



NCI | CeNC

NATIONAL CITIZENS INQUIRY

**EVIDENCE
SASKATOON HEARINGS**

NCI | CeNC

**Saskatoon, Saskatchewan, Canada
April 20 to 22, 2023**

ABOUT THESE TRANSCRIPTS

The evidence offered in these transcripts is a true and faithful record of witness testimony given during the National Citizens Inquiry (NCI) hearings. These hearings took place in eight Canadian cities from coast to coast from March through May 2023.

Raw transcripts were initially produced from the audio-video recordings of witness testimony and legal and commissioner questions using Open AI's Whisper speech recognition software. From May to August 2023, a team of volunteers assessed the AI transcripts against the recordings to edit, review, format, and finalize all NCI witness transcripts.

With utmost respect for the witnesses, the volunteers worked to the best of their skills and abilities to ensure that the transcripts would be as clear, accurate, and accessible as possible. Edits were made using the "intelligent verbatim" transcription method, which removes filler words and other throat-clearing, false starts, and repetitions that could distract from the testimony content.

Many testimonies were accompanied by slide show presentations or other exhibits. The NCI team recommends that transcripts be read together with the video recordings and any corresponding exhibits.

We are grateful to all our volunteers for the countless hours committed to this project, and hope that this evidence will prove to be a useful resource for many in future. For a complete library of the over 300 testimonies at the NCI, please visit our website at <https://nationalcitizensinquiry.ca>.

TRANSCRIPT TEAM (English)

Managing Editor
Jodi Bruhn

Transcript Coordinators
Debbie Palmer, Erin Thiessen

Formatting and Analysis Leads
Veronica Bush, Melissa Neville

Whisper AI Transcript Creation
Madison Lowe

First Review

Anjum Ahmad-Donovan, Bill Allwright, Lisa Aschenbrenner, Anne Marie Baxter, Vanessa Behrens-Nicholls, Pamela Boese, Yvonne Cunnington, Michael Darmody, Teresa Dockstader, Heather Domik, Rita Mae Ewanchuk, Chantal Gutfriend, Monika Harynuk, Michelle Hughes, Karen Kimmet, Kathy Ladd, Lori Morrison, Ronald Mucklestone, Melissa Neville, Debbie Palmer, Joanne Plamondon, Susan Reh-Bosch, Elisa Rolston, Tanja Shields, Ronald Simpson, Elizabeth Sleight, Al Smigelski, Darlene Smigelski, Barbara Spencer, Dawn Sutherland Dort, Christine Taylor, Evelyne Therrien, Erin Thiessen, Ada VandenBerg, Rich VandenBerg, Sally Williams

Second Review

Veronica Bush, Elizabeth van Dreunen, Brigitte Hamilton, Rosalee Krahn, Val Sprott

Final Review

Jodi Bruhn, Anna Cairns, Margaret Phillips



NATIONAL CITIZENS INQUIRY

Saskatoon, SK

Day 2

April 21, 2023

EVIDENCE

Opening Statement: Shawn Buckley

Full Day 2 Timestamp: 01:04:29–01:37:37

Source URL: <https://rumble.com/v2jlxvm-national-citizens-inquiry-saskatoon-day-2.html>

[00:00:00]

Shawn Buckley

Welcome to the second of three days of the National Citizen Inquiry hearings in Saskatoon. I have been asked to remind people to go to our website, nationalcitizenshearing.ca, and to sign the petition, and also to donate. Every time we do one of these sets of hearings in a city, it costs us about \$35,000, and we hope to recover our costs as we go along.

Commissioners, this morning I am attending as agent for the Inquiry Administrator, the Honourable Ches Crosbie.

I wanted to speak a little bit about masks, because that seemed to be a theme yesterday from various witnesses. It got snuck in one way or another. As I was thinking about masks, I was asking myself the question: Surely our governments knew? Surely the health authorities knew that masking was not a good idea? The CAPR's meta-study has come out. We had Steve Kirsch yesterday at one of his slides indicating the media and the public health authorities were relying on this Bangladeshi study, which apparently anyone reading it can understand that it's not there. We had Joe Bourgault here yesterday who, just as a businessman with employees, they brought in an expert to actually measure CO2 levels and oxygen levels within masks and were able to determine very quickly that they were not dangerous. So when I am a little along in my presentation this morning, I want you to keep that question in the back of your mind: Did they know?

