



NCI | CeNC

NATIONAL CITIZENS INQUIRY

**EVIDENCE
VANCOUVER HEARINGS**

NCI | CeNC

**Vancouver, British Columbia, Canada
May 2 to 4, 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

Vancouver, BC

Day 1

May 2, 2023

EVIDENCE

Opening Statement: Shawn Buckley

Full Day 1 Timestamp: 00:49:33–01:24:04

Source URL: <https://rumble.com/v2ln3p0-national-citizens-inquiry-vancouver-day-1.html>

[00:00:00]

Shawn Buckley

We welcome you to the National Citizens Inquiry as we begin Day 1 of three days of hearings in Vancouver, British Columbia. We have finally hit the West Coast.

Commissioners, my name is Buckley, initial S. I'm attending as agent for the Inquiry Administrator, the Honourable Ches Crosbie.

I would like to begin by explaining to those who are not familiar with the National Citizens Inquiry that we are a citizen-organized, a citizen-led and a citizen-funded group that just decided to hold an independent inquiry into how all levels of government dealt with the COVID-19 pandemic.

Our hope is, by marching across the land and allowing people to have a voice to tell their stories—

And I am sorry, I should probably start that again. I am sorry, I forgot to put the mike on, so I am going to say that again so people online can catch what I just said.

Again, I welcome you to the National Citizens Inquiry as we begin our first of three days in Vancouver, British Columbia. Commissioners, my name is Buckley, initial S. I'm attending this morning as agent for the Inquiry Administrator, the Honourable Ches Crosbie.

The National Citizens Inquiry is a citizen-organized, a citizen-run, and a citizen-funded group with a vision to have independent commissioners go across this land and discover what happened with the COVID-19 pandemic and to come up with recommendations to help us move forward in a better way. But just as important, we give a voice to Canadians who have been silenced for years. And we have been silenced. Whether you're vaccinated or unvaccinated, you're not allowed to tell your story. We're not allowed to have a discourse. And I guess I need to stop saying you're not allowed because you are allowed now to tell your story and you are telling your stories here. And we are now allowed to tell our stories outside of these hearings because we need to tell our stories.

Now I'm supposed to always do an ask before I go into my opening remarks. I do ask that you go to our website, nationalcitizenshearing.ca, and sign our petition. We want to have as many signatures on there as possible so that it's clear that citizens are demanding this honest inquiry into what happened.

We also ask that you donate. Every set of hearings costs us approximately \$35,000 to run. And we just kind of manage to pay our bills as they go along. We don't have a single big funder, so we actually rely on you to be donating every time we do this. And I actually feel quite humbled and proud to be part of something that really is a citizen-run event and that relies on the citizens. And the fact that the word is getting out is because you're getting the word out. We don't have any mainstream media here today, which is quite fantastic. When you think about the fact that never in history has a group of citizens gotten together and marched across the land, doing a fair and independent inquiry, and this COVID experience has been the most significant experience of our lives.

Even for those who lived through wartime in Canada, this has been more impactful and will be more impactful going forward. So the fact that this is happening itself should be front page news. This should be the leading story on every TV network, but it's crickets. And it's crickets for a reason, and we know the reason is because the mainstream media doesn't want to tell the Canadian citizens the truth. They're not ready and we haven't demanded it yet, although we're demanding it now. So we've depended on you getting the word out for us, sharing all of our social media.

The only social media that I thought we were not being hindered on and censored was Twitter, and we've done fairly well on Twitter. And in an opening in the Red Deer hearings, I asked everyone, and I ask again, whenever you tweet anything at all connected to a subject matter of this Inquiry, add the hashtag #NCI so their algorithms pick us up.

[00:05:00]

But we have come to the conclusion, and I don't know if it's Twitter Canada, I suspect it must be, that we are being search banned on Twitter. So that if you search for us on Twitter, if you search for the National Citizens Inquiry— And we have screenshots where we don't show up and we have screenshots where we do show up, and that shouldn't be happening except for somebody is putting a brake on us.

And I have to confess that I know really nothing about whether governments in Canada have been involved with censorship with social media as the governments in the United States have. Because we know in the United States, and let's thank Elon Musk for releasing what are called the Twitter files, that literally government agencies were involved in censoring voices that went against the government narrative. Now because Canada acted even in a more aggressive way on censorship than the United States, I would presume, but it's only an assumption, that perhaps the Canadian authorities were also involved in censoring.

But in any event, I'm asking you to take action to stop this search banning on Twitter. I'm asking everyone who hears this to basically tweet out at Elon Musk, tag NCI, and you ask Elon Musk to do whatever he needs to do to help the NCI and to ensure that we are not searched banned. And if enough of you do this, he might get the word because likely he doesn't know. He has shown that he does not want censorship on Twitter, and we are being censored, which in itself is tremendously alarming, and it's a result of the Big Lie.

