin as early as July 20, 2020. A budget of $40,000 would be required to undertake this campaign.

8) Effective Date of the By-laws

If Council enacts the draft by-laws, staff recommends an effective date of July 13, 2020 to allow staff time to prepare communication materials and purchase advertising and for GRT staff to prepare for implementation throughout its system.

9) Repeal of the Face Covering By-laws – Potential Criteria

Council may repeal or amend to reduce the requirements of the face covering by-laws at a time it considers appropriate and may do so in consultation with the Region’s Medical Officer of Health. Criteria for repealing or amending the requirements of the
bylaw may include factors such as consideration of the state of the local, provincial and global situation with respect to the COVID-19 at the time, a material change in the body of evidence and/or the advice of public health officials; and the availability of an effective vaccine and/or treatments such that there is no longer a risk of significant COVID-19 transmission and associated serious health consequences in the community.

10) Notice Policy

The Municipal Act, 2001 requires that municipalities have a policy for “the circumstances in which the municipality shall provide notice to the public and, if notice is to be provided, the form, manner and times notice shall be given.” This legislative requirement does not prescribe actual notice periods; rather it leaves it to the discretion of the municipality.

In 2007, the Region adopted its notice policy pursuant to the Municipal Act, 2001. The Region’s notice policy has four classes with Class 3 being Major Issues of general application in Waterloo Region with a notice period of 21 days.

This policy would need to be waived by Council on the basis of the COVID-19 emergency if Council wishes to enact any by-law on the date of this Report.

Corporate Strategic Plan:

This Report is in furtherance of the Region’s Strategic Objective of “Healthy, safe and inclusive communities” and specifically Action 4.5: Enhance community safety and wellbeing in Waterloo Region.

Financial Implications:

There is no specific budget for an education and advertising program for potential face covering by-law(s). The estimated cost of the education/advertising program is $40,000 excluding regional staff time. It is unlikely that there will be capacity to absorb these costs within the approved 2020 Public Health Operating Budget. Any costs incurred over and above the Public Health operating budget could be covered by incremental 100% COVID-19 related funding from the Province. Otherwise, such costs will form part of the Region’s overall 2020 year-end financial position, currently estimated to be in the range of a $13 million to $17 million deficit. Potential fine revenue is very difficult to predict. It is noted that the purpose of the by-law is to influence behaviour and not to generate revenue.

Other Department Consultations/Concurrence:

The Acting Medical Officer of Health / Public Health and Emergency Services Department, the Manager, Emergency Management, and staff of the Transportation and Environmental Services Department were consulted and provided input in the
preparation of this Report.

Attachments:

Appendix “A”: By-law to Require the Wearing of Face Coverings in Enclosed Public Places

Appendix “B”: By-law to amend the Code of Use By-law (13-050, as amended)

Prepared By: Richard Brookes, Senior Solicitor (Municipal & Litigation)

Approved By: Debra Arnold, Regional Solicitor and Director of Legal Services
Appendix “A” To Report PDL-LEG-20-33 Dated July 6, 2020
Draft By-Law Number 20-XXX
of
The Regional Municipality of Waterloo
A By-law to Require the Wearing of Face Coverings in Enclosed Public Places During the COVID-19 Pandemic

Whereas The Regional Municipality of Waterloo has the authority to enact by-laws for the health, safety and well-being of persons pursuant to section 11 of the Municipal Act, 2001, S.O. 2001, c. 25, as amended;

And Whereas the Province of Ontario and The Regional Municipality of Waterloo have declared emergencies as a result of the COVID-19 pandemic pursuant to the Emergency Management and Civil Protection Act, R.S.O. 1990, c. E.9, as amended;

And Whereas the Council of The Regional Municipality of Waterloo wishes to implement a requirement for persons to wear a face covering while in certain enclosed public places to assist in reducing the spread of COVID-19 within The Regional Municipality of Waterloo;

The Council of The Regional Municipality of Waterloo enacts as follows:

1. (1) Every person within an enclosed public place shall wear a face covering.

(2) Every person that is the parent or guardian accompanying a child that is 5 years old or older in an enclosed public place shall ensure that the child wears a face covering.

(3) A “person” in subsections (1) and (2) of this section shall include any occupant within an enclosed public place and shall include, but not be limited to, any owner, operator, employee and worker in the enclosed public place and any customer, patron or other visitor in the enclosed public place but shall not include any of the following persons:

(a) A child who is under the age of five years old;

(b) A person who is unable to wear a face covering as a result of a medical condition or a disability pursuant to the Human Rights Code, R.S.O. 1990, c. H.19, who is unable to put on or remove a
face covering without assistance or for whom a face covering would inhibit the person’s ability to breathe; and

(c) A person engaged in a sport or other strenuous physical activity.

(4) No person shall be required to provide proof of any of the exemptions set out in subsections (3)(a) and (b) of this section.

(5) For the purposes of this section, an “enclosed public place” shall mean the indoor areas of any building as part of the following establishments within The Regional Municipality of Waterloo that are open to the general public:

(a) Stores and other establishments that sell or offer to sell food, beverages, consumer products, vehicles, equipment or other goods;

(b) Restaurants, bars and other establishments that sell or offer to sell food or drink to the public for on-site consumption or take-out, with the exception of the patrons while consuming food and drinks in the seating areas therein;

(c) Establishments that provide or offer to provide services, including but not limited to professional, counselling, personal care, funeral home, transportation, repair and rental services, to the public, with the exception of services related to child care and day camps, care for the elderly and persons with disabilities;

(d) Shopping malls;

(e) Lobby areas of commercial buildings;

(f) Hotels and motels, with the exception of the rented rooms therein;

(g) Laundromats;

(h) Concert venues, theatres and cinemas;

(i) Fitness centres, gyms and other recreational and sports facilities;

(j) Arcades and other amusement facilities;

(k) Real-estate open houses;

(l) Museums, galleries, historic sites and similar attractions;

(m) Places of worship; and

(n) Municipal buildings.
(6) For greater certainty, a waiting area, lobby, service counter, washroom, hallway, stairwell and elevator are included as part of any “enclosed public place” prescribed in subsection (5) of this section if they are open to the general public.

(7) For greater certainty, the following places shall not be included as an “enclosed public place” for the purposes of this section:

(a) an enclosed public place that is owned or operated by or on behalf of the Provincial or Federal Government;

(b) universities, colleges and schools;

(c) hospitals, independent health facilities and offices of regulated health professionals; and

(d) an indoor area of a building that is accessible only to employees.

(8) For the purposes of this section, a “face covering” shall mean a medical mask or non-medical mask or other face covering, including a bandana, scarf or other fabric that covers the nose, mouth and chin to create a barrier to limit the transmission of respiratory droplets.

(9) Every person who is the owner or operator of an enclosed public place shall post clearly visible signage conspicuously at all entrances to the enclosed public place containing the following text in a minimum font size of 24 point:

Protect each other

Wear a face covering

Cover your nose, mouth, and chin

Required by the Face Covering By-law

Does not apply to children under the age of five and those who are unable to wear a face covering as a result of a medical condition or a disability.

(10) Every person who is the owner or operator of an enclosed public place shall not permit a person in such enclosed public place without a face covering.

(11) A “person” in subsections (9) and (10) of this section shall include, but not be limited to, a corporation.

2. This By-law may be enforced by:
(1) a police officer of The Regional Municipality of Waterloo Police Service;

(2) a municipal law enforcement officer or by-law officer appointed by the Council of The Regional Municipality of Waterloo;

(3) a municipal law enforcement officer or by-law officer appointed by a lower-tier municipality within The Regional Municipality of Waterloo; and

(4) such other person as designated from time to time by The Regional Municipality of Waterloo.

3. (1) Every person who contravenes any provision of this By-law is guilty of an offence.

(2) Upon conviction, every person who contravenes any provision in this By-law is liable to a fine not exceeding one thousand dollars ($1,000), exclusive of costs, for each offence, recoverable under the provisions of the Provincial Offences Act, R.S.O. 1990, c. P.33, as amended, or any successor legislation thereto.

4. If any provision of this By-law is declared invalid for any reason by a court of competent jurisdiction, only that invalid portion of the By-law shall be severed and the remainder of the By-law shall still continue in force.

5. This By-law shall not be interpreted so as to conflict with a Provincial or Federal statute, regulation, or instrument of a legislative nature, including an order made under the Emergency Management and Civil Protection Act, R.S.O. 1990, c. E.9, as amended.