I didn't have time to research, but I think one of the main advisers to Trump has admitted on TV that no, they just kind of made it up: "Well, let's do something, let's mask." And we've heard about all of this harm, about kids, literally their IQs being stunted because they are wired, hardwired; their brains learn how to speak and to learn emotion and appropriate behaviour by seeing our faces. So, an immeasurable amount of harm has been done. And the question I want you to keep in the back of your mind is: Did they know?

Now, I spoke last week in one of my openings about fear and how it is the main weapon used against us because we are so afraid of being shamed. We are herd animals. We are community people. We need to be part of the tribe. And we are so afraid of being shamed that our greatest fear is being excluded. In fact, police states have learned that, rather than

just torture and torture and torture people, just put them in isolated confinement for a long period of time and they'll break.

Now the enemy uses this fear that we have of being shamed by the herd and being excluded. It's the primary weapon. And the war is for your mind. This is where the war is being fought. And your enemy wants your mind closed so that you don't think. The enemy will give you messages, will give you a belief, and then will use this tactic of fear against you to close your mind. Understand, what I'm saying is: You will be given messages. You will be given beliefs. Then once you've accepted them, once they've been hammered in—although it's going to be constant repetition, I mean, read Hitler's *Mein Kampf*: repetition, just keep repeating the lie over and over and over and over again, and it becomes truth. Once you've accepted the message, then the next tactic—and it's playing on your fear of being shamed, it plays on your fear of being excluded from the tribe—is what I call “labels of shame.” And labels of shame are terms that are deliberately made up so that we will close our mind if somebody presents to us a message that is different than that that we've been force-fed. Labels of shame would include “conspiracy theorist.” What do you do if you're having a conversation with somebody, “Oh yeah, well, then there's this ‘conspiracy theorist—’?”

[00:05:00]

All of a sudden you don't even want to go there because if you do, that label will be attached to you. And now you will be an object of derision and shame: “climate denier,” “anti-vaxxer,” “disinformation.”

Wasn't Dr. Francis Christian refreshing yesterday? I found it interesting, I didn't know that the words “disinformation” and “misinformation”—that those words were first used in the Soviet Union as labels of shame. But understand that these terms are actually weapons that close your mind. Because if I have accepted the mainstream narrative that the vaccine is safe and effective, and then I've come to believe that if I personally go against that narrative I will be labeled as an anti-vaxxer—and I understand that that is a term of derision—now my fear of being excluded from the tribe is going to kick in. I'm actually going to have an emotional reaction to that type of information and I will close my mind as a defence mechanism. And I will close my mind because the last thing I want is to be shamed. The last thing I want is to be excluded from the tribe. So I hope you can see how effective these labels are. You're fed a belief and then you're placed in this context where, if you challenge that belief, if you even entertain ideas that go against that belief, you will be labelled with a derisive label and you will no longer be part of the herd or the tribe.

Now the danger about that is it means that we're only allowed to have one belief, and that's a belief that's given to us. It's not a belief that we've arrived at with our own thinking and without critical thought. So we've got to defuse those terms. We've got to start calling them out. I think we need to be proud of them. We need to call ourselves “anti-vaxxers” and “conspiracy theorists” and “disinformation spreaders” and “climate deniers” even if those labels actually don't even apply to us. But we have to take the power away from them.

And as soon as somebody starts doing that, I think we have to start explaining to them, “Do you understand that actually is a weapon being used against you? It means your mind is captured because when you use that label, it means that you are looking at any other counter-argument or information basically with disdain and with derision. And because you have that view, you can't even consider it. So your mind is closed. It's not about changing your mind. I mean, if you're so right, why are you threatened by information?” I think we need to be explaining to people that these weapons exist. Because if they can't see the weapon, they can't defend against the weapon.

When you hear a journalist use terms like “misinformation” or “anti-vaxx” or “climate denier” or “conspiracy theorists,” in that context it’s being used as a weapon. When you hear your family members or friends using that term, I hope that you can appreciate that they are a victim. So the weapon has been used against them and the weapon’s been effective, but that’s not a person to get angry about. That’s a person to have this conversation, about how they actually have a closed mind.

We have probably had the biggest fraud in history perpetrated on us. I mean, anyone watching these proceedings, it’s like: We have had these vaccines mandated. I mean, this can’t be a surprise to anyone. There were vaccine mandates. We all experienced it. For the first time, we’ve been basically told we can’t work, we can’t fly, we can’t travel, we can’t go to a hockey game unless we take a treatment, which by all definition is experimental. And we’re learning just how misguided that was—and that’s being a very generous term. I think that historians will look at what has happened in the last couple of years and describe this as the biggest fraud perpetrated in human history connected to a vaccine.

