



## NATIONAL CITIZENS INQUIRY

Quebec, QC

Day 2

May 12, 2023

### EVIDENCE

(Translated from the French)

---

**Witness 13: François Amalega**

Full Day 2 Timestamp: 09:10:20–09:56:00

Source URL: <https://rumble.com/v2v90b6-quebec-jour-2-commission-denquete-nationale-citoyenne.html>

[00:00:00]

**Chantale Collard**

Yes, hello. Chantale Collard, lawyer and prosecutor for today's National Citizens Inquiry. So today we have as a witness François Amalega. First of all, thank you, Monsieur Amalega, for coming to testify here at the National Citizens Inquiry. Your testimony is important. As a matter of formality, we're going to proceed with your identification, so simply state your first and last names.

**François Amalega**

My surname is Amalega Bitondo, and my first name is François.

**Chantale Collard**

All right. And now we'll proceed with the swearing-in. So Monsieur Amalega, do you affirm or swear to tell the whole truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth? Say "I do" or "I swear."

**François Amalega**

I do.

**Chantale Collard**

So Amalega François, maybe there are some of us here who know you, maybe others not so well. In any event, we'd like to know more about you. So perhaps first of all, a brief presentation of your main occupation, your professional career, and then from there, what brought you to where you are now. So regarding your professional career, what is your formal education?

**François Amalega**

First of all, I'd like to thank you for the honour of being here. It means a lot to me.

I immigrated to Quebec in 2012. Before that, I studied mathematics. I got the equivalent of a bachelor's degree in Mathematics in Cameroon in 2000, and also a secondary school teaching diploma. Then I also got a master's degree in teaching Mathematics in Cameroon, and I emigrated to Quebec after teaching mathematics in high school. So in Quebec, I studied for a master's degree in Mathematics at the Université de Montréal. I obtained a master's degree in Algebra. Then I went on to doctoral studies, where I studied arithmetic geometry. I didn't finish, I didn't submit my thesis, but I completed all the coursework. Then I started working at Collège Jean-de-Brébeuf as a mathematics professor. I taught for five years. After three years, I got tenure and became a permanent math professor at Collège Jean-de-Brébeuf. At the same time, I gave courses at UQAM [Université du Québec à Montréal], specifically at the École de technologie supérieure.

**Chantale Collard**

At the same time, you were teaching at UQAM, at the university.

**François Amalega**

Yes, and at HEC [HEC Montréal, the graduate business school of the Université de Montréal], but my permanent position, my job, was as a mathematics professor at Collège Jean-de-Brébeuf.

**Chantale Collard**

All right. So at Collège Jean-de-Brébeuf, you were there. We'll begin in 2019 or 2020.

**François Amalega**

Yes.

**Chantale Collard**

What happened? Basically, you were teaching, and what happened? Now, you're not teaching anymore, if I understand correctly?

**François Amalega**

Yes, on February 5, 2021, I submitted my resignation in the face of all the pressure I received at my school. What happened was that on March 13, we were in lockdown and were told that there was a very dangerous virus spreading around the world. I believed the story; I believed and trusted the Prime Minister. But since we were in lockdown—because we had been busy at work and suddenly we had nothing to do—I was at home. And they were talking about COVID, so I went all over the internet: YouTube, Google. I typed in "COVID-19" to find out what it was all about. That's how I came across Professor Raoult, who said that with hydroxychloroquine, it was all over. I said to myself, "Okay, that's it, we've panicked for nothing." But I was surprised to realize that he was challenged, insulted in France, and despised by many people. That's when I said to myself, "When I see his CV and I see that he's not being given any consideration, I understand that this is messed up."

And then I started to follow the press conferences with fresh eyes; and you could see that there were contradictions in mandates that changed at every turn. There was a strong contradiction between the certainties that were presented—because they said “we’re building the plane in flight, and we don’t really know what’s happening”—and the simultaneous authority which accompanied the issue of these mandates. Now these are two contradictory attitudes. One cannot be in the process of learning something and at the same time be authoritative in the way one dictates things. So it showed that this uncertainty had a single objective: to create confusion. But the real agenda had been pushed through by the authorities.

But that didn’t fit with my role as a professor. Because when I teach mathematics to students, we have activities before presenting a concept.