6. This By-law may be cited as the “Face Covering By-law”.

7. This By-law shall come into force and effect on July XX, 2020.

8. This By-law shall be repealed on a date as determined by Council.

By-law read a first, second and third time and finally passed in the Council Chamber in the Regional Municipality of Waterloo this 6th day of July, A.D., 2020.

__________________________________________  ________________________________
Regional Clerk                              Regional Chair
Appendix “B” To Report PDL-LEG-20-33 Dated July 6, 2020

Draft By-Law Number 20-XXX

of

The Regional Municipality of Waterloo

A By-law to Amend By-law 13-050, A By-Law Respecting the Conduct of Persons Entering Upon Buildings, Grounds and Public Transportation Vehicles Owned or Occupied by The Regional Municipality of Waterloo, to Require the Wearing of Face Coverings in Enclosed Public Places of Regional Buildings and on Public Transit

Whereas the Province of Ontario and The Regional Municipality of Waterloo of Waterloo have declared emergencies as a result of the COVID-19 pandemic pursuant to the Emergency Management and Civil Protection Act, R.S.O. 1990, c. E.9, as amended;

And Whereas the Council of The Regional Municipality of Waterloo wishes to implement a requirement for persons to wear a face covering while within Regional public transportation vehicles, bus shelters and platforms at transit stations and in enclosed public places of Regional buildings that are open to the public to assist in reducing the spread of COVID-19 within The Regional Municipality of Waterloo;

The Council of The Regional Municipality of Waterloo enacts as follows:

1. By-law 13-050, A By-Law Respecting the Conduct of Person Entering Upon Buildings, Grounds and Public Transportation Vehicles Owned or Occupied by The Regional Municipality of Waterloo (the “By-law”), is amended to add the following section 10.1:

   “10.1 For greater certainty, this By-law shall not apply to a person who is acting in his or her capacity as an employee or agent of the Region.”

2. Section 1 of Schedule “B” of the By-law is amended to add the following subsection (1.1):

   (1.1) “face covering” shall mean a medical mask or non-medical mask or other face covering, including a bandana, scarf or other fabric that covers the nose, mouth and chin to create a barrier to limit the transmission of respiratory droplets;

3. Subsection 2 of Schedule “B” of the By-law is amended to add the following subsection (2.1):
“(2.1) Being within a public transportation vehicle, bus shelter or platform at a transit station without a face covering over the person’s mouth and nose unless the person is under the age of five years old, or the person has a medical condition or disability that prevents the wearing of a face covering or would inhibit the person’s ability to breathe. No person shall be required to provide proof of any of the exemptions set out herein.”

4. Subsection 2 of Schedule “B” of the By-law is amended to add the following subsection (2.2):

“(2.2) Being in an area open to the general public within a Region building without a facial covering over the person’s mouth and nose unless the person is under the age of five years old, the person has a medical condition or disability that prevents the wearing of a face covering or would inhibit the person’s ability to breathe, or a face covering is not permitted pursuant to any provincial or federal legislation, directive or order. No person shall be required to provide proof of any of the exemptions set out herein.”

5. This By-law shall come into force and effect on July XX, 2020.

6. This By-law shall be repealed on a date as determined by Council.

By-law read a first, second and third time and finally passed in the Council Chamber in the Regional Municipality of Waterloo this 6th day of July, A.D., 2020.

________________________________________________________

Regional Clerk

Regional Chair
From: Lori Mason  
Sent: July 5, 2020 6:38:58 PM  
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Civil rights

Mandatory masking is raping us of our civil rights and freedoms. This should be very frightening to you in a free democratic country. Since when does a government have the right to dictate what I wear? The fact that our mayor for whom I shall never vote, finds himself in a conflict of interest is in itself frightening.

______________________________________________________________

From: Ted Parkinson  
Sent: July 6, 2020 9:46 AM  
To: Regional Clerk <RegionalClerk@regionofwaterloo.ca>  
Subject: Wearing Masks

I support the proposal to legislate the wearing of masks. We have to decide: are we serious about living in a pandemic, or is it just some passing fad? When I shop at most grocery stores only 40% of customers have masks. We know how Covid is spread through the air and yet it seems like we are only pretending to respond to this potentially devastating issue. It is certainly frustrating to wear a mask when inside all stores, and see so many people behaving like it is just a 'regular day'. I don't think this has to be forever. Regional Council can re-assess in the fall. If we can manage to avoid a second wave then we might be OK. I know there is not a lot of research about masks, but more is coming. And we know that meeting of choirs, or large crowds without masks increased transmission. People die. It has been proven over and over. So let's be adults about it, and be responsible. Thank you for initiating this legislation.

Ted Parkinson  
Kitchener, ON

-------------------------------------
From: Andrew Kish  
Sent: July 6, 2020 9:45 AM  
To: Regional Clerk <RegionalClerk@regionofwaterloo.ca>  
Subject: July 6 2020 Mandatory Mask By-Law

Hello Region of Waterloo Council,
As a citizen of Waterloo, I wanted to share that I am eagerly hoping you will pass the mandatory masks by-law today.

There are no steps that are too onerous for citizens to take, if it means preventing even one case of COVID-19.

I think of it like driving the speed limit: those limits are there for a reason. We could trust everyone to drive safely all the time, and for the most part, people would probably drive safely. But the laws and speed limits are there to make sure that everyone’s following the same rules, and everyone is doing their part to keep the community safe.

I view masks the same way – left to their own devices, most people would probably go about their daily lives safely. But having a by-law ensuring masks are mandatory would make sure that everyone is playing by the same rules, doing their part to keep the Region safe.

Thank you,
- Andrew Kish  
Waterloo

-------------------------------------------------------------------

-------------------------------------------------------------------

From: Sharon MacKenzie  
Date: Mon, Jul 6, 2020 at 9:29 AM  
Subject: Support Mandatory Masks  
To: <council@kitchener.ca>, <regionalcouncillors@regionofwaterloo.ca>, <council@waterloo.ca>

Good morning,
I just wanted to voice my support of mandatory masks in public spaces that Council will be discussing tonight. IF we wish to safely open schools in the fall, I believe that we now need to use masks to lower, if not eliminate, local cases of CoVid. It is a small inconvenience for people when inside public places and not wearing them is just not worth the risk.
As an individual who knew two people in this region who passed of CoVid, I am in full support of this. I do not mind wearing a mask when indoors as it is just a temporary but necessary item to keep people safe from me.

Sharon MacKenzie
CHCI
Special Education Department Head

From: Jamie & Karen Howieson
Date: Mon, Jul 6, 2020 at 9:34 AM
Subject: Mandatory Masks in the Region of Waterloo
To: <council@waterloo.ca>

Hello,

I am writing to you today to say that my wife and I fully support a vote in favour of mandatory mask usage in the Waterloo Region during the COVID-19 pandemic. It is our hope that council will vote in favour of this as a preventative measure to help reduce the risk of future outbreaks.

Sincerely,
Jamie & Karen Howieson

From: Laura Ramsahai
Sent: July 6, 2020 9:01 AM
To: Regional Clerk <RegionalClerk@regionofwaterloo.ca>
Subject: Mandatory Masks please

I live in the Eastbridge Neighborhood, ward 4. Ahead of tonight's vote I would like you to know that I am in support of mandatory Masks. It is true we have worked hard and reached a point where we have very little covid in our community. I want to see it stay that way, and as we all get out into the community the safest way to do that is with masks. Masks work best when everyone wears them and unfortunately from what I have seen lately people aren't doing it. Any benefit that the collective mask wearing gives us is worth the slight discomfort of the mask.

-------------------------------------
-------------------------------------
From: Karen Andrews  
Sent: July 6, 2020 8:36 AM  
To: Regional Clerk <RegionalClerk@regionofwaterloo.ca>  
Subject: say no to mandatory masks

Hello

Why do we sell cars? There are a lot of deaths & injuries each year from accidents.

Who is pulling the strings in Canada?

With such low numbers of deaths from this virus - why are you allowing mandatory masks & social distancing?

Please send me proof that this is helpful. I've read a lot that says it is not. Healthy people should not be wearing masks - children should not be wearing masks - they aren't dying from this virus.

The number of cases in Canada - ON have been dropping for weeks and weeks - even after the protests that were 3 or 4 weeks ago! (the number of deaths is the same as other flu seasons)

When you wear a mask you become low in oxygen very quickly – it’s not good for your health, not good for your brain.

Want a stronger immune system? Take vitamins C, D & zinc - that has a positive effect on your health and causes NO harm - why don't you suggest this?