[00:10:00]

And a lot of people listening to these words will go, “Yeah, I agree with that.”

Now, pay attention then to what happened yesterday. I was fascinated how witness after witness who would agree with me, “That vaccine was bad news and we’ve been gamed.” Witness after witness said the magic words: “I’m not an anti-vaxxer,” “I’m not an anti-vaxxer,” “I’m not an anti-vaxxer.” We heard that time and time and time again by a various number of witnesses that were outraged about what the government did. And yet here they are at the National Citizens Inquiry almost instinctively saying, “I’m not an anti-vaxxer.” And you know why they’re saying that? Because they don’t want that label on them. So even in the context of these proceedings, witnesses that are saying things that definitely go against the government narrative are saying, “I’m not an anti-vaxxer,” “I’m not an anti-vaxxer,” “I’m not an anti-vaxxer.” They’re saying this because their minds are captured on that point.

I can almost guarantee you that every single witness that said that has not looked into the science behind the vaccines to determine for themselves whether any given one is safe or effective. I can almost guarantee that. But they don’t want to be shamed. And instinctively, like robots, they do that. Do you see how scary it is in a context like this? Like, literally, this is an inquiry into what happened, into what likely is the biggest fraud in history connected to a vaccine. And we have witnesses instinctively saying while they’re testifying, “I’m not an anti-vaxxer. I’m not an anti-vaxxer. I’m not an anti-vaxxer.” It’s evidence to us of just how deep this conditioning goes.

As I say, the only way to break the power of these labels is to embrace them proudly and to let people know. Let’s stop being ashamed. Somebody wants to throw any label at us, let’s stop being ashamed. Because that’s where the power is. If you understand it’s just a weapon, the label is actually a weapon, and if you allow yourself to be shamed then the weapon has power over you: once you realize that, it stops. And these labels are dehumanizing. “Climate denier?” What the heck? You mean we can’t have an honest discussion about that? “Anti-vaxxer?” Like, really? If there’s strong science on anything, and Steve Kirsch made this point, then you’d think we’d want to actually look at the science and we could just shame anyone that disagreed with objective truth, couldn’t we? And wouldn’t that be what happens? Human beings are not stupid. We have the ability of critical thought. We have just had weapons used against us so that our minds are closed and that we don’t think critically. But these terms are dehumanizing and they’re meant to be.

And our actions have been dehumanizing. You know, our last witness, Marjaleena Repo, really struck me yesterday. If you haven't seen her evidence, you must see it. She was an elderly lady who could not wear a mask. She had COPD [chronic obstructive pulmonary disease]. When she was on the stand at the beginning you could hear her breathing. And I see some people nodding in the crowd, "Yeah, I know, I heard her breathing problems." She's got a letter from her doctor. There's no question that this old lady cannot wear masks. She can't. Medical reasons. Full stop. She shared with us how she went to her oncologist and got the news that she had stage four breast cancer. So basically, a death sentence. She's shocked. She's grieving. She's anxious. She decides to go to a café to just kind of get some comfort. And they ask her to wear a mask. And she says, "No, I'm medically exempt." And then they want her to sign her name and write down her address. Just like it was the East German Stasi: "What's your name? What's your address?"

[00:15:00]

And she quite rightly said, "Well, actually, that's not a requirement." And they have this little confrontation and she leaves. She posts on Facebook what happened. Remember, what was it—the next morning when she saw? Like a hundred people led by this radio newscaster had shamed her publicly. This little old lady, who had just learned that she had stage four breast cancer, who was just looking for a place where she could settle down, who can't wear a mask for medical reasons, was being publicly shamed by what I describe as mob violence. This public shaming, where we shame others online: that is mob violence. And let's call it for what it is: It's evil and it's wrong. I'll explain that a little further.

Do you remember how she said she got no kindness at the cancer clinic because she wouldn't wear a mask? It's almost like she was a leper. She's basically repeating things we've heard throughout these proceedings from patients and medical people that testified. She was banned by the bus driver. That's her way of getting around! Listen to a couple of things I wrote down that she said— I'm not a transcriber, I might have gotten this wrong but the meaning is going to shine through. Just listen: "Masking became a method to punish you in every such way." This is her experience. "Masking became a method to punish you in every such way." She said, "The horror of it, the horror of it, this total distortion, and very quickly—" She couldn't believe how we just turned as a society on her. And she described it as dehumanizing.