[00:05:00]

The aim of these activities is to lead the student to an impasse so that he or she understands the necessity of the new mathematical object about to be introduced. And to do that, students need to reflect and realize they’re stuck. And then you can tell them, “Okay, I’m going to show you this theorem that will solve the problem.” So to do that, you need him to critique you, to challenge you. And when they don’t, you challenge them. So it creates a critical mind, but that’s not what the government was proposing. The government was proposing that we believe, that we submit. And that didn’t work, so I started going to demonstrations, posting photos on my Facebook account, and so on.

**Chantale Collard**

I don’t mean to interrupt, but when are we?

**François Amalega**

We’re in the summer of 2020.

**Chantale Collard**

Okay, it’s not April. In April, you confirmed about the lockdown. It’s a bit later. In other words, in April, you’re in fact still technically working online for the school.

**François Amalega**

I worked for the school; until February 5, I still worked.

**Chantale Collard**

February 5, 2021.

**François Amalega**

In April, we restart the interrupted winter session online. And I already know that the government is talking nonsense, so I post about it. At this point, I’m not yet going to the demonstrations because my Facebook is a bit restricted, but I become more informed and my contacts keep growing. I still post about the virus and all the mandates. It’s clear to me that it’s all nonsense, and I publish along these lines. There are indeed a number of facts that show that everything we’re being told makes no sense. Facts that are easily verifiable.

For example, Ferguson’s article that predicted—and scared everyone—ends up being false because the data doesn’t work. In midsummer there’s, for example, “Lancet-gate,” and then a lot of other things that are obvious. But what’s happening now is that in the fall I take a photo of myself because it’s becoming clear, very clear to me that the people who are supposed to be protecting us are out to destroy us. And for me, civil disobedience becomes evident. There’s no possibility of negotiating at this stage. I take a photo of myself and I put it on my Facebook page.

**Chantale Collard**

And when are we exactly?

**François Amalega**

We’re at the end of September 2020.

**Chantale Collard**

2020.

**François Amalega**

So I film myself without a mask in the subway and I write: “Civil disobedience is a duty.” That photo gets me called in. I’m called in by the human resources department of Collège Jean-de-Brébeuf, and the director of human resources has a very stern look in her eye, but it’s online. And she asks me to remove the photo, to comply, to submit, and I tell her right from the start that it’s a waste of time.

**Chantale Collard**

Your photo was on social networks? Probably Facebook?

**François Amalega**

Well, at that time, the social network where I was most active was essentially Facebook because, before COVID-19, I really wasn’t too much of a social networker. I used it but not very much. But with COVID-19, we were locked down. It was almost the only means of communication, so I became very much a social networker from then on. So I put the photo on Facebook and I called for civil disobedience. In any case, that’s what I could do in my own small way. But this photo posed a problem. The school wanted me to remove the photo and I refused, so they backed down. In fact, they backed off and left me alone.

But things continued on because the mandates were absurd. For example, when we were doing exams— Because the studies were online, we had a problem with the way the children were assessed. So when you did a math homework assignment, each child was at home doing the exam. You had no way of monitoring them. So they would do the exam on the sheets, take a photo, and send that to us. So you had no way of knowing whether the photo sent to you by the strongest student might also have been sent to his classmates and girlfriends. There was no way of knowing. So as with all the other colleagues, the idea was to at least have in-person exams.

So we managed to have the exams in person, except that during the in-person exams, the main exam room was a large separate room, but the students had to wait in a small

adjoining room where they were crammed against one another. You'd go there and get them and bring them back to the big room, and it was in the big room that the students were spaced out—such ridiculous things. And then, even among the teaching staff, people would wonder, “Did the virus stop being active in the small room?” Things like that.

**Chantale Collard**

Okay, among your colleagues, you were all talking about the absurdity of it.

**François Amalega**

Well, some colleagues didn't have the courage to criticize the government directly, but with little measures like that, even they could see that there was a problem.

[00:10:00]

And I was very vocal among my colleagues, but for them, it was the school management that was confused. But it was François Legault that was the problem, at least at the Quebec level, and they didn't want to go there. There were so many things. I encountered problems. I was suspended for three days because I had my mask under my chin. I didn't want to put it under my nose. I was suspended for three days without pay. The final straw came on January 9: it was the first curfew in Quebec.

**Chantale Collard**

2020?

