

APPENDIX B



March 12, 2025

RE: Oakville By-law – Protests Near Vulnerable Social Infrastructure

To Whom it May Concern,

I am writing on behalf of the Centre for Israel and Jewish Affairs (CIJA), the advocacy agent of Jewish Federations of Canada-UIA, representing Jewish Federations across Canada. CIJA represents the diverse perspectives and concerns of more than 160,000 Jewish Canadians affiliated with their local Jewish Federation.

For more than a year, Jewish communities across Canada have been deeply distressed by protests targeting places of worship, schools, and community institutions that serve children, seniors, and other vulnerable individuals. These demonstrations – filled with hateful chants, signs, and antisemitic rhetoric – such as “From the River to the Sea,” “Go Back to Europe,” and “Intifada Revolution” – have targeted synagogues, schools, and community centres. These threats and protests have instilled fear, causing community members to feel unsafe while in or near these spaces.

CIJA was pleased that Council, at its meeting on December 16, 2024, directed staff to engage in a consultation and investigate a draft by-law for Oakville to address certain forms of protests within a reasonable distance of vulnerable community infrastructure. CIJA urges City of Oakville staff to compose a by-law similar to the one adopted by the City of Vaughan, By-Law 143-2024, which would prohibit “nuisance demonstrations” (protests) within 100 metres of religious houses of worship and schools, to ensure the safety, dignity, and well-being of students, worshippers, and the broader community.

It is crucial that the by-law be prescriptively strong, include punitive measures for non-compliance and strong enforcement powers, and, most importantly, that it be actively enforced. When too much discretion is given to enforcement officers, we have seen that response to by-law violations becomes inconsistent.

For the by-law to meet its objective in implementation and protect vulnerable communities from hateful and intimidating protests, CIJA recommends that the by-law:

- 1) Set a clear definition of a “nuisance demonstration” to ensure there are no irregularities or room for issues brought on by overt or other subjective bias. CIJA proposes the following definition of nuisance demonstration be reflected within the by-law:

“Nuisance demonstration” is any protest that involves expression of objection or disapproval toward an idea or action related to race, religious beliefs, colour, gender, gender identity, gender expression, physical disability, mental disability, age, ancestry, place of origin, marital status, source of income, family status or sexual orientation by any means, including graphic, verbal, or written means.

- 2) Include explicit direction and prescribe a clear and objective “test” for when the threshold of “nuisance demonstration” is reached. There must also be a clear commitment within the by-law to ensure law enforcement and by-law officers have the necessary resources to staff and respond appropriately to protests that fall under the jurisdiction of the by-law.

CIJA posits the following examples for the threshold test for a “nuisance demonstration:”

- Harassing or intimidating another person or persons.
 - Using offensive language or gestures; including but not limited to calling for death or eradication of an individual or group.
 - Creating discomfort, disturbance or confusion for members of the public, pedestrians, the occupants of a dwelling, or to passing motorists.
 - Obstructing the passage of pedestrians, thereby rendering passage impassable or difficult.
 - Playing music or any other noise that disturbs or is likely to disturb the occupants of a dwelling.
 - Ringing bells, sounding horns, blowing whistles, using amplifiers and microphones, shouting, screaming, or swearing.
 - Condoning, denying or downplaying the Holocaust, thereby willfully promoting antisemitism.
 - Displaying symbols of terror entities (such as Hamas or Hizbullah), including but not limited to flags and pictures.
- 3) The by-law should provide a clause that allows for greater enforcement flexibility to push the perimeter of the protest further away depending on size and scale of protest. For example, to ensure greater safety, a larger

protest (100+ people) could be positioned more than 100-metres from the protected space.

Opponents to such a by-law will claim that implementing a safe-access by-law is not constitutional. That argument is categorically false: while the rights to freedoms of expression and assembly are fundamental to Canadian society, these rights are not absolute and are subject to reasonable limits prescribed by law. Section 1 of the *Charter* allows for the balancing of benefits v. negative impact of reasonable limitations of these rights. There must be a reasonable balance between the protestors' right to civil disruption and the well-being of the rest of society. Instituting such a by-law will ensure Charter rights are protected. Further, there is precedence for safeguarding such institutions from disruptive protests as evidenced by by-laws implemented by other municipalities, including Brampton and Vaughan.