The treatment that she received can only be described as utterly shameful. I was ashamed listening. I was ashamed as a Canadian to hear how she had been treated. And she said, "I didn't see any resistance." I think that's the biggest thing of all. I think that's more shaming than anything else. We had a witness in Winnipeg [sic] [Toronto] that had a mental disability and a physical disability—and told the police before she was violently taken down at Walmart and handcuffed and dragged out in front of a whole line of people. But what shocked her most was nobody helped. Nobody said anything. There was no resistance.

The questions we need to ask ourselves today is: How do we get there? How do we as a society get to the point where we're bullying old ladies who can't wear a mask? And there's no resistance. How do we get to the place where we're going to wrestle a disabled person to the ground in front of a crowd and there's no resistance? Nobody says anything. And that was over a mask too. It can't be fear. It can't be fear from the virus that you have to wear a mask to protect yourselves. Because if people were really afraid that they were going to get COVID if they didn't wear a mask, then they wouldn't have even gone to restaurants. Because sure, you had to wear it going in, but as soon as you sat down at your

table you could take your mask off. And yeah, you're six feet away from the next table, but give me a break: If you were afraid that you were going to catch the COVID virus and get hurt or die because somebody wasn't wearing a mask, you would not go to a restaurant. And my favourite is the fact that the people that buy the mainstream narrative don't see the problem with this one: One day we're wearing a mask. One day we're wearing a mask, we're shaming old ladies in cafés, we're wrestling disabled people to the ground in Walmart. And the next day the government says, "You don't have to wear a mask."

[00:20:00]

And all of a sudden, we're all okay! We're 100 per cent okay. We can not wear a mask. We can smile at each other. Everyone's in a better mood. And that's not possible. That the government can all of a sudden understand that a virus is no longer going to go near somebody because they've taken a mask off. Was there some agreement with COVID-19 that was binding that was signed with the government?

It's not fear, it's compliance. It's compliance. Because the government then just says all of a sudden, "You have to wear a mask again," and then we're shaming old ladies again, and we're wrestling disabled ladies to the ground in Walmart. This is cult-like behavior. Listen to that. This is cult-like behavior. This became an excuse for Canadians to become vicious. And we were vicious. And we were encouraged to be vicious.

We had one witness, the pharmacist, telling us how in Saskatchewan they set up a snitch line. We watched some video clips in Winnipeg and it wasn't called a snitch line. It's like, "Be an ambassador. Be an ambassador." If that isn't a scary term. George Orwell would be very proud of that term, "ambassador." Now understand that when this is compliance, and understand how we were led to be in bad behavior: as I asked earlier understand, ask the question, "Didn't the government know that masks would make no difference?" Because if you conclude that the government knew, or should have known, that masks truly were a farce, and yet led us into these acts of violence and viciousness as a society, then some much more troubling questions come up in your mind.

The question I have for all of us who shamed people online, who were unkind to old ladies who weren't wearing masks, who stood and watched a disabled person get wrestled to the ground by the police—and I could go on and on—my question is: "Is this what we really are?" Because the problem is, we can say, "That's not who we are." We can say, "No, we're Canadians and we're kind to each other and we respect." But I have a saying: You don't look at what somebody's saying. If you want to know who a person is, who they truly are, you look at what they do. It's our actions that tell us who we have chosen to be. It's our actions. And I am ashamed of our actions. Masks are absolutely dehumanizing and the way we've treated each other is shameful. And understand that masks, like the passports: they're a sign of obedience.

If you conclude, "Wait a second, the government should have known. Why are we having to do this?" And I've spoken about the passports being a police state ritual; I might go back to that tomorrow, I haven't decided. But understand that the masks are a visual sign of your obedience to the state. Putting on a mask before you go into a store or a restaurant has become a new police state ritual.

Back to, "the government knew the masks didn't work." I wear a cloth mask that some lady was just selling online, that there's no way it's sealed against my face. And there was no specific requirement. If this was real, then we would have had to wear real masks. People actually would have been wearing respirators and the whole like. So, I'm hoping we can

accept that you're not really being honest with yourself if you truly believe that this worked.

But let's say the government knew this didn't work.