**François Amalega**

2021. So it was the first curfew in Quebec, and we went to defy the curfew at the Mont-Royal metro station. There were only about 20 of us and there were a lot of police and a lot of media. So since there weren't many of us, we were filmed by TV cameras and so on. And then a journalist asked me questions. He asked almost all the demonstrators questions because there weren't many of us. And there were a few seconds of footage of me, and that's when I got the impression that the school authorities had been rapped on the knuckles. This time they summoned me and suspended me for two weeks. They told me, “Now you're not just on Facebook, you're going to the media networks.” Because I think it was LCN, TVA, and all that.

**Chantale Collard**

In the mainstream media.

**François Amalega**

In the mainstream media. They told me, “No, you've gone too far now.” And then I told them that there was no way I was backing down. They realized that—for me—it was clear. I told them I was waiting for them to chase me out because no matter what, there was no way I would back down.

**Chantale Collard**

You are going to go all the way. You were ready.

**François Amalega**

At one point, they told me that Brébeuf has resources. Do I need some help?

**Chantale Collard**

Ah, okay, psychological help.

**François Amalega**

Yes. I said, “But that’s just what I’m waiting for.” So they decided to have me meet a biology teacher who’s well-known at Brébeuf, who’s a grandfather, in the sense that his students’ students are CEGEP biology teachers. So he was a reference in the matter. When they said I was going to meet a biology teacher, I smiled because I said to myself, “My opposition to health measures doesn’t come from the fact that I’ve mastered biology. That’s not my argument. My argument is the inconsistency of everything we’re saying.”

**Chantale Collard**

The incoherence.

**François Amalega**

And what happened was that I had prepared my presentation: I had nine points. And in the first point, I started to talk about mathematics. I talked about the Ferguson paper, which had made predictions about the number of deaths. He had said that in Sweden there would be 100,000 deaths by the first of May if they didn’t comply with health measures; however there weren’t even 10,000 deaths after the first of May.

So when we met that day, there were three of us: the president of the union, who was supposed to be defending me, but who was there to tell me to back down; and the biology professor in question. And the union president asked the biology professor to explain COVID and everything to me so that I’d understand that I was going astray. But the biology teacher said he’d rather I did the talking, so that he could help me.

So I started talking. I had nine points—but when I started the first point, he wanted to stop me to say, “No, these are just little probability problems, François, you’ll have to come back.” I told him: “No, no, no, no, listen, you’re a prof, I’m a prof.” And among the three of us, the president of the union is also a biology prof. I said, “Of the three of us here, the one who knows the most math is me. So you can’t just wave your hand at me and say, ‘It’s a question of probability.’ If I made a mistake in what I said, you have to point it out.” Voices began to rise and the union president calmed us down. Then, he told the biology professor to tell me what he says to his students. And so he presented Raoult; he presented me and everything; but in the end, the report was so— In fact, he had nothing to say.

**Chantale Collard**

There was nothing he could say.

**François Amalega**

He had nothing to say and he fled the meeting. He fled because he couldn’t cope. At the end, he said that he told me such and such a thing, to which I replied, “You tell me that, but Didier Raoult tells me this. You’re a CEGEP biology professor; Didier Raoult is a professor of



medicine, director of one of the largest centres in Europe, if not the world. If it's just a matter of faith, who do you want me to believe in?" He himself understood that it wasn't working. And then, well, it ended there; and he left, he disappeared.

But I remained for two weeks. I was surprised that at the end of two weeks, I received my salary because I was getting paid every two weeks. When I spoke to the human resources manager, I said, "But I'm getting my salary. That's rather interesting, because if you suspend me and pay me, I'll carry on." And then they took back the two-week suspension, they took back the salary and everything.

I'll perhaps come back to that in relation to the last question. So they said to me, "Okay, well, at this point, you're going to resume your classes and so on, but we're asking you just to make sure your Facebook is private. We're not prohibiting you from demonstrating and all."

[00:15:00]

Except that I was producing certain publications—videos that I was posting, articles and so on—where some of my Facebook friends were telling me, "François, we can't share," and so I made some of my posts public. This publication was visible. And afterwards, the human resources manager called me back and said, "You've got to make it private, there are things that can be seen." I told her, "No, no, I've made my Facebook private, but there are publications that are public. Those will stay that way." And then she scheduled another meeting. This time it was with the director of Brébeuf himself, asking me to close my account. If I didn't, there would be severe penalties and so on.