If you feel you're safer then wear a mask – don't make me wear one to make you feel safer.

My body, my choice!

Sincerely
Karen Andrews
From: Dawn Turai  
Sent: July 6, 2020 8:18 AM  
To: Regional Clerk <RegionalClerk@regionofwaterloo.ca>  
Subject: Mandatory masks - yes please!

Good morning. I know there is a meeting about making masks mandatory today. I just wanted to say that I really hope you vote for the masks. We've all read about the research and the opinions of medical experts. We've also seen what is happening in the States. Our best defense, besides hand washing and social distancing, is wearing a mask in public places. I'm committed to the mask cause, as I've personally made and given away over 400 masks to the community, for free. I know a lot of people complain about the infringement of their rights, but this is not about personal rights at the moment - it's about the safety of our community members. Please make the responsible, considerate choice and vote for mandatory masks. If you don't want to make it mandatory for ALL businesses (but I hope you do), please at least make it mandatory in grocery stores. It is very disturbing seeing so many staff and customers at grocery stores breathing on (and sometimes coughing and sneezing on) and touching food. If masks are not made mandatory here, I will definitely be doing my grocery shopping in Guelph, where masks are mandatory. Also, I'm hoping you will make face shields mandatory for those who can't wear masks for medical reasons. Thank you.

-------------------------------------

-------------------------------------

From: MaryLou and Milne Oakes  
Sent: July 6, 2020 8:16 AM  
To: Regional Clerk <RegionalClerk@regionofwaterloo.ca>  
Subject: Face Masks

Please forward to all councillors for today's meeting. We fully support the mandatory wearing of masks in indoor public spaces plus outside when social distancing is not possible. Doing this protects everyone and shows respect for the health of each person. Waterloo Region has done well and we cannot afford to falter but must go forward improving. Thank you.

-------------------------------------

-------------------------------------
I’m writing to urge you to adopt a requirement that masks be worn indoors in public spaces, including in stores and on transit. Mask mandates have been adopted in countries and localities around the world (including close to home, in Guelph and Toronto), and there is considerable evidence that masks are a critical tool in controlling the spread of Covid-19. We would all like to “reopen the economy” and get back many of the things we’ve missed during lockdown, but we are seeing right now in many American states how reopening can quickly cause the virus to spread uncontrollably even in areas where the virus had seemed to be comfortably contained during the lockdown phase. Particularly given our proximity to Toronto, where there continued to be higher numbers of reported cases even before the recent lifting of some restrictions, I am very concerned that Waterloo region is ripe for a spike in infections as we ease our own restrictions. Masks are essential to allowing us to reopen safely.

Discussion of mask mandates often focus on a vocal minority who insist they won’t comply, and therefore on thorny issues of enforcement and penalties. But the vast majority of people, when told something is a rule, will do what they are asked to do. And if the Region focuses on making masks available to those who need them, that will further increase compliance. I urge you not to get sidetracked by debates about who will enforce the rule or what types of fines to impose: just make the rule, and if 90% of people voluntarily comply (which has been the case in other jurisdictions) then studies show that we will reap an enormous benefit in terms of reduced transmission notwithstanding the small group of vocal dissenters.

-------------------------------------

Hi there, I have been following the news of the impending stage 3 opening which may include exercise facilities. I own a boutique hot yoga and exercise studio and have already plotted out our space with the 2 metre distance between yoga mats as well as the usual measures most businesses are taking. So, my concern is that we will have a blanket mandatory mask wearing rule implemented in our region that will inadvertently include those who are exercising. Wearing a mask over your face during exercise, especially in a hot room, can be dangerous to a person’s oxygen flow and they may become dizzy. I am happy to enforce mask wearing until the student is situated in their designated exercise spot, but then I ask the region to allow the removal of masks during
From: Terry  
Sent: July 5, 2020 10:18 PM  
To: Regional Clerk <RegionalClerk@regionofwaterloo.ca>  
Subject: Face mask vote

I would like to express my disfavor of mandating that the general public wear masks in any capacity albeit indoors or outdoors. My first argument would be that there has been no talk of what type of masks would be required. The vast majority of masks everyone is wearing DO NOT protect against viruses. Read the box of the attached file. So I ask what is the point of wearing a mask if it specifically states that it does nothing to protect against coronavirus. Dr Fauci is on record saying that masks do not protect you against Covid.

http://www.realclearpolitics.com/video/2020/05/12/flashback_march_2020_fauci_says_there's_no_reason_to_be_walking_around_with_a_mask.html?jwsource=cl

We are talking about microscopic particles that easily pass through the majority of masks. If we really want to protect ourselves from a virus we should take note of what virologist in virology labs are required to wear. There is also evidence that you do NOT get a CDC recommended level of oxygen while wearing a mask. I'm sure that this is against our Bill Of Rights to be required by a mandate to receive less than the recommended amount of oxygen.

I realize there are a lot of recent article refuting this but here is a scientific study peer reviewed that was done in 2008 that proves this


If wearing masks was an option that council believes is effective than why are we now just deciding this? We have managed to flatten the curve and are now in a downward trend. Why now are we deciding to inact totalitarian mandates? I ask that council votes against the mandate tomorrow.

-------------------------------------

From: Dan Tomic  
Sent: July 5, 2020 9:15 PM  
To: Regional Clerk <RegionalClerk@regionofwaterloo.ca>  
Subject: Please vote NO to mandatory masks

Hello to all on regional council,

I am writing to express my view, opposed to mandatory face coverings in our region.

1. The region has flattened the curve (which hardly even seemed to happen outside of LTC homes in the first place) and new infections are at an all-time low without the use of masks – so why do we need them now?

2. The chart in this link https://www.regionofwaterloo.ca/en/health-and-wellness/positive-cases-in-waterloo-region.aspx shows only 1 new case per day, for the last 4 days Jun 27 to 30 without mandatory masks. Why would council even consider mandating the whole region wear masks for such a low incidence?

3. Our positive situation doesn't warrant the ROW to now force residents to wear a piece of material that has been proven time and again to be virtually useless in preventing protection from this or any virus.

4. The absence of faces creates unspoken fear and mistrust in the community.

5. Mask wearers don't even wear them properly-exposing nose and/or mouth, improper fit, touching non-stop, etc. It creates false security to the wearer.

6. So hard to hear or understand speech, often resulting in leaning closer to speaker in order to hear.

7. If council believes mandatory masks must proceed, please exempt churches as they did in Guelph. Spoken word is a key component and must be heard clearly. Human interaction via facial expressions shouldn't be hidden.

8. I am praying that you make the right decision, not only in this matter but in all matters.

Thanks for your consideration.
Dan Tomic  
Roseville ON

---


---
From: Debrodniks Donuts <info@debrodniks.ca>
Sent: July 5, 2020 4:30 PM
To: Regional Councillors <RegionalCouncillors@regionofwaterloo.ca>
Subject: Forced Masking

Please enter the following statement from our businesses, on the record:

Your forced masking bylaw, downloads enforcement on small business owners, like us, without having consulted with business owners to see what impact this would have on their business. City council members won’t be the ones turning loyal customers and their children away and denying them service, it will be us, as business owners, that will be expected to enforce their policy and act as Mask Police. This will place undue hardship, stress and pressure on already struggling small businesses such as ours. We were not consulted, and we assume no other business owners were consulted to see if they wish to function as mask enforcement.

We have already seen cases of business owners being yelled at and insulted, in particular those who are visible minorities, while trying to enforce municipal mask mandates. This is an additional burden small business owners do not need at such a trying time. Once again, we can only assume this was not taken into consideration in formulating this bylaw.

We have been in touch with Dan Kelly, President of the Canadian Federation of Independent Business and he has publicly criticised this approach and does not recommend municipalities adopt it.

Furthermore, here is what your own health expert, Acting Medical Officer of Health for Waterloo region, Dr. Hsiu-Li Wang said to CTV Kitchener only a couple of weeks ago on June 20:

“I want people to wear masks, but I feel it’s not the right approach for us to put the onus on the business owner and operator to enforce that their patrons wear masks, to determine whether someone can be excluded from entering, to deal with people’s complaints why others are not wearing masks, and to do this under the threat of a fine of $5,000 a day,” she said. “I do not believe that’s the right approach at this time.”

We couldn’t agree with her more.

We have no desire to be the Mask Police.