Thank you for your consideration of these recommendations, and please do not hesitate to contact me if you have any questions for clarification.

Sincerely,



Michelle Stock
Vice President, Ontario

Subject: Support for an effective 'Bubble' Zone Municipal Bylaw to Protect Vulnerable Infrastructure.

Dear Mayor Burton, Members of Council and Town Staff,

We submit this document as part of the community and subject matter expert consultation process regarding the proposed Town of Oakville 'bubble' zone municipal bylaw. We strongly support the implementation of this bylaw that prohibits protests and demonstrations within a minimum 100-meter radius of vulnerable infrastructure to ensure the protection of those who rely on these spaces for their essential services, including places of worship and schools.

The Lions of Judah (#theLOJ) is a not-for-profit organization dedicated to identifying and filling the gaps necessary to build a stronger, safer, and more resilient community. Our mission is to protect and support communities facing targeted harassment, ensuring their ability to live, worship, and function without fear. Over the past year, we have collected and cataloged extensive evidence, including videos, images, witness statements, and victim reports, that document the disturbing reality of hate-motivated nuisance protests. Our efforts are focused on advocacy, education, and policy recommendations that help strengthen public safety and community cohesion.

Understanding Impeded Access

The concept of impeding access extends beyond physical entry; it encompasses *the right to peaceful and unencumbered use of said facility and the services it provides. In the case of faith-based infrastructure, individuals must be able to access their schools and places of worship without fear of being targeted, harassed, intimidated or made to feel shame. The freedom to practice religion is enshrined in Canadian law, and protecting access to these spaces is an extension of that fundamental right.*

Key Points For Your Consideration:

1. Freedom of Speech vs. Hate Speech

- Freedom of speech is a foundational right but is not absolute. There are many avenues for expressing views that do not involve targeting religious communities at their places of worship or children at their schools.
- The protests in question are not general expressions of speech; they are deliberate and often dangerous acts of harassment and intimidation targeted at specific groups. (*see link to evidence below*)
- Attendees of these faith-based institutions and vulnerable infrastructure are diverse in thought and opinion, and so blanket assumptions about their beliefs are unfair and harmful.

2. Public Safety and Financial Cost

- The presence of protests and demonstrations come with an increased risk to public safety that often requires a significant law enforcement response.
- We urge Town Staff and council to review data from the Oakville and Halton police on the financial burden imposed by the need for increased security at these locations. If necessary, data from the cities of Vaughan or Toronto can provide further insights into the costs associated with managing such demonstrations.
- Implementing an effective municipal bylaw would serve as a responsible and cost-effective deterrent, reducing the need for large police presence and mitigating the associated financial impact on the town.



3. Legal Framework for Hate Speech

- Under the Criminal Code and Human Rights Codes of Canada, speech is classified as hate speech if it is publicly expressed, targets a protected group, and employs extreme language likely to expose them to detestation and vilification.
- The evidence the Lions of Judah (LOJ) have compiled, including hundreds of videos, images, witness statements, and victim reports, clearly demonstrates that these demonstrations meet the legal test for hate speech AND that bad actors are exploiting deliberate obfuscation and non enforcement of the laws to target a group at their religious schools and places of worship. *(see link to evidence below)*
- Council has the authority to implement a bylaw that curtails such activities within the municipal framework, reinforcing community safety and well-being.

4. Defining Effective Enforcement

- The effectiveness of this bylaw will depend on clear enforcement guidelines. We propose a straightforward test: *Individuals should be able to enter and exit vulnerable social infrastructure without witnessing or being subjected to confrontational behavior.*
- Law enforcement must be empowered to enforce the bylaw effectively, and penalties for violations should be stringent enough to serve as a deterrent.