### **Chantale Collard**

Did they tell you, Monsieur Amalega, about the penalties? Was it a veiled threat or was it clear?

### **François Amalega**

No. He didn't say exactly what the penalty would be, but after taking a three-day suspension without pay, and a two-week suspension without pay, and a withdrawal from my classes, he said that a heavier penalty was on the way. So from that point on, I had the option of staying and waiting for him to penalize me. But that's a choice I made because I realized that they themselves knew they had no argument, since the first thing they said to me was, "You're entitled to your opinions, but we ask you to keep them to yourself." Opinions are expressed. Something that remains in the mind is not an opinion. You give your opinion.

Now as far as I'm concerned, it was unbelievable when I realized that they knew they were wrong, yet they wanted to keep me quiet. And that's because they wanted to preserve their social status. Because social death is more painful than biological death. When you die physically, you're gone: it's the people who love you who cry over you and you're no longer there. But to die socially is to see yourself and feel sorry for yourself—and that's even more painful. And that's why so many people do everything they can so as not to die socially.

My resignation was intended to send them a message and to tell them that, "I think you're the equivalent of prostitutes if you're genuinely prepared to go against your conscience to protect your gains." And that attitude was the reason for my resignation. I handed in my resignation on that same day. And I told them, "You're the ones who should be encouraging

me to think critically, but you're simply reciting what the government says." And I told them how disappointed I was. I submitted my resignation at that point.

**Chantale Collard**

Basically, you submitted your resignation but you continued to speak; you continued to demonstrate. What happened? After you resigned, was there no more teaching?

**François Amalega**

After resigning, there was no more teaching, and then all that remained for me was to demonstrate.

**Chantale Collard**

Your main occupation.

**François Amalega**

It was practically my main occupation.

**Chantale Collard**

Tell us about your main occupation after you resigned. There were demonstrations for a number of reasons, correct? I suppose it was the mandates?

**François Amalega**

My dream was to see 10,000 people out on the streets at curfew time. Personally, it was something I felt so strongly about defying. Because the problem is, there are people who fill themselves with anger. But when you fill yourself with anger and you show up in front of the police, it's nothing. And they're trained to inflict repression, so when you're violent, you prove them right; you give them the moral high ground. But if during curfew, 10,000 happy, gentle, calm people take to the streets and do no harm, the police have no moral ground; they are confronted. For example, mothers with walkers, people in wheelchairs, who do no violence, take to the streets. But the police are confronted because these gladiators don't have the moral backing to strike people who are acting peacefully. So that's why I, personally, have started going to police stations with other people.

**Chantale Collard**

For the benefit of the audience: you went to the police yourself. You were going to the police station yourself.

**François Amalega**

On February 14, 2021—I had chosen this day because it was the day of love—and I went to the nearest police station in my neighborhood. I went to tell the policemen that I was looking for my love who was freedom, who was locked up in the police station. And I told them I wasn't going home—I don't respect curfew—and I made it clear that it was out of the question. They fined me.



**Chantale Collard**

Okay, so you went deliberately to be fined.

**François Amalega**

Yes.

**Chantale Collard**

Have you accumulated many of these fines?

[00:20:00]

**François Amalega**

I have \$98,329.87 in fines.

**Chantale Collard**

So close to \$100,000.

**François Amalega**

My only regret is that I didn't reach the \$100,000. So the objective was that the more people don't comply, the more they're unable to act. And that's what happened because there are examples in Quebec. For example, they imposed masks on us during demonstrations, but when people refused to wear them, the police stopped issuing tickets. Because when 20,000 people march without masks, who are they going to start with? And then the nurses also provided an example. The nurses brought Dubé and Legault to their knees because they refused en masse to be vaccinated, and they understood what a disaster it was going to be.

So with peaceful civil disobedience: as soon as you take away the peaceful character, you give the police the moral backing to act. That's just what they're waiting for. And that makes the others happy. But the problem is, when it's peaceful, they have no moral ground. In other words, they have none when an 80-year-old mother with a walker tells a policeman, "I'm not going home" with a smile on her face. What can this seven-foot man do? If he hits her, then he acts to destroy that, so he is himself defeated. In fact, that's the idea. So I continued to protest. I was issued several tickets for it. I'm currently being prosecuted for that.