We have hundreds of people come through our door every week, and from our vantage point, there is no reason for the Mayor to suggest that the residents of our community are failing in some way by not meeting an arbitrary threshold of mask acceptance, and therefore, the only solution is to enact punitive and restrictive laws that force them to do something they may not wish to do. Our customers have all been so wonderful and cooperative. They have waited patiently outside in the heat and sun, perfectly socially distanced, and in good faith, fully cooperated with guidelines required by our health
experts. They have been so supportive as we continue to try to run a business under the strangest of scenarios. We see no failure on the part of the general public. Their response to these circumstances has been nothing but admirable and they are deserving of our eternal thanks and gratitude.

If you pass this bylaw, you need to take ownership of it and coordinate the boots on the ground to enforce it. Hire bylaw officers to patrol plazas and shopping areas and give them the authority to forcibly remove people doing their groceries from the store because they are not wearing a mask. Don’t make this our problem. We already have more than enough of our own.

Management Team
Debrodniks Donuts/Mini Mays Cookies
700 Strasburg Road
Kitchener ON

From: Geoffrey Gartshore
Sent: July 5, 2020 6:05 PM
To: Regional Clerk <RegionalClerk@regionofwaterloo.ca>
Subject: Draft Covid Mask Bylaws

I strongly support the proposed by-laws to require masks in public places and on Grand River Transit where social distancing is not easily achieved. Please see the attached brief letter outlining my thoughts and concerns, for review by Regional Counsel. Thank-you for this opportunity!


July 5, 2020

To: Regional Counsellors:

Dear Sirs/Madams:

I have read with interest about the draft mask bylaw that will be debated Monday night July 6, 2020.

I understand that letters are coming in and several delegations are planning to speak. No doubt there will be dissenters arguing either a loss of civil liberties or that science does not support mask wearing during this Covid period.

I am a retired scientist and strongly support a mask bylaw for the following reasons:

• Medical professionals are in agreement that wearing a mask where physical
distancing is not possible is advisable, both in protecting the wearer and those in close proximity from transmission

- We have done fairly well to date in flattening the curve here in Waterloo Region – but diligence is needed to ensure we do not have to revert back to more closures and restrictions, just because people can’t be bothered to wear a mask.

- Personal and public health is paramount here over personal feelings or “rights”, when so much is at stake.

- All of us, including businesses, want and need clarity in terms of mask wearing – from my observations and discussions with others, I would say a majority of people are not currently wearing masks in public places.

- It is not a major discomfort to wear a mask in a public place – at other times, when social distancing is easily achieved, we can opt not to wear a mask. A clear by-law on this is important.

- Now is not the time to be swayed by a few passionate dissenters – realize that likely the silent majority will support this by-law, with the understanding that it will have a shelf life as things gradually improve. Based on my discussions with many peers, all would support this bylaw for personal and public protection in the short term as we all struggle to get this Covid in check.

I trust you will all make the right decision on this important matter by voting in favour of the draft by-laws that will be tabled on Monday night.

Sincerely,

Geoffrey Gartshore
Waterloo, Ontario

From: Mybodyismychoice
Sent: July 5, 2020 2:31 PM
To: Regional Clerk <RegionalClerk@regionofwaterloo.ca>
Subject: Face masks

I’ve become aware that your team will be voting Monday on mandatory face masks for our region. Before your team does so I’d like to be able to meet with you and get you to sign some paperwork verifying that your team has been made aware of the undeniable dangers of doing so. I’d like to get a signature from everyone who will be voting Monday before they even vote if possible. Stay inside stay home orders have deprived our people of their vitamin D. Critical in maintaining healthy immune systems to fight
96 percent of all COVID deaths had vitamin D deficiency. The data I'm linking includes studies and approved oxygen levels etc. It's only from .gov sources. Meaning that it's reliable and approved data for public use. Also meaning it's not to be debated to suit anyone's narrative even if it contradicts the official narrative. As you can see the data clearly confirms not only are masks a false sense of security when fighting COVID they are actually lowering the populations chances of survival by suppressing their immune systems. Furthermore the article goes on to explain out of the 20 doctors tested all developed higher odds of developing pneumonia etc as I circled. COVID as you all know attacks the lungs and blood stream. Again this is government data shared from government sites and it's not someone's opinion. Not my opinion not anyone's opinion but the governments own opinions. Furthermore if your team is to push forward with mandatory face mask orders after reading this undeniable data you are literally endangering the lives of every citizen in this city and will be held accountable in the court of law. I sure hope it doesn't come to that. I need verification from your team and those voting that they have received this information. Can you please contact me with an available time to get confirmation. And I sure hope given light of this information we not only stop the mandatory suppress your immune system orders. We can work together to stop the corruption.

make sure you don't ignore the undeniable data to either push a law fear mongering or for profits whatever your motive is don't ignore the dangers! It's pretty clear as day masks are not good for fighting pneumonia so when you all vote in favour

Ruston Evans

-------------------------------------

-------------------------------------

Ruston Evans
From: Monique Krawecki  
Sent: July 5, 2020 1:51 PM  
To: Regional Clerk <RegionalClerk@regionofwaterloo.ca>  
Subject: Mandatory Face Mask Meeting

Dear Council Members, I respectfully ask that you please don't decide to make masks mandatory in our Region unless you actually see our numbers start to rise again to the point where we would be in danger of moving back to a Phase I re-opening status. Making people wear masks in the hot summer just in case it may prevent the spread of disease especially in places where there is no air conditioning may be asking a lot in the summer months. There are warehouses in Brampton (where masks are mandatory) that are not air conditioned & the workers are forced to wear masks all day. These are not conditions that many living and working in this Region would want to be subjected to. I know two hairdressers that are completely exhausted by the end of the day because they have to wear a mask while blow drying hair and using other hot appliances. One is thinking of closing her business in Waterloo if the mandatory wearing of masks goes on for too much longer in her field. In my own experience, my breath fogs up my glasses when I wear a mask and get too hot. Also, the hotter I get the more my face sweats. Then my face gets itchy and I tend to touch my face more often trying to wipe the sweat or scratch the itch. Aren't we supposed to try not to touch our faces. Which is worse - touching your face or not wearing a mask? I also worry that if masks are made mandatory, that these restrictions won't be reversed even if our numbers become much lower than they are today because who will want the responsibility to make the determination that we are completely out of the woods and safe enough to take the mask off. If you decide to follow other communities and make mask wearing mandatory anyway, then I please, please ask that masks not be made mandatory anywhere where social distancing is easily achievable and already in place and also ask that masks not be made mandatory inside buildings that do not have air conditioning in the summer months. Thank you for your consideration.

-------------------------------------
-------------------------------------
From: Dawn Parker  
Sent: July 5, 2020 1:21 PM  
To: Regional Clerk <RegionalClerk@regionofwaterloo.ca>  
Subject: Supporting the mask bylaw

Dear councilors. I support Mayor Vrbanovic’s proposed mask bylaw. There is sufficient evidence that masks may help prevent and dampen outbreaks. Peoples behavior is also strongly influence by social norms. Once a bylaw shifts the social norm most people will comfortably comply. In most circumstances wearing masks also causes little harm. I do suggest channels to provide masks for all who need them. Right now we are at risk of a contentious situation creating divisions among residents. A clear message will help mitigate this problem. Thanks all for good leadership in these challenging times.

-------------------------------------
-------------------------------------

From: Jena  
Sent: July 5, 2020 11:43 AM  
To: Regional Clerk <RegionalClerk@regionofwaterloo.ca>  
Subject: Not making masking mandatory in Waterloo region

I understand that the council will be voting on making masks mandatory at the meeting July 6th, 2020. I would like to to see the freedom of choice be exercised in this situation. There aren’t studies showing the effectiveness or safety in wearing masks in public. There are even situations where mask wearing has lead to illness. Most of the public have had no training in doning and doffing of face masks, making their use even less effective.
I am opposed to making masks mandatory in Waterloo region. As has been repeated many times, hand washing is the most effective way of stopping the spread of many illnesses. I have not heard anywhere that mask wearing is an effective method of halting transmission, and in fact have read many articles saying there are no studies done to confirm they help stop the spread of disease in a general public setting. I hope to see a result of letting people choose what they feel is best for themselves and their health and well being. Thank you.