And the one thing that jumped out at me this week as I was having discussions with people, as I was interviewing witnesses, and some of my interviews were very unenjoyable, I got reminded of the Big Lie. And some of you know what the Big Lie is, what that term means. And most of you won't know what the Big Lie is, and I'll tell you in a little bit. I'll tell you because you must know what the Big Lie is. And you must know because it's an ingredient to this spell that our brothers and sisters have been put under, where they actually believe that a lie is truth: that they're living in a world that is not true, that they believe fundamental things that are not true. Literally, they're under a spell. And the Big Lie was one of the ingredients used to put them under this spell.

I've spoken in other openings of how we're herd animals, and there are very few things that we are more afraid of than being shamed, from being excluded from the herd. In fact, police states have learned that you don't have to torture people, just put them in solitary confinement for a long enough period of time and they break. We can't tolerate it.

Now it's been a theme that's come up in the past couple sets of hearings of people actually giving testimony about how awful this COVID-19 vaccine is and then volunteering: "But I'm not an anti-vaxxer, I'm not an anti-vaxxer, I'm not an anti-vaxxer," which just shows how conditioned we are to accept that as a pejorative term. And what I'm wondering is whether or not we should, in a manner consistent with the second commandment, start using that psychology to help wake the vaxxed up.

And when I say vaxxed, I'm meaning people that follow the government narrative because that's really where our divide went: Like overall, people that got vaccinated believed in the government narrative or were otherwise coerced. And people that didn't get vaccinated tend to be those that were skeptical of the government narrative. And I appreciate there's a whole range of other individuals in there, and I'm speaking very broadly. So understand that when I'm using the term vaxxed, I'm referring to those that accept the government narrative, but I want to contrast it with the unvaxxed or an anti-vaxxer. I think the vaxxed need to understand how we actually look down at them as deceived. I think that they would feel shame if they understood that now. And we're the majority now; we're the majority of people that don't buy the government narrative.

So they're now in a minority, where the majority are looking at them and thinking that they are downright silly and to be pitied. And I think that those of you that are vaxxed, that buy into the government narrative, need to understand we literally look at you like you're blind.

[00:10:00]

Aren't many of you in disbelief at how people can't see what's right before their eyes? And people in the crowd are shaking their heads. We look at you or vaxxed people as if you're ignorant. We look at you as if you've been tricked because you have been tricked. And when somebody's tricked, they can't see it. The hardest thing, psychologically, is to accept that you've been fooled, that you've been taken for a patsy. It's hard for us to get there, but we look at you and we look at you as Proles: as literally the unwashed masses in George Orwell's book *Nineteen Eighty-Four*, that were controlled by the authorities, that were controlled by the lies, that were controlled by the Ministry of Truth.

And so, I want you to understand—those that accept the government narrative, those that I'm calling vaxxed—that if you understood how the majority looks at you, you would feel shame. And you need to start opening your eyes and becoming reasonable, and you need to stop living a lie.

I'm going to use a phrase as I continue, because I can't resist. One of the people that I follow is a blogger, Greg Hunter, of usawatchdog.com, and I enjoy him for several reasons. But he has a phrase that he sometimes uses that I want to borrow, so I'm giving him credit for the phrase. But sometimes he'll be talking about something, and he'll say, "You know, that is too stupid to be stupid." And I just love that phrase. So there are so many things that we went through that are too stupid to be stupid. It's like—really—you couldn't think about this and realize how silly it was?

Let's talk about how people were forced and coerced to take the vaccine. We've never witnessed anything like it, and we've had witness after witness explain that they were coerced. Well, that meant a whole bunch of you—employers, family members, friends—were doing everything you could to convince people to take this vaccine. And you could only do that if you believed it worked, right? You're not going to coerce somebody; you're not going to stop being friends with your best friend; you're not going to alienate your family members just because they don't take a vaccine—if you didn't believe it worked, right? This is just common sense.

But the problem is, if it worked, if it protected you from COVID-19— And that's what they were telling us at the beginning, the reason for taking the vaccine changed over time. But let's not make any mistake about it: at the beginning, people were just assuming you wouldn't catch COVID-19. Even the word "vaccine," that's what it implies, right? Although the definition was changed by the Ministry of Truth. So if you believe it works, how can you get mad at somebody that doesn't take it? I mean, if you've taken it and your kid's taken it, they're safe.