**Chantale Collard**

Basically, Monsieur Amalega, you've participated in many demonstrations. Have they always been peaceful?

**François Amalega**

Absolutely.

**Chantale Collard**

And you've always continued your efforts in a peaceful way. On the other hand, you have been penalized and sent to prison. Would you like to tell us about that?

**François Amalega**

Yes, I've been imprisoned several times. In fact, I've been in prison four times. I can't count the number of times I've spent nights in a cell.

**Chantale Collard**

That's one single night?

**François Amalega**

Yes, a single night in a cell. I'm not sure how many; it's several times. I have to stop to figure it out. But prison itself: I've been to prison four times. And I'd like to point out that I did seven days in prison because I refused to wear a mask at the municipal court. That's the only reason. That is, I went to the municipal court for a trial I had and I refused to wear a mask. Since I was being tried for a mask-related offence, it was clear to me that, in order for there to be any chance of a fair trial, the judge had to at least allow me to proceed through my trial without a mask. If it was impossible for me to participate in my trial without a mask, then I was already convicted. And the judge made the mistake of holding me for seven days. And that's it, I was in prison for the seven days of my whole trial because I didn't wear a mask. I spent three months, three weeks in prison.

**Chantale Collard**

Can we say it was for this offence?

**François Amalega**

No, because I went to prison four times, the fourth time being three months, three weeks. And that time, it was because I'd been arrested: they'd given me a condition not to be within 300 metres of the Prime Minister.

**Chantale Collard**

Okay.

**François Amalega**

But on January 16, 2022, the Prime Minister was supposed to go on "*Tout le monde en parle*," [a Radio-Canada program] and we organized a demonstration around that appearance because he had to pass by that way. And the police arrested me, saying I hadn't respected my condition. They put me in prison and then wanted to release me a few days later with other conditions so that I would have to wait. At that point, I told them I wasn't a criminal. If they think I'm a criminal, they should keep me in prison but if not, release me unconditionally. So that's how I spent all that time in prison, by refusing the conditions. In the end, I was released unconditionally.

**Chantale Collard**  
You were released?

**François Amalega**  
May 9th.

**Chantale Collard**  
May 9, 2022?

**François Amalega**  
Yes, I was arrested on January 16, 2022 and released on May 9, 2022.

**Chantale Collard**  
Released or acquitted?

**François Amalega**  
I had four trials, of which two trials were in prison, both of which I won.

**Chantale Collard**  
So won: we're talking acquittal.

**François Amalega**  
Acquitted, yes. But the verdicts for my other two trials came after my release from prison.

**Chantale Collard**  
What were the verdicts?

**François Amalega**  
This is what demonstrates the political aspect. Because the first two trials, at which I was acquitted, were much more delicate than the other two, which were very easy to prove. Except that when I got out of prison, I had interviews with several influencers where I said that: "I won the trials, I was right." And I think that, to teach me a lesson, they had me lose the other two trials. Because in one of the trials I had four counts against me: I was acquitted for three and convicted for one. And with the other last trial, I was also convicted and sentenced to probation.

**Chantale Collard**  
Okay. Were there any convictions other than probation?

**François Amalega**  
So far, all I've had is probation.

**Chantale Collard**

Probation for what? Keeping the peace?

**François Amalega**

I was told: You have to keep the peace; you cannot disturb the public order.

[00:25:00]

Yes, generally, that's the probation they gave me for most of these trials. But I'd still like to say that, when I was in prison, those were times— I didn't always have access to all the privileges of other prisoners. For example, in prison, the quality of the food and all isn't good. For example, there's a canteen you can order from. And I was ordering from the canteen but my orders only started coming through towards the end of my time there. I had the same outfit for maybe 40 days. I had the same clothes on my body, meaning it was the same garment I had on my body, and the conditions were really humiliating.

**Chantale Collard**

Discriminatory, would you say?

**François Amalega**

Yes.

**Chantale Collard**

Compared to other inmates?