-------------------------------------
-------------------------------------
From: Tracy Morency  
Sent: July 5, 2020 10:21 AM  
To: Regional Clerk <RegionalClerk@regionofwaterloo.ca>  
Subject: Mandatory Mask bylaw

Councillors,

As a Waterloo resident who operates a retail business in Guelph, I strongly urge you to NOT make masks mandatory in Waterloo Region unless you amend the bylaw such that the onus for compliance and consequences are directed at individuals and not businesses. The Guelph bylaw is untenable for businesses and has created many more problems for me as a retail manager than it is has resolved. I must pay a staff person to babysit my front door at all times. I have alienated numerous customers who were happy to shop when masks were optional, but will not set foot in my store now that they are mandatory. As there is no onus on individuals who claim a medical condition that exempts them, I am left with taking people at their word, and then the backlash from other customers who are wearing a mask and question why some individuals are not. When an "exempt" person enters my store and I address them, I then need to run around to my other staff members to alert them that I have questioned the individual and they need not do so again, lest they anger the person who now feels harassed. Simply put, businesses are struggling to regain their footing as it is; making them police a bylaw to avoid a huge fine is not in the best interests of anyone. The vast majority of customers are already complying with recommended practices, including social distancing, making use of the hand sanitizer I have at the door, wearing a mask if they feel comfortable doing so, etc. If you insist on making masks mandatory, then put the onus for compliance on individuals - and do your own enforcement. Thank you.

-------------------------------------  
-------------------------------------

From: RiPh  
Sent: July 4, 2020 8:17 PM  
To: Regional Clerk <RegionalClerk@regionofwaterloo.ca>  
Subject: Mask By-law

4 July 2020

Please distribute this letter to the Chair and Council for their consideration to discuss the By-law to Require the Wearing of Face Coverings in Enclosed Public Places and the By-law to amend the Code of Use By-law (13-050, as amended) at the Council Meeting on July 6, 2020.

I would urge the Council to vote in favour of these By-Laws.
I have read the Report PDL-LEG-20-33 and Appendices.

This is literally a life and death issue where the Regional Government and Health Authority must take action to protect its residents and to protect its residents from each other.

There is no vaccine for Covid-19. There is no effective treatment or therapies which will guarantee that everyone who gets Covid-19 will live. This is an invisible virus that knows no boundaries and attacks human beings, is transmitted human to human, and does not discriminate who it targets.

The most frightening aspect for the entire population is that people can be asymptomatic [not displaying any symptoms] and still transmit the virus.

Therefore the wearing of cloth [non-surgical, non N-95] masks must be made mandatory as per the proposed By-Laws.

Thank you for your consideration.

Richard Phillips
Cambridge, ON
Ward 8

From: Raymond Hoang
Sent: July 4, 2020 6:40 PM
To: Regional Clerk <RegionalClerk@regionofwaterloo.ca>
Subject: Re: Mandatory Masks Bylaw Comment

Hi,

Would it be possible to put in a religious exemption to the mask by law, to prevent any constitutional challenges? The County of Essex has allowed a religious exemption, even though they had the worst outbreak in Ontario.


---
From: Carol Thorman  
Sent: July 4, 2020 2:56 PM  
To: Regional Clerk <RegionalClerk@regionofwaterloo.ca>  
Subject: Mask bylaw

Dear Chairwoman Redman and Councillors:

Mask it or Casket! Please, pass this bylaw immediately since common sense is not common.

Our economy cannot afford to be shut down again especially when we have reasonable measures to ensure safety.

Carol Thorman

-------------------------------------
-------------------------------------

From: John Jackson  
Sent: July 4, 2020 9:13 AM  
To: Regional Clerk <RegionalClerk@regionofwaterloo.ca>  
Subject: Proposed by-law re wearing masks during covid

I urge you to pass a by-law requiring wearing of face masks in the situations you specify in your draft by-law. The voluntary face mask use system is not working. Those who fail to wear masks deprive the rest of us of our right to reasonably safely participate in the gradual re-opening of our community. One example is on the Region’s transit system. Earlier this week, I took the bus downtown to do some essential errands. There has been much publicity about the Region urging transit riders to use masks. In addition, there were recorded messages playing occasionally on the bus urging people to wear masks and to socially separate. Is it working? No. In my ride to downtown Kitchener out of a total of nine people on the bus only three of us wore masks. Coming back home, half of the twelve riders wore masks. In addition, even though there was lots of space on the bus for people to sit at safe social distances, a couple of people sat down right next to other people. This is not good enough. I urge Regional Council to pass a by-law as quickly as possible to protect our community from new outbreaks of COVID-19 and to protect the rights of all of us to fully participate in our community as it gradually opens up. Wearing masks is not interfering with the right of people to participate in the reopening of our community. But those who don’t wear masks do interfere with the right of the rest of us to fully participate in our community as it reopens.

John Jackson, Kitchener
From: Emily Schroeder  
Sent: July 3, 2020 6:19 PM  
To: Regional Clerk <RegionClerk@regionofwaterloo.ca>  
Subject: Copy of email to all councillors re: mask bylaw

As you prepare for the special council meeting on July 6, I appeal to you to review the attached letter previously sent to you by the Ontario Civil Liberties Association, which details concerns with probable harms from a mandatory mask bylaw. I strongly agree with all concerns in the letter. I have already contacted my personal representatives, Regional Chair Karen Redman and Mayor Sue Foxton. However, since I access goods and services throughout the region, this issue is of immediate importance to me and my family.

The World Health Organization itself outlines likely disadvantages of the use of masks by healthy people in the general public (noted in the attached letter), including:
• potential increased risk of self-contamination due to the manipulation of a face mask and subsequently touching eyes with contaminated hands • potential self-contamination that can occur if non-medical masks are not changed when wet or soiled. This can create favourable conditions for microorganism to amplify • potential headache and/or breathing difficulties, depending on type of mask used • potential development of facial skin lesions, irritant dermatitis or worsening acne, when used frequently for long hours; • difficulty with communicating clearly • waste management issues; improper mask disposal leading to increased litter in public places, risk of contamination to street cleaners and environment hazard

I would add a potential increase in anxiety, depression, and feelings of social separation as masks restrict normal human interaction.

I implore you to consider the body of evidence and the breadth of public health considerations when contemplating a sweeping change that would restrict the public’s access to essential needs like food and other life-sustaining goods and services. Please do not use our tax dollars to support a fear-based mandate not based on solid scientific study that will only increase division in the region, and waste money in futile bylaw enforcement.
From: David Croft  
Sent: July 6, 2020 10:26 AM  
To: Regional Clerk <RegionalClerk@regionofwaterloo.ca>  
Subject: Easy decision on masks. Look to Vietnam and Taiwan

Both Vietnam and Taiwan have had mandatory mask requirements since the beginning. They've had a total of 369 cases in Vietnam and about 479 in Taiwan. Business is operating close to normal in both countries. I realize that individual rights are a concern but there is the greater good and burden on health care and the vulnerable elderly. I have been puzzled by the chief health authority in Ottawa who initially said masks were of no benefit and then reversed that opinion. Could it be that because of the shortage of masks they did not want to panic the populace?

David Croft  
Waterloo ON

---

From: Adrianne Kershaw-Gies  
Sent: July 6, 2020 10:22 AM  
To: Regional Clerk <RegionalClerk@regionofwaterloo.ca>  
Subject: Fwd: Supporting mandatory mask wearing in Waterloo Region

To Region of Waterloo Council Members,

Respectfully, the following are my thoughts regarding supporting mandatory mask wearing in the Waterloo Region.

I am a mother, wife and daughter who has taken Covid very seriously. Here are my reasons..

- currently a mother to a teenage daughter with asthma (who is okay wearing a mask for the brief periods of time when it's absolutely necessary)

- my son was hospitalized and was in critical condition at Grand River Hospital in 2009 with H1N1, fortunately back then, tamiflu was available to progress recovery, & hospital beds for quarantining were also available. (He now gets a flu shot yearly as per Drs. Orders as they feel he is compromised) this is an active hockey playing, college student and golfer who you would never think would have been affected so critically. So you just NEVER know!

- wife of a diabetic in his 60's
- daughter to a vibrant 82 year old mother, and 2 parents in law who are in their 80's and pillars of the community. (All living independently, thankfully, as the assisted living environment is NOT where I'd feel comfortable)

- acquaintance of a man who lost his life due to Covid in April, (who was NOT living in an assisted care facility) here in Waterloo.

I have been shocked and dismayed at the lack of mask wearing in the Waterloo region. We are very different from other centres. In London, it's the exception to not wear a mask out in public, especially in the retail sector. I have been served in retail stores and drive thru Windows by employees not wearing a mask. After all the preparations & precautions taken to disinfect surfaces, installing Plexiglass and direct the flow of traffic and stickering to ensure distancing, I still walk in places like The Short Stop, for example, to be greeted by customers and staff not wearing masks.