Do you see the logical inconsistency? If it works, you don't have to coerce anyone. So the fact that we got worked into a frenzy over a vaccine that we believed worked—because you're not going to do all this pressure on coercion and hatred and division for something that doesn't work, that's meaningless. The fact that we got into this frenzy was too stupid to be stupid because it's logically indefensible.

One of my favourites is masks and restaurants. And I know people are watching us all around the world; this isn't just a Canadian thing. In the province that I live in, Alberta, and I think this was true across most of Canada, there was a period of time where we had to wear masks into restaurants. I'm smiling because, I mean, even the idea of wearing masks that don't stop viruses that are so small, it's crazy. And then you can just wear whatever mask you want. And even if you had an N95 or something that could work, if you read the instructions, you're supposed to stop using it after a couple of hours. And you're wearing it for weeks and pretending that it means something, but aside from all that silliness, which is also too stupid to be stupid.

So in Alberta, you'd have to wear your mask into the restaurant. Literally, there'd usually be somebody at the door: you're only getting in there if you can show your identity papers and if you're wearing a mask. But then, as soon as you sit down, you can take your mask off. If this was a deadly pandemic, if this was a deadly disease, and if masks worked—let's just assume all those things.

[00:15:00]

And we'd have to assume those things or we wouldn't be wearing masks. So let's understand that. We're not going to be wearing masks—we're not going to be accepting that, wearing masks in restaurants—unless we believe that there's a deadly virus

warranting a mask, and we believe that masks work. Or otherwise, we're too stupid to be stupid, right?

So if we believe those things, how can it possibly be—I mean truly, how can it possibly be that then, we could take our masks off as we sit at the table, which is most of the time we're in there, and that that's okay? So help me out: that's a little too stupid to be stupid.

And how the restrictions, they wouldn't be phased out. It wouldn't be like, "Oh actually, this part of the city is doing poorly, so you still need passports there and you need masks to wear. But these other areas, we're going to—" No, no. For us it was like a light switch going on and off. So you might be getting yelled at and kicked out of a store one day for not wearing a mask or not being able to go places because you don't have a passport. And then flick, the next day, you're able to go wherever you want: nobody's wearing a mask; nobody's upset about it; like, nobody's all of a sudden afraid.

We were having to put people under house arrest, a portion of the population, where they couldn't go out except for essential services because they didn't have their police-state identification papers. And we had to wear masks to protect ourselves from this daily virus on Monday. But on Tuesday, we don't need the masks. And on Tuesday, we can let everyone out of their houses regardless that they're in a social subclass that has less rights because the virus has decided to go on vacation. This is too stupid to be stupid.

Ignoring censorship. And I'm sorry, you had to be asleep to ignore the censorship. We had in Canada all of our media, both government-owned and private sector, our mainstream media speaking with one voice. And every single government at every level speaking of one voice, federal, provincial, municipal. And anyone who stepped out of the government narrative would be reported in the mainstream press as spreading misinformation, which Dr. Francis Christian told us, as an expert witness in Saskatoon, that that term was invented in Stalinist Russia. So it's appropriate that we're using it in Canada.

We had censorship. And it was supported by the public. We had censorship by people. We can't even talk with family members and friends that are still in this vaxxed category, that still buy the government narrative—although we can't believe that they do. But these people haven't thought this through. Could you imagine living in a society where there was agreement on important issues because you couldn't step out of the narrative because there was censorship? Do they want to live in that type of society? That's full-on police state.

If we were truly in a dangerous pandemic—is that not the time where we actually have to privilege every voice and say, "We're going to have open discussion, where any idea, we're not going to discount. We're going to treat people with respect. Obviously, as ideas don't pan out or don't seem reasonable, we'll focus on other ones." But if we were truly in a global pandemic—if this truly was a 1918 flu and we were in trouble—isn't the best public policy to have open and free debate and let provinces and countries try different things, not a one-solution-fits-all? That makes no common sense: it is too stupid to be stupid.

But the icing on the cake, and what led to literally the crime of the century, is this mantra of "safe and effective." If you go to Health Canada's website today and you find their Pfizer page, and I didn't check today, but they have a page for every single vaccine that they've approved. And every time I check—and I usually just go to the Pfizer page, at the top of the page, and this is on Health Canada's website—will be a sentence that reads something like: "All COVID-19 vaccines approved of by Health Canada have been proven to be safe,

[00:20:00]

effective and of the highest quality.” And the safe, effective, and highest quality part is in bold. Now, we’ve had witnesses speak about the quality control problems. And to say that it wasn’t an absolute lie that they were of the highest quality would be an understatement. But I want to focus on the safe and effective.