**François Amalega**

For example, one day— Because it happens that prisoners hide drugs, they hide weapons, they hide telephones; there's a lot of trafficking going on in prison. And to catch the prisoners, what they do is sometimes—since there are the cells and there is the common area—they make unannounced raids. So when we're in the communal area, they just turn up and pick out four or five cells and search them. And it's random searches like that, which allow them to find things. And there was a day when they went into the prison—that day, I was watching a chess match; and that's one of the positive things I've learned, my chess level has improved a lot— So that day, I was watching a chess match and they came. They went around and they entered a single cell: one single cell. And just when they were entering the cell, a prisoner there said, "But why are they in the cell of the conspiracy theorist?" Because he knew. So they went into my cell—just my cell—they turned everything upside down. And then they ransacked everything. Just my cell. They didn't ransack any other cell.

**Chantale Collard**

How did you get through that period? Because it's really difficult: you're in prison, you're already getting unfavorable treatment, but now, on top of that, they're only ransacking your— How did you get through that? It's undoubtedly a struggle.

### **François Amalega**

It's a huge struggle, but the problem is that I knew I had exposed myself to all these attacks. And the problem is that we mustn't give them the chance to think they're winning because in reality, they're not; because in all they are doing, they're exposing themselves. And I'd like to take this opportunity to say that, for example, at the beginning of this month, I received a letter from a bailiff for the \$98,000 I owe—because I've already been sentenced for \$69,121.69—and for that they're proposing that I do 817 hours of community service. And if I don't, they're going to put me in prison.

### **Chantale Collard**

What are you going to do?

### **François Amalega**

As far as I'm concerned, I'm not going to help them sweep their crime under the rug. Because it's important to know that on May 12, 2023—today—the Quebec government is still prosecuting people for non-compliance with health measures, so it's not over yet. Because right now there's a possibility of arrest, and not only that: there are other people who have, for example, made agreements with the government. I'm not condemning them—people live in different situations—but the government is collecting money. In other words, there are people who have decided to pay \$50 every month for this. So that means that COVID-19 isn't finished: because they haven't stepped back from it.

And I can't wait to see the judge who's going to sign my arrest warrant. Because the judge who's going to sign the arrest warrant is definitely condemning himself. I have fully forgiven all the people who, in their confusion, committed acts in 2020 and even in 2021. But the judge who, in 2023, signs my arrest warrant—of course, I will surrender peacefully—but that judge, Quebec should clearly remember that this man has written his name among the greatest criminals of all time. This is not a game, because when he signs my arrest warrant, it's not because I was driving 120 kilometers an hour and hit a pregnant woman. No, no, he's going to sign an arrest warrant because I didn't wear a mask in the demonstrations, because I didn't respect the curfew, and so on. So that means that, in 2023, this judge will be saying that the government was right to do what it did. So it's important to know, and even those who are collecting the \$10 and \$20: they're condemning themselves now because things can't stay the way they are.

[00:30:00]

So by refusing to take a step back and instead continuing to commit their crimes, they are definitely proving that they don't regret what they're doing. So I'm eagerly awaiting my arrest warrant and the first thing I'm going to get is the name of that judge. It's clear that Legault has been condemned, but that judge is also writing his name among the guilty, so it's very important that he knows that. And I think that before he picks up his pencil and signs, he should tremble and step back because it's not just Amalega François he is attacking.

I say this because there is, for example, the trial of Professor Patrick Provost which, for me, is not the trial of Patrick Provost: it's the professor against the science. In other words, someone doesn't even have to say things accurately, but the discussion must take place. Meaning that it's through the confrontation of ideas that the collective intelligence creates something that none of us would have achieved otherwise. That's why whoever signs my arrest warrant will be saying that he approves it.

But I think that if a judge is pressured to sign my arrest warrant—if he thinks there should be a debate on COVID, I'm not even saying if he thinks I'm right, no; if he thinks that, in 2023, we should take a step back and look at what's going on—if a judge is pressured, I think he should resign. So if a judge signs my arrest warrant, he should know that he has no excuse. We're going to forgive him in our hearts but we're going to make sure that he's judged to the full extent of the signature he's provided—because what he's about to do is very serious.

### **Chantale Collard**

Absolutely. Listening to you, there aren't many people like that who follow through to the end. You're a man of principle and you've been called a lot of names, but today you have a chance to answer them, and you've largely answered. But there is one question: what do you say to all those who have called you a conspiracy theorist? What do you say to them today, on May 12, 2023?

