

1. Despite the fact that a letter is not required to be produced and can only be requested by Police/Peace officers, we know that the mask ignorant will demand it at stores and the public will scream at us behind the mask.
2. Doctors will not write letters even for people with issues on the list of exemptions which Hinshaw knew, thus creating more anxiety and discrimination against a protected class.
3. Deena Hinshaw, a Doctor, but not **your** Doctor, has decided what conditions you may have to qualify for an exemption - without examining a single person. This is NOT her decision. There are so many conditions that a mask impacts, including rational brain functions! This is practising medicine on the public through willful or gross negligence acts causing severe harm and possibly death. This is nothing less than terrorism and criminal intimidation.

Some of the mores subtle changes in this Order are just as critical to consider:

Order 20-2021 has a sub-heading "**Masks**", Order 22-2021 has a sub heading "**Masks Required**"

#### **Order 20-2021**

Includes the words

*"Subject to section 2.7 of this Order, a person must wear a face mask at all times while attending an indoor public place. For greater certainty, an indoor public place includes any indoor location where a business or entity is operating."*

#### **Order 22-2021**

Removes the clarification - therefore it now applies to all places even if not in operation. It also infers a much greater definition of a 'public place'.

*"3.1 A person must wear a face mask at all times while attending an indoor public place."*

#### **Order 22-2021**

Has modified the exemptions in three critical ways;

In Oder 20-2021 we had, "2.7 (a) is a child under two years of age;" has been removed from the exemptions section and added to the "**Exceptions for children and students**". It now reads;

*"4.5 Despite Part 3 of this Order, a child under two years of age does not need to wear a face mask **at all times** while attending an indoor public place."*

The "**at all times**" is CRITICAL here as it is setting up for the masking of infants which should be a capital crime! Read this as a child under two WILL be required to wear a mask SOMETIMES.

Sections 4.6 and 4.7 in Order 22-2021 adds more confusion to this by excluding a child from a mask in some group situations. So, why have wording suggesting the masking of an infant!?

In Oder 20-2021 we had, "(c) is unable to wear a face mask due to a mental or physical limitation;" This has been removed entirely. This is where the medical letter comes in.

#### **"Exception for health condition**

*4.2 Despite Part 3 of this Order, a person who is unable to wear a face mask due to a health condition as determined by an authorizing health professional is excepted from wearing a face mask while attending an indoor public place.*

*4.3 For the purposes of section 4.2, the health condition must be verified by a medical exception letter that includes the following:*

*(a) the name of the person to whom the exception applies;*

*(b) the name, phone number, email address, professional registration number, and signature of the authorizing health professional; and*

*(c) the date on which the written confirmation was provided.*

*4.4 For greater certainty, although the medical exception letter must verify that a health condition listed in Appendix A applies, it must not include specific information about the health condition."*

This outlines the structure of a letter, that most health care professionals have been telling their patients they cannot write because of the College. I have heard from other Doctors that this isn't the case so we obviously have either Doctors lying to patients or the College targeting Doctors, as they have for HCQ prescriptions.

However, even if the Doctor decides you should not wear a mask as it is unsafe, i.e. due to CO2 build up, not fit for purposes, not fit to the person, not fit (i.e. you are not fit to wear one) and not fit for the environment (how can you need a mask standing up, but not sitting down eating?) **unless** it's on Hinshaw's list, too bad, so sad. Effectively, this forces a Doctor to tell you to wear a mask even if they believe it is unsafe for you to do so. If the risk is there in the environment, sitting down didn't change that. You don't get to eat lunch and take off the protective gear when removing asbestos or cleaning an anhydrous ammonia tank just by sitting down!

Hinshaw has now decided what conditions qualify for exemptions. As a Doctor who has never seen you as a patient, she has no ability to decide what conditions you may have that would pose a risk. However, she has handcuffed health care professionals with a limited list without examining a single person. This is Gross Medical Negligence causing harm and risking death.

Hinshaw has not defined an appropriate 'mask'/respirator (there isn't one) and has not provided training in use or care. As such, she is committing offences relating to health and safety and should be prosecuted (along with everyone else).

Some points.

- No Police Officer can force production but can give a ticket (like always)... nothing changed. Take the ticket and fight it in court.
- No Judge can force production but can give a fine (like always)... nothing changed. But here you get your day in court and the exemption was never the real defence.
- The changes to the exemptions are insane... (in my professional opinion as a retired Police Officer).
- Doctors have been told by Colleges not to provide letters and Hinshaw et al knows this. This is causing substantial harm to a protected class. As such, this is willful (or grossly negligent) discrimination under human rights per se.
- Doctors can charge for these letters (I just heard some are charging up to \$100). Therefore, exempt people are further discriminated under the Human Rights legislation (even if you can obtain a letter).
- Hinshaw et al. know this will cause more discrimination when stores and the public think you have to produce a letter. The obvious escalations and stress will put disabled people (and others) at risk.
- Mask dangers (CO2) cause an already volatile environment due to the physical manifestation of CO2 increase.
- Masks don't work. Consider all the outbreaks in Costco and other big box stores that have all been left open?
- Anyone who enforces these Human Rights violating 'rules' could be guilty of criminal intimidation. That includes my colleagues.
- Practicing medicine i.e. Hinshaw now deciding what would impact someone and forcing her 'patients' to mask up when she has no idea what the impacts are for society at large.
- The letter AHS has suggested (attached) also goes against the Order in that it specifically identifies conditions (some of which would be obvious) which in turn would be a breach of privacy.

Masks are outright dangerous. The increase in CO2 that it creates is literally designed to cause FEAR in anyone even someone without a working amygdala<sup>1</sup>. (40 times the legal limit of CO2 in minutes of putting on. Just ask Chris Sheaffer)  
<https://youtu.be/9Vmwsq8Eabo>

---

<sup>1</sup> <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/3122696/>  
<https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC1850806/>  
<https://jamanetwork.com/journals/jamapsychiatry/fullarticle/481714>  
<https://www.livescience.com/5910-carbon-dioxide-triggers-primordial-fear-suffocation.html>  
<https://www.scientificamerican.com/article/panic-attacks-as-ph-problem/>  
<https://www.nature.com/news/researchers-scare-fearless-patients-1.12350#:~:text=One%20situation%20in%20which%20the,concentrations%20that%20are%20not%20lethal.>  
<https://www.sciencedaily.com/releases/2009/11/091125134651.htm>