I wear one for myself, but also for others, as does my entire family. I try valiantly to distance myself in these situations, however, some people (without masks) aren't getting it. They have no Covid spatial awareness, brushing right by me in an aisle, rather than distancing. How hard is it to wear a piece of fabric over our face in these situations for a small period of time, in light of the current situation?

I am only putting myself in these situations when absolutely necessary. So, when I'm there, I would like to protect myself, my family members, and in turn, others.

I believe mask wearing needs to be mandated for the time being, in any indoor public space, or places where it's harder to distance, wait staff on patios, for instance. This would pull any perceived stigma away from the wearer as it would take the decision out of their hands. I think it is important to think about the greater good currently, while ensuring that we safely meet any risks appropriately, together.

Sincerely,

Adrianne Kershaw-Gies

mother, teacher, spouse, sibling and daughter

From: Monique Joy
Sent: July 6, 2020 10:10 AM
To: council@waterloo.ca; Regional Councillors
To: <RegionalCouncillors@regionofwaterloo.ca>; Regional Clerk
To: <RegionalClerk@regionofwaterloo.ca>
Subject: Decision on Making Masks Mandatory in Waterloo Region

Good morning all and thank you for the opportunity to voice my opinion and for your attention to it. I appreciate your difficult position of making this decision for the people in
the Waterloo region. I hope you get enough feedback to feel confident in your decision for us.

With that said, I feel strongly that making masks mandatory is not a sound decision. Not only are the numbers extremely low in our area and continuing in that trend, masks have not been proven to be effective for the general public. When the WHO recommended (please note that they recommended, NOT mandated) masks, they did so with provisions on how people should be wearing them and unfortunately, most people do not adhere to these guidelines which is likely making them more susceptible to the virus. If the science were solid, masks would have been made mandatory by the WHO in January. It is now July, our region is doing really well, we are social distancing, and slowly getting into a new normal - making masks mandatory at this time seems foolish to me.

I also think it will also be a motivator of harassment in public spaces as people will feel even more entitled to police other citizens as I was several weeks ago even without a mandatory mask bylaw.

I believe passing a mandatory mask bylaw would create more public problems and actually increase people's chances of getting COVID-19. For these reasons, I urge you to not do so.

Thank you for your time and attention in this matter.

Monique Joy
Waterloo, ON

From: Sarah Robson
Sent: July 6, 2020 10:13 AM
To: Regional Clerk <RegionalClerk@regionofwaterloo.ca>
Cc: Regional Councillors <RegionalCouncillors@regionofwaterloo.ca>
Subject: Mandatory mask vote

Hello,
I wish to express my support for the vote to make masks in Waterloo region mandatory. I would be very pleased if masks were mandatory. While I am already wearing a mask voluntarily, I would be more comfortable when I do need to go out if others around me would also mask.
I believe this is supported by sound medical and scientific research.
Thank you.
Sarah Robson
Waterloo, ON
From: Lindsay Laur  
Sent: July 6, 2020 10:15 AM  
To: Regional Councillors <RegionalCouncillors@regionofwaterloo.ca>; Council@waterloo.ca; Regional Clerk <RegionalClerk@regionofwaterloo.ca>  
Subject: Mandatory masks in Waterloo Region

Good morning to all who are reading this.

Today you will be voting on mandatory masks in Waterloo region and I have several concerns regarding this.

1) Firstly, as someone who suffers from extreme claustrophobia, I’m extremely concerned about my wellbeing when I am out without a mask. I cannot have anything covering my mouth or I suffer from panic attacks.

So I must choose to “label” myself so when I am getting groceries for my family I am not verbally abused by those wearing a mask or choose not to go into any indoor establishment while this is in place.

2) That leads to my second concern of an out plan. Masks should not be a “new norm” but rather a “new now”. There needs to be an exit strategy in place prior to this being voted through.

3) How is this going to effect the mental health of those who cannot hear? Those who rely on reading lips to communicate? Our elderly who have a difficult time hearing as it is? Is this something you are considering? As someone who can hear perfectly well, I’ve already had multiple times where I cannot hear what a person is saying because they are behind both a plexiglass and a mask, add to that a thick accent and communication is almost impossible!

4) Health wise...you talk about masks being required where social distancing is hard or people are not moving around. This very well could be parks when Phase 3 begins. So this means our children will be required to wear masks outside, in the summer, when it’s 40C with humidity? Absolutely not! It’s hard enough already for many to breathe in an air conditioned building, let alone playing and running around outside in the heat! This is a serious health concern and will result in health complications.

I truly hope this matter will be discussed thoroughly and trust you will look at all of the criteria and concerns before a vote is taken.

From a concerned local mother of 2 with claustrophobia

Lindsay Laur
From: Evelyn Bennett  
Sent: July 6, 2020 10:59 AM  
To: Regional Clerk <RegionalClerk@regionofwaterloo.ca>  
Subject: Masks in a public places  

Good morning ,  
I am not sure if this is the right department to send this to.  
I am deeply concerned about the lack of wearing face masks in public .  
Recently my grocery shopping was most unpleasant and disturbing . In Sobeys at Bridgeport Road it seemed that hardly any customers were wearing a face mask along with most staff members. Social distancing seemed to have been abandoned. I could hardly wait to get out of the store.  

I have had two trips to TD Bank at Erb St and King over the past weeks. While they have marked out social distancing when I went to join the line up a staff member approached far to close to ask why I needed to be there. This happened on both occasions and both times the staff were unmasked and I asked them to step back. As a resident of Kitchener Waterloo I am trying my best to protect others by wearing a mask and I do hope that Council will vote to make it mandatory. Watched the LRT this am on my early morning walk, very few people who were on the train were wearing masks !  
I sure don’t want to have to drive to Guelph to feel safe shopping. I am not alone in this thinking.  
Can you please forward this to the appropriate department.  
Thank you,  
Evelyn Bennett  

--------------------------------------------------------
--------------------------------------------------------

From: Joan van Arragon  
Sent: July 6, 2020 10:57 AM  
To: Regional Clerk <RegionalClerk@regionofwaterloo.ca>  
Subject: Mandatory Facial Covering (masks) By-laws  

As a Cambridge citizen who wears hearing aids, I am absolutely against a mandatory masks by-law - especially concerning wearing masks outdoors where social-distancing is practised. When we go for walks outdoors during the hot weather, masks get soaked and become much harder to use properly. Because masks muffle voices, I have difficulty understanding what is being said and making myself understood. My fear is that it can be too easy to pass by-laws which totally disregard personal responsibility and freedom. I would much prefer to see recommendations that mirror the provincial guidelines which apply to us already. Sincerely, Joan van Arragon  

--------------------------------------------------------
From: Corliss Olson  
Sent: July 6, 2020 10:53 AM  
To: Regional Clerk <RegionalClerk@regionofwaterloo.ca>  
Subject: In favour of mask by-law

Hello,

We wish to add our names to the list of people supporting a mask by-law. It is common sense, & we need your leadership to pass this by-law to help protect us all. Such a by-law will also assist businesses trying to implement a mask requirement; only with a mask requirement will we be patronizing local businesses.

We urge you to support the mask by-law. Thank you.
Corliss Olson & Douglas Drake 
Kitchener

From: Andrzej Jaronski  
Sent: July 6, 2020 10:51 AM  
To: Regional Clerk <RegionalClerk@regionofwaterloo.ca>  
Subject: Should masks be mandatory?

To whom it may concern,

Unless this region has experienced a huge increase in covid-19 cases and related deaths far above the average for a regular flu season, I vehemently object to this bylaw.

Given the amount of flip-flopping by the WHO, especially it's most recent announcement that MASKS are NOT ENOUGH, implying that only a vaccine can eliminate this novel coronavirus, not a healthy person's immune system, I believe forcing masks on the MAJORITY of residents does not make sense and will force this taxpayer to stop patronizing stores.

Sincerely,
A. Jaronski 
Waterloo, Ontario
From: Mark Andrews  
Sent: July 6, 2020 11:39 AM  
To: Tim Brubacher <TBrubacher@regionofwaterloo.ca>  
Subject: Mandatory mask bylaw

Hello Tim,

I would like to formally voice my opposition to this proposal. The forced wearing of masks at this point is nothing more than virtue signalling. Masks for the healthy are unnecessary and ineffective. Studies have shown the increased C02 levels and decreased oxygen levels associated with wearing a mask can actually be harmful.

Additionally, the low number of cases in the region simply does not warrant this level of government interference.