So we come out with a vaccine literally in a year for a novel coronavirus. We’ve never had a mass vaccine for a coronavirus ever, and we’re told it is new technology. I mean, who had ever heard of mRNA being injected in us before? Who had ever heard of lipid nanoparticles prior to this? So we all know, they’re being open about, this is new technology. This is rushed. We know it’s rushed. We lived it. It happened in a year. And you’re not critically thinking that maybe this hasn’t been proven to be safe and effective? How could they prove it to be safe for three months or four months? And just so you know, it was a mean of two months. How would we know how this is going to affect us even in the short period, let alone the long term? We can’t know. And so if you would believe that—and people would just, you know, the mantra, “safe and effective,” “safe and effective.” It’s almost as nauseating as “follow the science.” I mean, I’m sorry: that’s just too stupid to be stupid, isn’t it?

Now let’s talk about the media and government, what I think is one of the biggest crimes of the century, which anyone, any one of you, could have uncovered in an afternoon. The beauty about this crime is, it’s not hidden. It will be hidden. Some of the documents I expect will very soon be erased from the web, but they’re still there. You can still find them today. You could find them in an hour. We all knew this was rushed. We all knew it. We were told it was rushed. We live the U.S. mainstream media and, you know, emergency authorization. And a whole bunch of Canadians believe ours was approved under emergency authorization, which is the wrong terminology. We don’t have an emergency use authorization pathway. We did something worse.

We had the Minister of Health issue an order, basically, exempting these vaccines from our regular drug approval process, which requires proof of safety, which requires proof of efficacy. And once you understand the safety and efficacy profile, then you do a risk-benefit analysis. You can’t do that unless you know the safety profile and the benefit profile. But an interim order was issued, which exempted the vaccines from the regular test. And again, anyone could have found this out in an hour. Anyone. And let’s put this in context: We’re in a global pandemic. We’ve lost our freedoms. We’re becoming divided and hateful. We’re afraid for our children. We’re afraid for our parents. We’re afraid for our very lives. We know a vaccine is rushed. I mean, you couldn’t take an hour of your day and maybe do a little research about—was this proven safe or effective?

The test that the vaccines were approved under, the word “safety” isn’t even mentioned. Let that sink in for a second. And I’ll cite the test. I might get it off by a word or two, but I’ve read it enough times, I can, just from memory, tell it to you. But when I tell it to you, I challenge you to listen for the word “safety” as part of the test. And I also challenge you to listen to the word “efficacy,” which is just—does it work? Because that word’s not there also.

So the test that all COVID-19 vaccines were approved under, it begins with—“The Minister has sufficient evidence to support the conclusion.” Now I’ll stop there. Minister means Health Canada. So I’m going to say it again, and I’m going to substitute [for] Minister, Health Canada. So the test is—“Health Canada has sufficient evidence to support the conclusion.” I need to stop because what follows, I want you to understand: Health Canada doesn’t have

to be convinced of anything. There doesn't have to be objective proof to convince Health Canada. If Health Canada had to be satisfied that something needed to be proven, the test would read "Health Canada has sufficient evidence to conclude."

[00:25:00]

That's how we word it.

But our test for these COVID-19 vaccines is "The Minister has sufficient evidence to support the conclusion"—not Health Canada's conclusion, so just an argument needs to be made. I'll start at the beginning: "Health Canada has sufficient evidence to support the conclusion that the risks of the drug outweigh the benefits, having regard to the uncertainty concerning the risks and benefits and the urgent public health emergency presented by COVID-19." Did you hear the word "safety" in that test?

So we'll use Pfizer as an example. The Pfizer vaccine was approved under that test: Pfizer did not have to prove the vaccine was safe. Did you hear the word "efficacy" in that test? Pfizer did not have to prove that the vaccine worked. There's cost-benefit language in that test, but if you actually go to the order and study it, Pfizer doesn't even have to prove that the benefits outweigh the risks. They just have to have evidence to support—they basically just need to make the argument. They don't have to convince Health Canada.

And this wasn't hidden. The media actually reported that this was approved under an interim order. And I assure you, people looked: journalists looked; members of parliament and MLAs, they looked, some of them looked; some doctors looked; some nurses looked. They looked and they didn't tell you. They didn't speak out. But what's too stupid to be stupid is for the biggest event of your life, you didn't look.

And now let me get to the really shocking part about this interim order.

Under our regular drug approval law—and you can just go to our drug regulation C.08.002 and start reading there. They're not long provisions. It'll be a couple of pages. But keep going, and you'll see that the Minister has power after a market authorization is granted.