Providing Evidence in Support of an Effective Bylaw

In support of this submission, we have attached a compilation of video [evidence showcasing the aggressive and harmful behaviors that take place in the absence of an enforceable municipal bylaw](#). This documentation allows council members to witness firsthand the reality of these protests and the necessity of legislative action that will protect All communities that make up the Town of Oakville. Please access the evidence by clicking on the attachment or through the following secure links:

How a protest at a Hindu temple spiraled into 2 days of violence (CBC News)

[CLICK HERE](#)

How a Palestinian protest brought hate and harm to a Jewish community in Vaughan (LOJ)

[CLICK HERE](#)

Freedom of expression must work in harmony with freedom of religion to uphold the values of a strong and free Canada. A bubble zone of protection around vulnerable infrastructure does not restrict free speech but it does protect communities from being targeted and unduly subjected to hate, violence, harassment and shame. We urge Council to consider the points presented herein and act decisively to effectively protect vulnerable infrastructure and the communities that rely on it in the Town of Oakville.

We look forward to Mayor Burton and Council's leadership in safeguarding the well-being of Oakville's diverse communities.

With Appreciation for your attention to this matter,

The **Lions of Judah** Organization (LOJ)

e: hello@lionsofjudah.org

w: www.lionsofjudah.org



March 13, 2025

Dear Mayor and Councillors,

I am writing to support the adoption of municipal “bubble” legislation by the Town of Oakville.

By way of brief background, I am the Chair of the Alliance of Canadians Combatting Antisemitism (ALCCA), a coalition of 56 community organizations, Jewish and non-Jewish dedicated to fighting antisemitism and other forms of hatred through legal advocacy, education and respectful dialogue. I have been a criminal lawyer for 45 years, serving as both a defence counsel and prosecutor, lectured extensively on legal remedies to combat hate, and trained police, prosecutors and government agencies on the availability of criminal and municipal measures to combat hate. I have promoted respectful Muslim-Jewish, Sikh-Jewish and Black-Jewish dialogues. I have appeared before Parliamentary committees and in the Supreme Court of Canada on multiple occasions on issues relating to antisemitism, hate activities and the constitutionality of hate crime legislation. I am a former member of the Ontario Human Rights Tribunal. This past week, I presented to the National Forum on Antisemitism in Ottawa on legal measures to combat hate.

You are undoubtedly aware of the pervasive antisemitism now being experienced by the Canadian Jewish community at levels unprecedented since WWII. One report reflects a 670% increase in antisemitism in Canada since October 7, 2023. Antisemitic hate crimes have spiralled out of control representing by far the largest percentage of religion-based hate crimes. Hate crimes include shootings, firebombings and vandalism of places of worship, Jewish day schools, and community centres. We have also seen an increase in hate crimes directed against other identifiable groups. Sadly, hate activities have become normalized in Canada.

Contemporary antisemitism extends well beyond ancient tropes or stereotypes about Jews. Now, Canadian Jews are targeted merely because they support the existence of the State of Israel. To be clear, the IHRA (International Holocaust Remembrance Alliance) definition of antisemitism, adopted by 43 countries including Canada, the Province of Ontario and many others, clearly states that criticism of Israel (whether its government, policies, or practices) in the same way other countries are criticized does not amount to antisemitism. However, the demonization of Zionism and all Zionists (including 91% of Canadian Jews) without distinction represents the most insidious current form of antisemitism. Last week at the National Forum on Antisemitism, the Prime Minister said he is Zionist and condemned its use as a pejorative term.

Protests, demonstrations and occupations in Canada are not confined to pro-Palestinian chants or slogans. They regularly characterize all Zionists as racist, genocidal and evil, without distinction, celebrate terrorists, including those designated as such by the federal government, urge the use of “any means necessary” to promote a global intifada and of particular relevance here, deliberately target Jewish neighborhoods, places of worship, and community centres to intimidate and harass the Jewish community. What I am describing is not protected free speech but hate speech. The Supreme Court of Canada has reflected that such speech not only marginalizes the targeted community members, making it more difficult for them to fully participate in our democracy, but may attract like-minded adherents to the cause.

