



ANALYSIS OF ONTARIO DECLARATION OF EMERGENCY

COVID-19 DATA AYLMER ONTARIO

Crucial Information to Understand

Did you know that in order to make a Declaration of Emergency in any province or territory in Canada, that certain “conditions” must be first met? This would make sense, otherwise you could have mass pandemonium for nothing. Conditions are like the “safety” feature on a firearm. 100% necessary or else you could kill someone by accident. However, this did not happen when each province and territory in Canada, including ONTARIO, made their respective Declarations of Emergency.

What we are about to expose to you is this. Ontario did not meet the definition or conditions to make their declaration of emergency, therefore the declaration is invalid.

Start at the Beginning

In mid March 2020, each Canadian province and territory declared their respective Declarations of Emergency one right after another. Beginning on March 14 until March 27, 2020. Within 14 days, the entire country was locked down. Never before in our history. Below is a detailed summary for Ontario only. Aylmer specific data can be found on page 5.

On March 17, 2020 when the province of Ontario made its declaration of emergency, there was only 1 COVID-19 “related” death in Ontario, and 2 in all of Canada. In fact, the first COVID-19 “related” death was reported in British Columbia on March 9, 2020, a man in his 80’s with reported underlying health conditions

<https://www.cbc.ca/news/health/coronavirus-canada-death-1.5491907>. Ontario’s first COVID-19 “related” death occurred on March 11, 2020, a 77 year old man
<https://globalnews.ca/news/6705096/coroner-con>.

With Canada’s population of nearly 38,000,000 and only 2 COVID-19 “related” deaths at that time, all provincial and territorial declarations were excessive, unreasonable and unjustified.

With further and continual extensions to the Declarations of Emergency by all provinces and territories, it is now proven to be a sheer abuse of authority. The states of emergencies did not, and never existed. Everything for Ontario is explained in detail below.

ONTARIO Declaration of Emergency - Did Not Meet Definition or Criteria

March 17, 2020 – Premier Ford made a “Declaration of Emergency” under section 7.0.1 of the Emergency Management and Civil Protection Act (EMCPA).

In order to make this “declaration” though, the following 2 criteria needed to have been first met under sub-section (3).

Section 7.0.1(3)

Sub-section(3) – there are 2 criteria for making a Declaration of Emergency:

Criteria 1:

There is an emergency that requires immediate action to prevent, reduce or mitigate a **“danger of major proportions”** that could result in serious harm to persons or substantial damage to property (this is the actual definition)

Our analysis:

- on March 17, 2020, there was only 1 COVID-19 “related” death in Ontario when the Premier declared this emergency
- with Ontario’s population of just over 14,745,000 – this criteria of “danger of major proportions” was not met
- 1 death does not constitute any “danger of major proportions”
- **therefore the Premier’s declaration under the 1st Criteria was made in VIOLATION to the very definition of “emergency” under the EMCPA**

Criteria 2:

ONE of the following 3 (iii) circumstances must exist in order to make this Declaration of Emergency:

(i) circumstance under Criteria 2:

The **“resources”** normally available to a ministry of the Government of Ontario or an agency, board or commission or other branch of the government, including existing legislation, **“cannot be relied upon”** without the risk of serious delay

Our analysis:

There are 2 meanings here - let’s challenge **“resources”** under #1 and **“cannot be relied upon”** under #2 below:

- #1 meaning – that the existing **“emergency plans”** (one of their “resources”) were not reliable
 - did you know that every Municipality in Ontario and the Government of Ontario itself must formulate an emergency plan under sections 3, 6, 8 or 8.1 of the EMCPA?

