

RE: Councillor Proof of Vaccination Policy

January 6, 2022

Dear Chair and members of the CSC,

As promised, I am following up with additional reasoned arguments to avoid what I consider unfruitful discrimination between vaccinated and unvaccinated personnel.

Due diligence

Staff are at liberty to make administrative policies without council involvement. Once a duplicate policy is considered for council, then I believe we are obligated to do our due diligence on both. This is the purpose of my communication for those that read on.

Vaccine disappointments

I wish mRNA vaccines had been the “hard hat and safety boots” that we hoped for. What we metaphorically received instead was a toque that doesn’t prevent contraction and sandals that don’t prevent transmission. The lack of success was not a surprise to many experts in the field, but at least the vaccinated have personal protection from the most extreme outcomes of COVID.

mRNA vaccines can be harmful

I am seeing harmful side effects from the vaccines in my circles. These include ghastly short-term reactions, debilitating long-term injuries at the site of the injection, teens with myocarditis and one likely death. Nurses have contacted me with stories of tragic heart and blood clot problems they believe were adverse results of the vaccination. We need to honour the right to informed consent, especially for those people who already have myocarditis and blood clot issues. It is surprising that this is not talked more about in the press.

Devastating loss of respect

I believe the greatest damage caused by COVID is the loss of respect that has happened between family members, between friends, and between people who work together. It should be a priority to stop this before the damage escalates.

No moral high ground

Because of adverse reactions and the failure to prevent contraction and transmission, there is no group of people who actually did the right thing in their vaccine choices versus a group who actually did the wrong thing. There is only a single group, the people who thought they did the right thing, which is everyone. If we can accept this, then we can return to a respectful workplace, which some employees say has been a lost ideal within the corporation.

Tests have questionable value

Small to Medium size businesses can acquire rapid antigen test kits by signing an agreement with “HER MAJESTY THE QUEEN IN RIGHT OF CANADA”. The document requires the applicant to “acknowledge and agree” that:

1. The Kits have not been authorized by Health Canada for asymptomatic screening.
2. The Kits do not diagnose whether an individual has COVID-19, and the Kits may yield a false negative or false-positive result.
3. Workplace Screening does not replace public health measures such as symptom screening, physical distancing, masking and hand hygiene.

I see no value in having healthy people take these costly tests, especially when there is a need for them elsewhere.

No informed consent possible

The agreement also states that a company receiving the kits “represents and warrants to Canada” that they will “secure the prior informed consent of the individuals participating.” I

would like to know if the city has a similar restriction because I understand that consent cannot be given under duress, such as the threat of job loss.

Case counts

Testing people without symptoms prevents us from abandoning a dysfunctional redefinition of “cases”. Three years ago, if you said that grandma had a case of pneumonia, it meant that she was sick with a serious infection. Today we consider a case of COVID to be a perfectly healthy person with a tiny amount of suspicious DNA fragments in their nose. My son-in-law was such a case and had to quarantine for 10 days after a positive PCR test.

Blinders

Today I came across a fascinating lecture by Jordan Peterson, who observed that “Every stable society is threatened by willful blindness and malevolence.” In the present case of Ontario, we seem to be blinded by an obsession to minimize respiratory virus case counts in the broader public rather than focus on the vulnerable. Condemning the unvaccinated is the second myopia that prevents us from focusing on other crucial priorities such as:

- Job losses
- Business Closures
- Huge deficits
- Inflation
- Family disruption because of school closures
- Loss of civil liberties
- Breakdown of personal support structures
- Mental health issues
- Addiction
- Suicide
- Vaccine injuries
- Etc.

Proper risk assessment

COVID was only ever a significant threat to people at risk of death from comorbidities. Primarily it replaced the flu and pneumonia as the cause of death for people who would have succumbed to those diseases under similar circumstances. Much of the fear would disappear if people understood how little they are personally at risk (even from the unvaccinated).

Chain reactions

Many had the concern that if healthy people were allowed to interact normally then the virus would be transmitted and eventually make its way to an at-risk grandma in the nursing home. After two years, we have had the chance to create some pretty good protocols to protect grandma that don't require closing schools for instance.

Non-discrimination

For all these reasons, I believe that our best approach is avoid contributing to the sense of division in society and to return to an equal treatment policy where we mostly encourage people to stay home if they feel sick.

Medical advice

Though I believe it to be damaging and unnecessary, I do not entirely rule out the need to have different protocols for unvaccinated people. However, if there is some medical advice that justifies such a change in policy, I must insist that it be in writing, I insist that I see the document, and I insist on being shown the scientific evidence that supports it. I also believe that it should be public for transparency and proper scrutiny.

Sincerely,
Michael van Holst