Bubble legislation is not designed to punish hate crime offenders. The criminal law is to serve that purpose. Bubble legislation is designed as a preventative measure to keep vulnerable community members safe and enable them to carry on their lives, with full access to their social infrastructure without fear for their safety and security. “Access” in this context does not only mean unimpeded physical access to places of worship and other community spaces of importance, but also the ability to lawfully use and enjoy those spaces without fear.

Municipal and provincial governments have the duty to take appropriate measures to protect their vulnerable community members from intimidation, harassment and fear. Ontario’s Municipal Act, 2001, SO 2001, c.25 empowers municipalities to pass bylaws respecting the health, safety and well-being of its residents. It also empowers municipalities to prohibit and regulate respecting public nuisances, including matters that, in the opinion of council, are or could become or cause public nuisances (emphasis added). The prime reason why protestors target Jewish neighborhoods, places of worship, schools and community centres is to intimidate. I respectfully remind you that one illustration of antisemitism is attributing collective responsibility to the Canadian Jewish community for the actions of a foreign state.

It is now well recognized that bubble legislation survives constitutional (Charter) scrutiny when carefully crafted so as to not unnecessarily limit freedom of speech and assembly. Its constitutionality has been upheld when enacted to address widespread efforts to intimidate those associated with providing abortion services and to address widespread efforts to intimidate those involved in the administration of Covid 19 safety measures, including vaccinations. Widespread and ongoing efforts to intimidate Jewish and other religious communities, and the exponential growth of hate activities in Canada compel the same type of legislative response. Indeed, as already suggested, this is doubly so because, in the case of Jews, they are being held collectively responsible by protestors for the actions of others.

I would be pleased to address you on the existing jurisprudence. Suffice it to say in this brief submission, bubble legislation of various forms exists at the provincial and municipal levels across the country. There are at least eight provinces in which bubble legislation exists. Even civil liberties associations, in written submissions I have reviewed, have at times conceded (and appropriately so) that some limitations near hospitals and places of worship may be acceptable, although legislators “must think of solutions that minimally impair freedom of speech.” I agree that such legislation must not be so broad as to unreasonably impair freedom of speech or assembly. Governments across Canada have been successful in crafting such legislation.

I ask rhetorically, how is freedom of speech and assembly significantly impaired by prohibiting protestors from close proximity to Jewish (or Muslim) places of worship, schools and community centres? No one suggests that such protests be prohibited altogether (unless otherwise in violation of the law) – just that they take place so as not to intimidate vulnerable communities which, it is important to add, include children, and the elderly who have experienced or witnessed often deadly or violent racism in their lives.

There is no province-wide legislation that addresses the safety and security of our religious communities at present, so it is necessary to legislate at the municipal level. I also observe that the use of municipal bylaw powers represents minimal impairment of rights, when compared to the use of the criminal law. Of course, the two are not mutually exclusive in appropriate circumstances.

I have reviewed various examples of bubble legislation across the country. In my view, the City of Vaughan's bubble legislation provides helpful guidance although it could be improved in one important way.

Vaughan's bylaw defines a "nuisance demonstration" as involving "one or more people publicly protesting or expressing views on an issue in any manner – whether it is intended or not – that is likely, on an objective standard, to cause a reasonable person to be intimidated, meaning that they are either concerned for their safety or security or unable to access vulnerable social infrastructure. For greater certainty, intimidation can be caused by, but not only by, actions or expressions that incite hatred, violence, intolerance or discrimination."

As noted earlier, the Municipal Act (s. 128(1)) enables municipal governments to prohibit and regulate public nuisances, including matters that are, could become, or cause public nuisances. Excluding from such legislation lawful labour strikes (which necessarily target places of employment), it is the close proximity of protests to vulnerable community institutions, such as places of worship, day schools and community centres that is likely to cause intimidation. There should be no need for a prior showing of actions or expressions that intimidate before the legislation can be invoked. The objective is to prevent exposure to incitements to hatred, violence, intolerance, discrimination or similar acts or expressions of intimidation, not address it after it has already taken place. Limits on protests within close proximity to vulnerable institutions minimally impair protected freedoms by preventing, not responding to, intimidation.