- and that they conduct training exercises each year in order to be fully prepared for any emergency?
- and that this emergency plan is reviewed and revised each year?
- **therefore, this “circumstance” under subparagraph (i) does not exist**

- #2 meaning – that the current medical system (another “resource”) could “**not be relied on**” to handle any crisis
 - but wait, if the hospitals had not cancelled all surgeries and remained open for business as usual, then this “circumstance” would have existed
 - but this did not happen
 - in an effort to meet the “danger of major proportions” with this medical crisis, the hospitals cancelled all surgeries, and cleared beds waiting for a tsunami of COVID-19 patients that never came
- **therefore, this “circumstance” under subparagraph (i) also does not exist**

(ii) circumstance under Criteria 2:

The “**resources**” referred to in subparagraph (i) may be “**insufficiently effective**” to address the emergency

Our analysis:

In addition to the same analysis as above which also applies here, there is another meaning here. Let’s challenge “resources” again and “insufficiently effective”

- #1 meaning - that the hospitals (which are “resources” as well) are insufficiently effective
 - again, if the hospitals had remained open for business as usual, this “circumstance” would exist
 - however, the hospitals cancelled all surgeries to ensure they would be “sufficiently effective” to address the emergency, of which never came
- **therefore, this “circumstance” under subparagraph (ii) also does not exist**

(iii) circumstance under Criteria 2:

It is not possible without the risk of serious delay, to “**ascertain**” whether the “**resources**” referred to in subparagraph (i) can be “**relied upon**”

Our analysis:

Here are the following considerations to take into account when challenging the “resources” under this subsection, which implies that they could not be “relied upon” in this circumstance

- All factors for consideration:
 - Our emphatic first response is, *REALLY?!*
 - considering that the “resources” under subparagraph (i) are the 444 Municipalities in Ontario
<https://www.ontario.ca/page/list-ontariomunicipalities>; plus the Government of Ontario itself; and including the 384 hospitals in Ontario
<https://www.statista.com/statistics/440923/total-number-ofhospital-es-tablishments-in-canada-by-province/>
 - considering the yearly review and training exercises of all emergency plans by municipal and provincial staff
 - considering the cancellation of all surgeries by Ontario hospitals in their effort to meet this medical crisis (which never came)
 - considering all of these extraordinary things the Government of Ontario was doing to keep Ontarian’s safe
 - in light of all of the considerations that all parties went to in order to be “reliable” and ready for emergencies in Ontario
- **therefore, this “circumstance” under subparagraph (iii) also does not exist**
- **therefore, the Premier’s declaration under the 2nd Criteria did not meet any of the three circumstances**
- **Therefore, since the definition of “emergency” was not met and none of the three circumstances existed, the March 17, 2020 Declaration of Emergency by the Premier of Ontario was unauthorized, invalid, and illegal.**

Summary and Conclusion - Then vs Now - Ontario

Then - March 17, 2020 1 death did not constitute a “danger of major proportions” out of a population of 14,745,040

Now - November 4, 2020 3,166 deaths (0.021% of population 14,745,040) still does not constitute a “danger of major proportions” AND in consideration of the fact that of those deaths, 85% (2,691 deaths) occurred in long-term care home in Ontario, AND especially when the recovery rate of COVID-19 is 99.9%

- **Therefore, no such “emergency” ever existed for Ontario, then or now.**

Declarations of Emergencies called on Predictive Basis

Flash forward to today, we now know that all the provinces and territories made their respective Declarations of Emergency based on an international *predictive* model from Professor Neil Ferguson of Imperial College London UK on March 16, 2020. His report warned that **tens of millions would die** in a pandemic that was compared to the Spanish flu, the deadliest epidemic in modern times. Two days later, the US-Canada border closed to 'non-essential' travel, and one week after that, Prime Minister Trudeau announced an \$82 BILLION aid package to address the massive job losses expected from the lockdowns. Please refer to this hyperlink for full information <https://www.iedm.org/the-flawed-covid-19-model-that-locked-down-canada/> (we have downloaded it as a PDF in the event it is removed online).

Predictive vs Reality

Ferguson projected that, unmitigated, **COVID-19 would kill 326,000 people in Canada** this year. That would be **0.861% of Canada's population** [326,000 / 37,855,621]*100]. As of November 4, 2020 there have been **10,279** COVID-19 "related" deaths in Canada or **0.027%**, and **3,166** in Ontario or **0.021%**. We don't know about you, but that is a VAST difference and one that can no longer be ignored. Stats Canada only has data up until 2018 - 8,511 influenza deaths (the flu). Given that 2019 is not published for whatever reason, it would appear that the COVID-19 "related" deaths for 2020 are in par with reported Canadian government statistics.