So what happens is the drug company applies: they have to prove safety and efficacy, and then—this is a good idea—benefits outweigh the risk. And a market authorization is granted. But sometimes, in fact, most of the time, we actually don't know how safe a drug is or how effective it is until we get it into the general population. And so that's why we do post-market authorization surveillance. And we have a power in our drug regulation so that if after market approval is granted, the Minister realizes, "Wait, it's not safe." Or "Wait, it doesn't work," then the Minister can withdraw it from the market. That makes pretty good sense, doesn't it? Can anyone argue that the Minister should have that power?

So here we are with the COVID-19 vaccines, and I challenge anyone to read that interim order. You're not going to sleep at night. So not only is this interim test granted, but the Minister's power to withdraw a COVID-19 vaccine after it's approved is withdrawn from the Minister for a year. Did you hear that? So normally, the Minister has the power to withdraw market authorization, to pull a drug off the market if subsequent evidence shows that it's unsafe or subsequent evidence shows it doesn't work, which then would change the risk-benefit profile. The COVID-19 vaccines were deliberately, by the Liberal Government, exempted. Basically, the Minister lost the power under this interim order to order the withdrawal from the Canadian market of COVID-19 vaccines if further evidence showed that they were unsafe and if further evidence showed that they were not effective.

And that lasted for about a year. It varied from vaccine to vaccine because of the way the order was written.

Now—how—how is this in the public interest by any metric? And that clearly has to be a rhetorical question. I've thought about this: You can only remove the power to protect us from an unsafe or an ineffective vaccine if your intention is to kill, steal, or destroy. This has nothing to do with the public interest. And anyone who has ears, let them hear.

[00:30:00]

And some of you just got a message that means you have to stand up and you can't sit down ever again.

But for those of you who didn't understand the message that I just gave, understand that we are in the eye of a hurricane. And we just went through three years of the first part. You understand a hurricane is circular, and when it hits you, it's just awful. The winds are blowing, things are flying through the air, you're lucky to get through, and then you hit the eye. And this is so all-encompassing that nobody would make up this lie. So people actually believe the lie because it is just so big and outrageous, and it's just a psychological thing.

So for example, I think most of you will be aware of this. We had Woody Harrelson, the comedian, on Saturday Night Live not long ago, and he's standing up and he's talking about, "Oh, yeah, I got this script for a movie," and he told us kind of how it went. And then he says, "You know, I wasn't going to follow this." So basically, he said about this script, "Well, hey, you know, we've got all these powerful and rich pharmaceutical companies that basically started buying off the regulatory agencies and the governments. And we found ourselves in this world where we're locked down and we can only leave our house if we'll take these, you know, drugs from these pharmaceutical companies." And he's going, "Well, that's a script that was just a little too outrageous, and so I didn't follow it."

That's an example of the Big Lie. Because do you understand that those people that are still buying into the government narrative, the idea that the pharmaceutical companies could collectively get together and they'd have so much power and wealth that they would basically buy the regulatory agencies and buy the government and control the colleges of doctors and physicians, and the like, and basically place us in a situation where we're locked in our homes and have to take a drug for money—that is so outrageous that you can't believe it.

But if the government pushed that narrative, and it likely will be a narrative that will be pushed, if the mainstream media started pushing that narrative, then we would believe it. Because it's just too outrageous. It's too big. Nobody could make that up. So if all of a sudden CBC is sharing that narrative with you—even though before you might consider it outrageous—you would believe it. We were told a lot of Big Lies. We're living the Big Lie now. And things like safe and effective are part of them. So how the spell was cast is the Big Lie, fear, which I've spoken about, and repetition. And I'm just going to end my opening comments because fear and repetition are essential for the Big Lies to stick.

I was thinking this morning as I was deciding what to speak about, and I just posed the question. And I don't know the answer to the question, but I'll just pose it to you. Because I can't watch TV anymore. We don't even subscribe. About a month into the COVID thing, my wife and I just made a decision. We have to turn off the TV because it creates so much fear. And it actually, I think it took us a full month to settle down. And I shared on another opening how I was watching Del Bigtree's show, "The High Wire," and one of his episodes—

I don't know if it was monkeypox or something else they're trying to get us scared of. And in his show, he literally showed five or six minutes about how the media was reporting this. And so now I'm watching on his show the mainstream media. And in that short period of time, I got scared. They're experts at manipulating your emotions and getting you in fear.

So the question that I leave you with is—is watching television consistent with you being alive in three years? That's the question that just came to my mind. I don't know the answer. But I do know that we are experiencing the Big Lie. We're living in a lie. And that if everyone turned off the television sets, we would have a completely different nation and a much better one.

[00:34:30]

Final Review and Approval: Margaret Phillips, August 25, 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/>

NCI | CeNC