In conclusion, the benefits of bubble legislation, insofar as it is applied to address the vulnerability of the Jewish community (though it has application to other vulnerable religious communities) include:

- Protecting the safety and security of Jewish community members
- Protecting their right to worship as they please without intimidation
- Protecting their right to unimpeded access to their social infrastructure
- Protecting Jewish community members from emotional distress when in the presence of protestors in unnecessarily close proximity
- Reducing the likelihood of destruction and vandalism directed to Jewish institutions
- Preventing the interference with the lawful use and enjoyment of property by members of the Jewish community, also characterized as interference with full access to their social infrastructure
- Reducing the likelihood of confrontational activities leading to violence or public disturbances
- Minimally impacting the protestors' freedom of speech or assembly, as they are free to protest outside of the bubble zone

I would be pleased to answer any questions you might have or assist in any way, including a detailed legal review of draft legislation. Thank you for your consideration of these submissions.

Yours truly,

Mark Sandler, LL.B., LL.D. (honoris causa)

Statement from Shaarei-Beth El Congregation of Oakville regarding the support from the Jewish community for a bylaw to prevent disruptive and intimidating protests from hindering access to “vulnerable social infrastructure.”

March 13, 2025

Since October 7th, 2023, the Jewish community has experienced a dramatic increase in antisemitism and hate crimes. This has caused our synagogue at 186 Morrison Rd in Oakville to pay for ongoing police protection during special worship and education times, as well as a private security firm to provide ongoing surveillance and checks at our front door, especially during Sabbath morning services.

We are all aware that synagogues and Jewish schools have been attacked by protestors and vandals across Canada and especially here in Ontario, spray painting hateful slogans, smashing windows and shooting bullets. Our synagogue in Oakville has had a protestor march in front week after week with a sign that says “shame” with a Jewish star and dripping blood-red paint. This has caused heightened concern, with feelings of anger, intimidation, and psychological harm among members of the congregation of all ages.

This sort of intimidation and aggressive behavior impedes access to the fundamental rights of our community and faith to exercise our religious freedoms in a safe and respected manner. No community or congregation should be targeted at their house of worship or forced to experience duress, harassment or shame in exercising their religious freedoms. We are hopeful that this bylaw will protect this right of our congregation and all faith communities here in Oakville.

It was with great relief that we understood the town of Oakville will once again lead the way in our province by ensuring unimpeded access in all its forms in front of houses of worship. We believe all faiths, Christian, Muslim, Bahai, Buddhist, Hindu, Sikh and Judaism, should have this protection. The psychological suffering that is inflicted on houses of worship must be addressed and stopped by creating safety zones (suggested minimum 100

Metres) surrounding vulnerable social infrastructure such as houses of worship.

Shaarei-Beth El is a founding member, and Rabbi Stephen Wise is an executive member, of the Interfaith Council of Halton. Their goals and objectives are to promote peace, harmony, and understanding. At the Town Council meeting in December the Interfaith Council of Halton unanimously agreed and presented about the importance of preserving the sanctity of places of worship. Worshippers should be able to attend and offer prayers in peace, free from fear or disturbance.

Sincerely

Rabbi Stephen Wise

Expert Submission to Town Councillors in Support of a Bubble Bylaw Protecting Places of Worship

Subject: Urgent Need for a Bubble Bylaw to Protect Places of Worship and Prevent Psychological Harm

Dear Mayor Burton and Councillors

I am writing to you as the immediate Past President of the Board of Directors of Shaarei Beth El Synagogue to express our urgent need for a bubble bylaw that will protect places of worship from targeted harassment, intimidation, and obstruction. Our synagogue has endured a deeply distressing experience, and we do not want any other faith community to suffer the same.

Our Experience: A System That Fails to Protect Places of Worship

-

For nine months, our synagogue was targeted by a protestor who engaged in ongoing harassment and intimidation.

-

Despite repeated reports to law enforcement and an open investigation, police failed to intervene effectively, forcing us to pursue legal action on our own. We also tried to initiate mediated dialogue but the protestor refused.