- Predictive = 326,000 COVID-19 deaths or 0.861% of Canada's populations **would occur**
- *Reality = 10,279 COVID-19 "related" deaths or 0.027% of Canada's population / 3,166 COVID-19 "related" deaths or 0.021% in Ontario **did happen**
 - *As of November 4, 2020 there are 10,279 COVID-19 "related" deaths for 2020 in Canada; this is still in par with latest reported Canadian government statistics on annual deaths for influenza which was 8,511 deaths in 2018

| | |
|---|---|
| Aylmer ON - Population: 7,492 as of 2016 Census | Falls under Elgin County - Population: 94,922 as of 2019-07-01 |
| Aylmer falls under Southwest Public Health - Population: 200,000 approx in all municipalities who fall under Southwest Public Health | |
| ● # of COVID-19 "related" deaths: 5 (4 women and 1 man) | |
| ○ 0.0025% of population covid "related" deaths | |
| ○ Average age: 77 | |
| ○ 1st death - a woman in her 80;s - St. Thomas | |
| ○ 2nd death - a woman in her 70's - city unknown | |
| ○ 3rd death - a man age 90 - city unknown | |
| ○ 4th death - a woman age 72 - city unknown | |
| ○ 5th death - a woman age 64 in July - city unknown (this is the last death Jul/20) | |

Since the middle of July until present, Southwestern Public Health has had 180 positive COVID-19 cases but **no one has tested positive for the flu!** If they are not in flu season, how are they in COVID-19 season? Does not make sense. Does anyone die of the flu anymore?

Counting the Continual Declarations of Emergency in ONTARIO

So let's say that we would call the FIRST Declaration of Emergency as an act of "good faith". That our provincial governments were acting in the best interest of Canadians with the information they had at hand during that time. Heck, we could even go so far as to say they were still acting in good faith for the SECOND and *maybe* even the THIRD Declaration of Emergency. But what about the FOURTH, FIFTH and SIXTH and now with continual lockdown for one year at a time now?

| | | | |
|-------|-------------------|---|------------------|
| • 1st | s. 7.0.7(1) EMCPA | 14 days only | Mar 17-30/20 |
| • 2nd | s. 7.0.7(2) EMCPA | 1 further extension 14 days only | Mar 31-Apr 13/20 |
| • 3rd | s. 7.0.7(3) EMCPA | additional periods no more than 28 days | Apr 14-May 11/20 |
| • 4th | s. 7.0.7(3) EMCPA | additional periods no more than 28 days | May 12-Jun 8/20 |
| • 5th | s. 7.0.7(3) EMCPA | additional periods no more than 28 days | Jun 9-Jul 6/20 |
| • 6th | s. 7.0.7(3) EMCPA | 14 days this time | Jul 7-20/20 |

When it is all going to end?

Good question. Are you wondering like us, how long this can go on for? Seems like the powers shifted from the Premier to the Lieutenant Governor in Council (LGC) (*and you wonder why most Canadians are confused with this stuff!!!*) under section 7.0.7 Termination of Emergency.

Turns out that under this section that the LGC holds all the cards now. The LGC under section 7.0.7(1) "an emergency declared under section 7.0.1 (by the Premier of Ontario), is terminated at the end of the 14th day following its declaration UNLESS the LGC by order declares it to be terminated at an earlier date.

According to s.7.0.7(4) "If there is a resolution before the Assembly to extend the period of the emergency, the declaration of emergency shall continue until the resolution is voted on." Huh? Who is the "Assembly"? They are the MPP's who you elect and who sit in the Ontario House of Commons.

Seems that the Assembly may have powers to END the declaration of emergency because according to section 7.0.9(1) "Despite section 7.0.7, the Assembly may by resolution **disallow the declaration of emergency under section 7.0.1** (made by the Premier) or the extension of emergency." Maybe give your MPP a phone call if you want the declaration of emergency to end. Seems they DO have more power than they may have been telling their constituents.