### **François Amalega**

I think that if a man refuses to let his wife look at his phone and his wife finds odd pictures of him, finds him acting strangely and such, and then he doesn't want to give his wife any explanation—he instead says she's crazy, he talks nonsense and so on, while his wife pieces together a puzzle, and it shows on her face that she knows something's wrong—I think this is just someone avoiding confrontation because he knows he's in the wrong. That's exactly the situation we're in right now and there are so many factors.

And I say this: COVID-19 is a medical issue, but then there is the “Lancet-gate.” In other words, you see an article appearing in the world's biggest academic journal saying that hydroxychloroquine doesn't cure it, for the purpose of discrediting Raoult and all the people who are with him. But afterwards, we realize that the data are false and it is retracted; and we even realize that the director of human resources is a porn actress. And *The Lancet* writes afterwards that they made a mistake. Meaning: I don't need to be a doctor to see that it's a commissioned article.

I don't need a mistake to see that the article from someone like Ferguson—who encouraged compliance with health measures— was later found to be false. And you find that during the health measures, he committed adultery twice with a married woman, disregarding the health measures. I mean, when you see that, you think, “These people don't believe in it. They're talking nonsense.”

So when we gather all this evidence to say, “Look, your mandates are contradictory, there's no truth, and all that,” and then I'm told that I'm a conspiracy theorist— But as soon as you refuse to have a debate, a discussion, as soon as you create murkiness in a subject, it's clear you favour the other. So among us who contest the measures, some are moderate, others are a little less moderate, others go far. But all this happens because of the lack of transparency. So if someone believes even very serious things, that is much more excusable than the government making things deliberately opaque. So no, I think the word “conspiracy” is just a word created by weak people to discredit solid arguments against them.

### **Chantale Collard**

The argument of the weak: labelling.



**François Amalega**

Absolutely. It is the argument of the weak. In fact, they're the weak ones. We're much stronger than they are because we're in the truth. Listen, if you do something bad, the look in a five-year-old's eyes will make you tremble because you're wondering, "Did he see what I did?" So that's the situation we're in right now.

[00:35:00]

They can have all the weapons they want but I don't think they have that many. They mostly operate through intimidation. And one of the lessons I've learned from this is that in the fight for justice, you can't be moderate. You can't be moderate because it's with the use of microaggressions that they just keep gaining ground.

Personally, I think that perhaps I ought to have been a lot more vocal from September 2020 onwards because I was only posting on my Facebook and chatting with friends and such. But the issue is that when you don't allow microaggressions and you stop things early on, these people will also have difficulty moving forward. They're nothing but people who work through intimidation, lies, that's all. They don't have any more power than that.

**Chantale Collard**

Thank you.

**François Amalega**

Thank you very much.

**Chantale Collard**

Thank you. Listen, maybe I'm like many others. I listen attentively and your words carry an air of truth and authenticity that we very rarely see in people. Perhaps our commissioners will have a few questions for you.

**Commissioner Massie**

Thank you, Monsieur Amalega, for your testimony. My question, in fact I only have one, is: Where does your inner strength come from? Does it come from your culture? Does it come from your personal journey? What gives you the courage to express your opinions with such firmness and kindness?

**François Amalega**

I think there are two main things: there's my faith in God, and there's also the fact that I've been exposed, in a way, to untruths. In fact, I've been convinced that certain things that are officially said are not true. That did predispose me. Personally, I followed things like the Kennedy assassination. When I was growing up, we were told that the ozone layer was going to disappear and that the world was going to burn and all, and September 11th and all that. There were a number of things that made it clear to me that what we were being told wasn't true.

And then, I remember when I was at Brébeuf, I asked a colleague—since I had had discussions with this colleague on a number of subjects—and one day I said to him, “What is the unfinished pyramid doing with the little eye on top of it on the one-dollar bill?” One day, I asked him, “I want you to explain that to me.” I don’t have an explanation but I said to him, “How do you explain that?” So I mean, there is the fact that I’m exposed to these things that have no explanation.

And the biggest problem is telling people there are bad questions. When I go into a class as a prof, I tell my students that there are no bad questions because I hope that when the student leaves the class, he won’t say Monsieur Amalega told him such and such. No. But rather, that he’ll say, “This is true because I can prove it.” So the fact is that I had been exposed and it was clear to me that there were a lot of things being said that weren’t true.