Mark Andrews

---

From: Robert Graham  
Sent: July 6, 2020 11:26 AM  
To: Regional Clerk <RegionalClerk@regionofwaterloo.ca>  
Subject: Myth - It’s new we have no defence

Every living person is proof they have the natural defences inherited from a long line of ancestors who have survived every pathogen which has ever attacked them. While this virus may be new, new viruses are nothing new. They have come along countless times in the history of humanity. And if you think this virus is deadly to healthy people you haven’t been paying attention to the facts. The fact is that each time a healthy immune system encounters this virus it promptly begins to defeat it. Then, after recovery, the person has nothing to fear and those around are safe from transmission from that person.

---

From: Jaclyn Witt  
Sent: July 6, 2020 11:36 AM  
To: Regional Clerk <RegionalClerk@regionofwaterloo.ca>  
Subject: In support of mandatory masks

Good morning,

I’d like to vote in support of mandatory masks in Waterloo region. Thank you kindly,

Jaclyn Witt

Sent from my iPhone
Hello,
Please include this in tonight's vote for mandatory masks in the Region of Waterloo. Please remove any personal information like my name and email.

Good evening Mayor, council and regional chair,
I am in favour of mandatory masks in Waterloo Region to help limit the spread of COVID-19. I have been wearing a mask since stores started to open up. My family, including 3 children, do as well. I have sewn over 300 masks for my community, so I know people are wearing masks.
I will continue to advocate for wearing masks in our communities, stores, etc. when my children go back to school, they are prepared to wear a mask. It is not an inconvenience, it is to show others that I care for them and I care for me. I would hope others would do the same for me.
Please vote yes, for mandatory masks, to protect my parents, your parents, and everyone and so I have a community to continue to call home, and my children have a community to grow up in...
thank you

From: Deanna Ozolins
Sent: July 6, 2020 11:47 AM
To: Regional Clerk <RegionalClerk@regionofwaterloo.ca>
Cc: regionalcouncillors@regionofwaterloo.ca
Subject: Support for mandatory face masks

I wanted to voice my support in favour of passing the mandatory face masks in Waterloo Region. The science clearly shows that masks work and from my observations the people of Waterloo Region cannot be trusted to do the right thing without it being enforced. Go to any given grocery store on any given day and you see people not maintaining distancing, not following the directions arrows and not wearing masks. Making masks mandatory will give the retailers the support they need to keep us all safer.

Deanna Ozolins
Waterloo
2 July 2020

SUBMISSION to Waterloo Regional Council on Mandatory Mask Bylaw Vote.

Title: Legal Public Notice
Calling for Complete Legal and Civil (Full Personal) Liability to be Held Against ALL Council Members and Mayors.

To: Waterloo Regional Council c/o Board of Health Chair
Karen Redman
Regional Chair’s Office
1st Floor, 150 Fredrick St., Kitchener, ON
N2G 4T0
tel. 519-575-4585

PUBLIC DOMAIN/INTERNET

Dear, Board Health Chair, Karen Redman,

Please consider the following an official citizen submission to the Waterloo Regional Council for the Mandatory Mask Bylaw vote as necessary because of the very serious impact it will have on the population. Be fully aware of the serious intent of this document and submission of evidence to the Waterloo Regional Council (hence Council): to hold ALL Council members, from Mayor Barry Vrbanovic to and including ALL voting members to be held to high standards of liability under CIVIL and CRIMINAL law for any and ALL
harm, damages and losses that the citizens of the region will experience due to the passage of MANDATORY MASK LAWS being proposed to be IMPOSED on the general public. Too often the world has seen flippant and careless leaders take incompetent and oppressive actions that have harmed the public. The most blatant being Neil Ferguson of Imperial College whose AWFUL AWFUL useless models predicted millions of UK deaths, when in REALITY, only a few thousand occurred. A HORRIBLE and USELESS LOCK DOWN (HOUSE ARREST) resulted and the population suffered DEPRIVATIONS NEEDLESSLY.

NOTE: the numbers for covid 19 from the very beginning have always been QUESTIONABLE with the CDC constantly revising them down/ward, and admitting the testing has been seriously flawed. The very classification of “pandemic” has been seriously questioned by the world’s leading epidemiologists, who content that it should NEVER have been classed as a pandemic in the first place! In the context of your Mandatory Mask Bylaw, Neil Ferguson was under lock down/self isolation, but that did not stop him from having sex with a married woman. POINT: even the guy who made incredible predictions did NOT believe in the so called data which caused his own quarantine.

Conclusion, if such experts are in charge, how in any good sense can a person even believe your contention of the need for such a Mandatory Mask Bylaw? The precedent has been set, the government experts demanding extreme measures have been proven wrong, incompetent and down right disgraceful! The authorities caused great harm and did not listen to the world leading experts who were stating the opposite. BAD POLITICAL POLICIES AND INTERESTS were put ahead of the best experts on earth! And this is EXACTLY the case I am presenting to you. You can act on presented scientific documents, or you can choose some private political interest. The difference I intend to see is that if the Council can not document supported judicial actions taken with care, YOU will be PERSONALLY held accountable with personal LIABILITY!!

Premier Doug Ford has shown a complete failure of leadership by playing politics. He chose not to impose a Mandatory Mask law, so either it is a failure of leadership, or he KNOWS it is NOT necessary. There is clearly
NO REAL MEDICAL basis for any such law! NOT NEEDED. A dangerous virus does NOT care what a provincial figure may choose versus a regional one. A virus is either dangerous or NOT! WE are not talking about Harry Potter Magic! That Premier Ford chooses not to act proves the virus is not dangerous. Premier Ford would not endanger the people of Ontario. And that makes the Region of Waterloo frivolous and hubris if they choose to impose an unnecessary and foolish law (that will add unnecessary harm and stress to its citizens). The ENTIRE province has much greater resources than any regional municipality: hence, a more limited Council to impose the bylaw represents a FRIVOLOUS Act of Arrogance (like Neil Ferguson). So then it follows that the Waterloo Regional Council FLOUTS the Rule of Law:

"the mechanism, process, institution, practice, or norm that supports the EQUALITY of ALL citizens before the law, secures a NON ARBITRARY form of government, and more generally PREVENTS THE ARBITRARY use of power. ARBITRARINESS is typical of various forms of DESPOTISM, AUTHORITARIANISM,..., Despotic governments include even highly institutionalized forms of rule which the entity at the apex of the power structure (a junta, party committee, i.e., the Waterloo Regional Council) is capable of acting without the constraint of law when it wishes to.

In general, the Rule of Law implies that the creation of laws, their enforcement, and the relationships among legal rule are themselves LEGALLY REGULATED, so that no one—including the most highly placed official—is above the law. The legal constraint on rulers (Waterloo Council) means that the government is subject to existing laws as much as its citizens are,..., the idea of equality before the law, which holds no"legal" person (Waterloo Council members) shall ENJOY privileges that are not extended to all and that NO person SHALL BE IMMUNE from legal sanctions (modified from Rule of Law: Britannica Online Encyclopedia).

Point of Fact: can it be alleged that any Waterloo Council members have ever enjoyed SPECIAL PRIVILEGES not extended to ordinary citizens, and did not suffer penalty under law? Allegation Example: in building the LRT, the allegations have surfaced that the route changed so it could pass over land owned by, or by friendly interested parties, of Council Members. That
prosecution for the allegations of corruption were never followed up on. This is a typical allegation of any regional council that could be found in all of Canada. Point: allegation is that some council member could have profited while others in the community without special privilege of council while others in the community without special privilege experienced no such gain (perhaps even loss). Since no one was ever investigated then allegedly the council members had placed themselves above the Sanction of Law. Therefore, a FOUNDATION has allegedly been established that any criminal can act in alleged arrogance and not face accountability for their actions. MORE LIKELY THAN NOT A DEMONSTRATED FOUNDATION for a logical argument.

NOTE: the actual LRT route choice was NOT a scientific development but more of PERSONAL CHOICE. Alleged Foundation: Council did not use strictly scientific decisions but more personal/political preference after the actual science was given.