-

After an exhausting legal battle, we successfully obtained a peace bond—but it only lasts 12 months. This means that in a year, we could be in the same situation again.

-

No faith community should have to endure this kind of prolonged harassment or bear the legal and emotional burden of protecting themselves when authorities do not act.

Psychological Damage to Congregants, Families, and Children:

-

This ongoing harassment caused significant emotional and psychological distress to our congregants.

-

Children were especially affected, with many expressing fear of attending services and religious school, associating their place of worship with hostility and intimidation.

-

Families felt unsafe, anxious and the overall well-being of our community suffered.

-

Exposure to sustained harassment and intimidation has well-documented long-term psychological effects, particularly on young children, leading to anxiety, stress, and trauma-related symptoms.

Why a Bubble Bylaw Is the Solution:

A bubble bylaw would create a designated safe perimeter around places of worship, ensuring that faith communities can gather without fear of targeted protests or intimidation.

Legal Authority for a Bubble Bylaw:

-

Ontario law allows municipalities to enact bylaws that protect public safety and prevent nuisances (Ontario Municipal Act, 2001).

-

Similar laws, such as Ontario's Safe Access to Abortion Services Act (2017), establish buffer zones to protect individuals from targeted harassment while still respecting free speech rights.

Recommended Bylaw Provisions:

-

Buffer Zone: A minimum 50-metre perimeter around places of worship where targeted protests, harassment, or disruptive demonstrations are prohibited.

-

Enforcement Mechanisms: Clear penalties for violations, ensuring immediate police intervention, rather than leaving faith communities to take costly and lengthy legal action on their own.

-

Exemptions: The bylaw would not restrict general public assembly or peaceful discussions outside the designated zone.

Call to Action:

We should not have had to endure nine months of harassment and the responsibility of taking our own legal action just to secure a temporary measure of protection. No other place of worship should have to go through this.

The burden was placed entirely on our community to resolve the situation, rather than on authorities to prevent the harassment.

A bubble bylaw is a necessary and reasonable step to protect the safety, dignity, and well-being of faith communities in our town. Places of worship should remain safe spaces.

I urge the Council to take immediate legislative action. I am available to provide further expert testimony as needed. We have compiled extensive testimony from our congregants on the impact of the protestor's actions and would be happy to share this as well.

Sincerely,

Nancy Freedman

Immediate Past President, Board of Directors

Shaarei Beth El Synagogue

Dear Mayor Burton and your Team who are examining the above situation. Here is the Statement from the Hindu Community regarding support for a bylaw to prevent disruptive protests from hindering access to "vulnerable social infrastructure."

In recent years the Hindu community has experienced a rise in disturbances affecting our community and houses of worship. We have also noticed the rise in hate speech and disruptive protests in Oakville and at vulnerable institutions such as houses of worship of other faiths. We understand the town of Oakville will once again lead the way in our province by preventing disruptive and intimidating protests in front of houses of worship. We believe all faiths, Christian, Muslim, Bahai, Buddhist, Hindu, Sikh and Judaism, should have this protection. The psychological suffering that is inflicted on houses of worship must be addressed and stopped by creating safety zones (suggested 100 Metres) surrounding vulnerable social infrastructure such as houses of worship. This by-law will allow for unimpeded access as a freedom of religion. Vaishno Devi Temple has been a long-time supporter and I have been an executive member for 10 years of the Interfaith Council of Halton. Our goals and objectives are to promote peace, harmony, and understanding. At the Town Council meeting in December the Interfaith Council of Halton unanimously agreed and I stood up and waited hours to present about the importance of preserving the sanctity of places of worship. Worshippers should be able to attend and offer prayers in peace, free from fear or disturbance.

Sincerely,

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

March 14, 2025

Stephen and Mayor Burton,

I still support preserving the sanctity of places of worship. Worshippers should be able to attend and offer prayers in peace, free from fear or disturbance. I agree that a balance must be maintained between rights, such as freedom of expression and peaceful protest, and obligations to respect others' freedoms. In this context, I support the establishment in Oakville of a 100-meter safe buffer zone around places of worship, ensuring the safety and peace of worshippers while upholding the right to peaceful assembly or protest beyond these boundaries. I also support similar restrictions around schools to protect children.