[00:25:00]

What happened subconsciously to a person who— Before, we were free. So before the mask mandate, you could do anything. You could go to the grocery store. You could go to kid's hockey game. You could do anything. Essential service, non-essential. You didn't have to put on a mask, you're absolutely free. Nobody was going to kick you out of the store. Police weren't going to come and wrestle you to the ground. You weren't going to be treated with unkindness. But as soon as there's this mask requirement now you actually have to go through the ritual of putting the mask on. And if you believe it doesn't work and is a farce, understand this is now just a total ritual of submission. And subconsciously the message is that, "You have to go through this action."

You used to be free to go to the grocery store but now you're not free to go to the grocery store. You are granted the privilege "if" you do what the police state is asking you to do and put on a mask. We need to start understanding that there's a real programming-in-our-mind problem. There's a real subconscious thing that occurs when we participate in things like masking. Let's say we were in a situation where we truly were in a scary, dangerous pandemic and masks could be helpful. There's still a cost. There's still a cost to the government saying, "You must wear them," instead of saying, "Here's the danger, you choose." Right? Because a lot of people—if we were being fed truthful information, we would choose to do things. Most of us probably would. Not all. The government makes it mandatory to force compliance. We're told. But understand, it also conditions us to be sheep. Because it tells us we're not free to do something we were free to do before unless we go through this ritual. So there's more going on here.

I've already said those that were attacking Marjaleena Repo are themselves victims. It means that they have accepted the conditioning, they've accepted the fear. And they're actually enforcing the ritual. So many people would not have worn masks but for it was the social pressure. It was the businesses, it was the citizens, it really wasn't the police. So we embraced this unaware.

I think that the second commandment is our only way back as a nation. And for those of you who don't know what the second commandment is, it's just when Jesus said that we are to treat every other person like ourselves. So basically, we're supposed to treat people the way we want to be treated. That's the second commandment.

I don't want to live in East Germany when it was under communist rule and their secret police, the Stasi, had every neighbour and family member snitching on everyone else. And I don't want to live in the Canada of 2020. I don't want to live in the Canada of 2021. And I don't want to live in the Canada of 2022. I don't want to ever live there again: Where we have governments telling Canadians to be good ambassadors. Where we have Canadians basically enforcing police state rituals. Where we have Canadians not treating others like they themselves would want to be treated. And I think our moral compass, our basically societal norms of right and wrong have been broken.

I was very interested when Dr. Francis Christian was on the stand yesterday, and he was talking about post-modernism. Where something might be true to you, but now we're in this milieu where, "Yeah, well, that's your truth, but I have my own truth." So there's really

no anchor of truth. There's no moral standard. And that has been deliberately imposed upon us through the education system, through the media. It's been deliberate. And it's been imposed on us to separate us, and to divide us, and to conquer us.

[00:30:00]

Because we have a civilization that was based on Christian principles, and you can't deny it. For those of you who are lawyers, one of our great jurists was Lord Denning. And he had great influence in our civil law, and our civil law dictates our responsibilities to each other. "Hey, you can't trespass on my property," for example. There was this one famous case where he just asked the question, "Who then is my neighbour?" Because we were entering an industrial age and we could now be affected by things more broadly than when we were just in an agrarian society. And he asked, "Who then is my neighbour?" That was the touchstone. The second commandment was the touchstone for determining what our civil obligations to each other are. So we had a society, and we still have a legal system, based on the second commandment, that we are to treat others as we would like to be treated ourselves. But that is being undermined, and this culture is being undermined.

I think our only way back is to understand that there are moral truths. And that the second commandment is a moral truth. It is true. You can't say it's not your truth. I'm telling you: "It is true that you are to treat others like you would like to be treated." And that needs to become the bedrock of the new Canada. If we all believe that we have to treat others like we want to be treated then there will be no bullying of old women online. And there won't be unkindness in cancer clinics. And there won't be this viciousness and this dehumanization of others. And so we have to get back to our anchor, our moral compass.

So that's how I wanted to open today. It's important because, what we're seeing here is, we're seeing witness after witness after witness affected. Experts concerned about how we basically haven't followed the law and how all our institutions have changed. And lay witness after lay witness basically testifying about the effects of this. And the problem is that we have gone into this postmodernism, this moral relevance. And we no longer hold it as a core value that we need to treat others like we'd want to treat ourselves. And if we did hold onto that, we would treat each other with kindness and respect. And none of this could happen. I think that we need to understand and start thinking at a philosophical level.

[00:33:08]

Final Review and Approval: Jodi Bruhn, August 21, 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.

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