Alleged Demonstration: Council acts in its own political best interests. Allegedly on historical model, Council believes that it is beyond (personal) accountability and the RULE OF LAW. Premier Doug Ford with ALL the medical scientific and resources of the ENTIRE province of Ontario will NOT order Mandatory Masking. Nevertheless, with alleged hubris, the Waterloo Council and Mayors believe that they have more medical expertise than the entire province. I do not believe that Waterloo Council is so qualified. I believe the expertise of Waterloo Regional Council was demonstrated in their handling of the LRT project and the debt burden they have acquired for many decades to come. Their noted expertise is substandard when it must weigh the mental health and other stressors that they will inflict on the citizens of Waterloo and their lack of expertise in the field of epidemiology and related concerns. The expertise has built an alleged Foundation that gives Council special privilege not shared with the citizens. A violation of the Rule of Law: Despotic and self serving. As such, every private citizen should have the recourse to hold each council member personally liable for any and all harm that comes from their voting policies. The citizens of Waterloo Region are suffering personal and economic hardships, and Council’s unqualified hubris can make that suffering much worse if they do not
demonstrate the ability to learn and act, because their failures will make the suffering worse: suicide, alcoholism, drug abuse, spousal abuse etc. If council refuses to review all scientific and medical submissions made to them in good faith, the vote for mandatory masks can cause more harm. Then, to safeguard the public, Council can no longer be allowed to hide behind the shield of council indemnity where the taxpayers payout for lawsuits, the council members must be liable to have to pay settlements from their own holdings, bank accounts, homes and other properties to pay for the harm they may cause with this vote. THERE ARE SERIOUS CONSEQUENCES IF COUNCIL MAKES THE WRONG CHOICE based on arrogance and the belief they are above the law. Hence, my presentation is most serious and blunt so the decision to pass or fail the vote for masks will weigh very heavily on the Council’s collected mind. We do not need any more Neil Fergusons.

An allegation in the public right now is the masks are needed to instill fear in the public so they will want vaccines in order not to have to wear masks. If more and more municipalities force more and more of their citizens to wear masks, then you promote the vaccines by causing panic and pain. The allegation then becomes that there are many forms of kickbacks from such sources as politicians and people who have interests in the vaccine companies, and from universities for research monies. Like the LRT, it may or may not be true, but has a more likely than not foundation. POINT: therefore, the vote YES to mandate masking is not based on medical science nor the public good, but private gain. And that means the masks are of no value to the citizens. And down the road, The Council must be held liable.

THEREFORE, THE Council vote must be recorded and each member must have their name beside the yes or no on the public record.

BENEFIT OF DOUBT: The Council will hold a vote, and hopefully in the best interest of the public. The material submitted in this document by Greenhalgh is made in sincerity to give medical science based evidence why the mandatory masking bylaw is not good and must be voted NO.
REAL MEDICAL EVIDENCE OF DEATH. There must be a real and present
danger from covid 19 greater than others to justify the bylaw.
Example: 1969 and the Hong Kong Flu. One to four million people DIED from
the flu. No lock down (house arrests) no mandatory masking and minimal
economic hardship occurred. No suicides. No alcoholism etc. In fact it was
the Summer of Love. If you believe the very flawed covid 19 data, about
500 thousand people have died, but even the CDC discounts that number
citing bad tests, and bad data recording. The number is probably much less.

Modern 21st Century Precedents Cited.
STATISTICS CANADA Deaths due flu/pneumonia in 2018 = 8511 Canadians
39,192 cases
Government of Canada Deaths due covid 19 2020 =8,522 Canadians
103,250 cases.
Note, comparing the two groups deaths, they are statistically IDENTICAL.
However, when you look at the number of cases (infected) the flu is MUCH
MORE DEADLY. The flu kills more within a smaller sample group. The “flu”
was roughly THREE TIMES more lethal!!! NOTE: 2018, NO HOUSE ARRESTS
NO MASKS. LESS suicides, alcoholism etc.

These are Government of Canada figures, but from these, there is NO valid
reason, nor basis for mandatory masking bylaw!

The Council may ask for an outside witness, and one such person could be
Dr. Denis G. Rancourt (of Ottawa). As of 29 June 2020 he has written:
Masks Don’t work: A Review of Science Relevant to Covid 19 Social Policy.
That sounds EXACTLY like the input the Council would demand to make their
decision.

Again, Council who would vote YES are imposing appalling conditions
on already stressed people. And so, you must consider the following
commentary.

COMMENTARY: masks-for-all-for-covid-19-NOT based on sound data.
By Dr. Brosseau and Dr.
JAMA Patient Page March 4 2020
Medical Masks by A.N. Desai MD MPH and P. Mehrota MD MPH
https://jamanetwork/journals. These authors say masks may have a use in
the restricting the spread of infectious diseases, but most people do not
clean themselves properly, nor wear them properly and handle them
improperly. They conclude, “FACE MASKS SHOULD BE USED ONLY BY
INDIVIDUALS WHO HAVE SYMPTOMS OF RESPIRATORY INFECTION SUCH AS
COUGHING, SNEEZING, OR IN SOME CASES FEVER. FACE MASKS SHOULD not
BE WORN BY HEALTHY INDIVIDUALS to protect themselves from acquiring
respiratory infection because THERE IS NO EVIDENCE TO suggest that face
masks worn by healthy individuals are effective in preventing people from
becoming ill.”

Science Daily https://www.sciencedaily.com/ Cloth Masks: DANGEROUS to
your Health? April 22/2015
Summary: Respirator infection is much higher among health care workers
wearing cloth masks compared to medical masks, research shows. Cloth
masks should not be used by workers in any health care setting.”

There are many many other examples you should consider before
voting on mandatory masks. Remember, Waterloo Regional Council is
claiming that it has much more expertise than the Premier of Ontario.
I can not believe that is true. If you do not look deeper at all the research,
much of which argues against masks. Very respected researchers with years
of experience. You would, therefore, be proven NEGLIGENCE, if Council
disregards this evidence and makes a hasty “flip” vote of convenience for
whatever private gain or agenda you are seeking. That would not be in the
public good, and expect much harm to result. Therefore, the public must
have the ability to seek compensation from the harm your hubris will cause.
And this is the reason why all of this must be public domain and part of
open public records. The public must be able to seek fair re dress and
compensation liability from negligent council members.

Other important research you must consider are the video
presentations of the world’s leading epidemiologists such as Dr. Wolfgang
Wodarg, Dr. Knutt Wittkowski, Dr. Simon Thornley, Dr. Dolores Cahill, and
Dr. Sucharit Bhakdi (whose Federation of Epidemiologists have sent an open letter to the German government to end the lockdown). Consider, https://www.israelnationalnews.com/ “Coronavirus is dead, claims former Health Ministry Director-General” Prof. Yoram Lass, former Director-General of Health Ministry says coronavirus is dead. Tests are confusing old infections with new ones,..., writing that the virus has been essentially eliminated by antibodies developed by people infected during the first wave.”

And be sure to review the following, “Millions of accumulated years of life will be lost to Covid 19 response. June 15, 2020 https://www.covidplanb.co.nz/media-and-politics/

[Lockdown] policies have created the greatest global disruption in history, with trillions of dollars of lost economic output. These financial losses have been falsely portrayed as purely economic. To the contrary, using numerous National Institutes of Health Public Access publications, centres of Disease Control and Preventia (CD) and Bureau of Labour Statistics data and various actuarial tables, we calculate devastating non-economic consequences that will total millions of accumulated years of life lost in the United States, far from what the virus itself has caused.”

READ that again: “devastating non-economic consequences that will total millions of accumulated years of life lost in the United States, far beyond what the virus itself has caused.”

Now read that again as “how much suffering have YOU /Council caused in Waterloo region leading to suicide etc??????I have given you a chart of flu deaths vs covid 19 deaths (identical) BUT I respectfully request, Karen Redman, that you supply a chart of the number of suicides for the region, with 2018 vs 2020. You will see a huge spike for 2020. Chair Redman, Mayor Vrbanovic and Regional Council, how much MORE suffering are YOU going to keep stacking on the poor people of the region??? Why masks? Why don’t YOU just get a club and beat the people to death??? If you pass the mandatory mask law, as the medical evidence would contra
indicate, then I can not put into words just how dreadful you are. If you don’t let up, there is no health danger by the evidence presented, then YOU have some private agenda and personal gain not related to medical evidence. Hence, I have made two cases, 1. medical based, and the second 2. based on the need for the public to be protected by being able to hold ALL of YOU personally liable. I respectfully request that you make copies of this submission available to ALL Council members. A complete medical science referenced argument has been made against the mandatory mask bylaw. I also request any vote taken is held with attendance taken and each members vote recorded. And that is the bottom line. And why I have listed this submission as Public Domain and to be put on the internet for all to see and judge your response.

Thank you.

Edward A. Greenhalgh, MSc., HBSc

July 2020.