Emergency Powers Shifts from EMCPA to Reopening Ontario Act

The extensions of emergency now pass from the EMCPA to the NEW **Reopening Ontario Act** (or Bill 195) that came into force on July 21, 2020. In case you didn't know the significance of this, it gives the provincial government extraordinary powers to **keep Ontarians in a state of emergency for one year at a time** under section 8.(2) of the Reopening Ontario Act (rather

than approving every 28 days under the EMCPA). How can we possibly REOPEN Ontario if we are continually in a state of emergency for one year at a time now? Was anyone paying attention to this when it was being voted on? Did your MPP fully disclose these extraordinary powers under this new Bill to you? At some point the declaration of emergency must end. The expressed understanding of an emergency is that it is temporary. These continual extensions of emergency give NO sight in end to the “temporary” emergency.

What was the Point of all this Information?

To bring you up to speed on what date the provincial governments had real-time Canadian data, that the “predictive” model was outrageously overstated and no longer valid. Since we know that the majority of those COVID-19 “related” deaths occurred between April-May 2020, almost 6 months later, the government can no longer keep us in a state of emergency based on their original predictive model.

The real-time Canadian data proves this. As of November 4, 2020, there have only been 10,279 COVID-19 “related” deaths in Canada, NOT the whopping 326,000 predicted deaths. And of that total, 3,166 COVID-19 “related” deaths occurred in Ontario of which 85% happened in long-term care homes.

Shouldn't we ought to be very concerned with what happened in those homes? Our seniors are at continued great risk from the COVID-19 regulatory measures that restrict their rights and freedoms. Right to be with their families. To express their humanity with their friends and family by way of human touch and social association. We are social creatures. This is NO way for our seniors to spend the latter part of their lives - this is inhumane and cruel.

- **Therefore, the Ontario provincial government can no longer justify the continued state of emergency because they have had data since April/May which confirms that the predictive model for making the original declaration of emergency is NO LONGER VALID. Their actions, beyond any “good faith” period of the 1st 28 days of lockdown, are now in fact done in “bad faith”.**

With the recent introduction of the October 20, 2020 1st reading of **Bill 218**, if passed, will completely remove liability to the province for their negligence on how they failed to respond and protect the vulnerable people living in Ontario's long-term care homes, when Premier Ford declared Ontario to be in a state of emergency on March 17, 2020.

Section 2(5) indicates “**No cause of action** arises against any person as a direct or indirect result of an individual being or potentially being **infected with or exposed to coronavirus (COVID-19) on or after March 17, 2020**”. This means that no one in the Ontario provincial government can be held accountable for their response to COVID-19 in respect of the tragic and completely avoidable loss of human life of our precious elders living in these homes. No one will have any right to recourse under this Bill.

Further details of Bill 218 under section 2(5), eliminates all lawsuits which have already been started by anyone suing the Ontario government in this respect under section 2(1). So no lawsuits *before or after* the effective date of this new Bill, if it is passed. Wow.

In what world of *people with good conscience*, would ever vote this in?

Protection from liability - no accountability for people we elect. This proposed Bill is not indicative of a free and democratic society. How did it ever come to this for Ontario? Isn't Canada supposed to be true north strong and **free**?

Do you think all of this might have something to do with the notion of the *saviour vaccine* that the Prime Minister and all provincial Ministers have been telling us for months now? That we cannot open "safely" until there is a vaccine. And what we will need this vaccine 3-4 times a year for the rest of our lives. This will be a BILLION if not TRILLION dollar business. Do you think that greed of profit may be driving this? Has anyone ever heard the government talk about herd immunity or the body's natural ability of our immune system to deal with viruses?

We feel a certain obligation to remind everyone of the United Nations Universal Declaration of Human Rights. For the full text - <https://www.un.org/en/universal-declaration-human-rights/>

The Universal Declaration of Human Rights

Preamble

Whereas recognition of the inherent dignity and of the equal and inalienable rights of all members of the human family is the foundation of freedom, justice and peace in the world,

Whereas disregard and contempt for human rights have resulted in barbarous acts which have outraged the conscience of mankind, and the advent of a world in which human beings shall enjoy freedom of speech and belief and freedom from fear and want has been proclaimed as the highest aspiration of the common people,

Whereas it is essential, **if man is not to be compelled to have recourse, as a last resort, to rebellion against tyranny and oppression**, that human rights should be protected by the rule of law,