Peace and blessings to you.

The Venerable Jeff Ward+

Rector, St Cuthbert's Anglican Church
Archdeacon of Trafalgar
1541 Oakhill Drive, Oakville, ON L6J 1Y6

Dear Mayor and Councilors, I hope you, and those close to you, are keeping well and in reasonably good spirits in these disturbing times.

As the founder and, until recently, the Coordinator of the Oakville Gaza Peace Group which held three public demonstrations in the streets of Oakville in 2023, all of which went off peacefully and in cooperation with the Halton Regional Police, I want to share with you the following thoughts regarding any proposed bye-law about public demonstrations.

Demonstrations are the orderly expressions of public participation in the development of our society, which is of the essence of a democracy composed of free individual persons.

Demonstrations arise out of people's passionate commitment to what contributes to human wellbeing and what contributes to its deprivation.

A demonstration is not a mob, a riot, an insurrection or a revolt whose objective is to gain control over what they oppose, simply by the use of their Intimidating physical presence and use of strength.

There can be occasions when, in a highly controlled, authoritarian society, such actions are the only means of expressing a commitment to expressing human freedom, but, in a functioning democracy, the use of such physical and violent actions to bring about change, are destructive of that democracy.

Demonstrations must be organized on the basis of, and must abide by, non-violent behavior.

Demonstration speakers may use passionate and strong language but not racial, political or religious hate-language. They must not encourage violence.

Demonstration organizers and leaders must have ways of discouraging and stopping individuals and groups within the demonstration from committing acts of violence against persons or property. If necessary, this should include calling on the help of the police.

Since demonstrations should be valued as an important expression of free people participating in the development of their democracy, the law should trust organizers of demonstrations to act within the law, in speech and action. Without this trust between free people, democracy is impossible.

Police permission should not be required to hold a demonstration.

The police, however, whenever possible, should be aware of intended demonstrations and present at active ones. They should be prepared to intervene if, on reasonable grounds,

they consider the law is being broken, and, in extreme cases, prevent the demonstration from continuing.

These rules should be applied even at sensitive areas such as places of learning, places of healthcare, places of religion, courts of law and seats of government, because they are often the most likely focus points about deeply held convictions.

However, demonstrations should be prohibited from being held at these socially sensitive and essential locations at times, or in manners, which could prevent or intimidate persons from accessing the fundamental and necessary social purposes of these places.

In the best of circumstances organizers of demonstrations should inform the police about their intentions and should consider any concerns the police may have. Incorporating that desire into a bye law may be impossible.

I hope these suggestions are helpful

Sincerely,

Mervyn Russell

Speaking to the Town Council on the Proposed Bubble Zone By-Law

I think it important when considering your vote on this matter that it be viewed in our local perspective. There is a term used in mathematics which describes a value which is too small to be measured. Infinitesimal. That describes how much this vote before the Town Council, and indeed the protests that they are proposed to address, are going to affect the eventual outcome of the Israel-Gaza War.

On the other hand, if these protests are designed to seek a form of retribution on the Jewish community in Oakville – who had an equally infinitesimal part in inciting and participating in this war – this is a quantity that is real and substantive.

The Palestinian lobby is obviously going to try to disguise or deny these intentions. But my open question to you is, if this is not the case, why would the exact location of protests be an issue in the first place? Why then would it not suffice to protest in areas that are mutually acceptable?

I urge you as Town Council members not to get bogged down in the dogmas of war, or any distracting issues of an antidemocratic breach of free speech when considering your vote. Any claim to a Charter right for this type of behavior is easily refuted even by a paralegal.

Your responsibility is not with the citizens of Gaza, rather with the people in Oakville who will bear the consequences should you not decide in their interests, as evidenced by the stresses that have been brought upon the Jewish residents of Toronto.

Sandy N. von Kaldenberg