And then, the second thing too: I believe in God. And for me, human authorities are very important: I believe they are appointed by God. They are very important and must be obeyed, but they themselves are answerable. So that means there’s an authority above human authorities; and for me, that’s a very important thing.

**Commissioner Massie**

Thank you very much.

**Chantale Collard**

Thank you again on behalf of the Commission. There is one question.

**Commissioner DiGregorio**

Pardon me, I’m going to ask my question in English; Doctor Massie will translate. You spoke about your time in jail and how you were treated differently from the other inmates. And I’m just wondering if you know what crimes those other inmates would have been in for, what types of crimes?

**Commissioner Massie**

So the question is, you spent time in prison and, according to your testimony, you were treated differently from the other prisoners who were there.

[00:40:00]

And the question is: What kind of crimes did the other prisoners who were in the same place commit compared to your crime?

**François Amalega**

So Bordeaux prison, one of the prisons that I was in for three months and three weeks, has two types of prisoners. There are prisoners who received sentences of two years less a day. Generally, it’s theft, things like that, or someone who was perhaps violent towards his wife, arrested, and then sentenced. And there are those who are awaiting trial. So they’ve been deemed dangerous; they can’t release them, they’re waiting.

And there, I met people who had committed murders, who had killed several people. So there are people who have committed murders. I remember once talking to a guy who was

very big, very strong. He was there because he had hit a gentleman who ended up in a coma. So he had hit him; he was very violent and everything. Listen, it's really— There are several people who committed horrible crimes inside. They dealt drugs, they did things. And all these people are there, in prison, and you have to be there with them because you refused to submit to health measures.

I believe that the government and all these people have committed crimes. We all want to turn the page, including me, but the problem is that if the page is turned without having resolved the issue, that means more harm can be done in the future. So we mustn't turn the page without really— That's why I think a commission like this is so important. Crimes must be identified. Things have to be stated clearly.

**Commissioner DiGregorio**

Thank you. Merci.

**Commissioner Kaikkonen**

Thank you for your testimony. I'm just wondering if you think there's a spiritual climate change that needs to be addressed in this country?

**Commissioner Massie**

So the question is, should the spiritual crisis we're currently experiencing in our society be examined, or at any rate, should we try to find solutions to this spiritual crisis?

**François Amalega**

Honestly, I do. I believe that creating a purely material world in which people have no hope is brutal. And I think this is sustained. It's sustained because—at least when I arrived in Quebec—when I wanted to talk, people told me that we don't discuss politics and religion. But this is quite extreme because politics and religion are the most important subjects in society.

When we don't discuss politics and religion, we can talk about hockey, we can have fun, we can do anything and everything. Yet politics and religion are still the main subjects because, even when someone says that they don't believe in God and they're an atheist, that is a religious subject. I mean, when you exclude all that, it means you're excluding very important subjects: politics, religion. The rest are low-grade subjects. We're just having fun, laughing with each other and all that, but it separates people.

And what really happens is that the government takes God's place. As a result, some people have nothing else because there's nothing beyond the government. So without necessarily having one religion—because I think it would be a bad thing for one religion to dominate; it would be pointless—but I think that driving faith and religion out of the public square is a job that has been and continues to be carried out methodically. And I think it produces people who put all their hope in the material world and in their lives. And I think they'll do anything to keep that, because they've lost all hope. And I think it's something important.

**Commissioner Kaikkonen**

Thank you, merci.

**Chantale Collard**

François Amalega, thank you sincerely, from the bottom of my heart. Your testimony has touched many, including myself. We understand that it's a spiritual battle—I wouldn't say that you're fighting but that you are firmly rooted in your values, in your convictions—and the truth will most certainly come out.

[00:45:00]

I won't tell you: "Let's keep going." I'm going to tell you, "Carry on, carry on!" And by all means, you've given us hope today. Thank you.

**François Amalega**

Thank you very much.

[00:45:50]

***Final Review and Approval:*** Erin Thiessen, November 12, 2023.

*The evidence offered in this transcript is a true and faithful record of witness testimony given during the National Citizens Inquiry (NCI) hearings. The transcript was prepared by members of a team of volunteers using an "intelligent verbatim" transcription method, and further translated from the original French.*

*For further information on the transcription process, method, and team, see the NCI website: <https://nationalcitizensinquiry.ca/about-these-translations/>*

NCI | CeNC