

LIVE Q&A ZOOM CALL WITH SHAWN BUCKLEY VIDEO TRANSCRIPT

Fundamental Health Decisions, Second Class Citizens, Control and Quiet Submission

Presentation by Shawn Buckley, LL.B., President of the Natural Health Products Protection Association on December 8, 2021

Transcript last updated January 18, 2022

Canada's Courts, COVID & Choice

The following was transcribed from a Live Q&A Zoom Call recording, which took place on December 8, 2021. The transcription below is of Shawn Buckley's comments that evening.

The video replay, including additional Q&A, is available [here](#).

Shawn Buckley:

3:48

I really appreciate that everyone is here. I'm viewing this as a joint experience as we, kind of, try and figure out exactly where we are and what we should be thinking of from a philosophical, legal perspective, and hopefully helping each other figure out how to navigate this going forward.

It was interesting, as I was preparing for this, I noticed – oh, it's December 8 2021. And I don't recall, if Canada declared war on Japan on December 7, or December 8. I know it was before the US that for a short period of time we stood alone. But we were already at war with, obviously Nazi Germany, in December of 1941. And I thought that was somewhat thematic. It's interesting that, you know, by that time, most of Western Europe was under the Nazi's control. And they were just doing things that today would be unbelievable. And I'm being a little facetious, but really unbelievable. Can you imagine that back in 1941 in December in France, or Germany, or a bunch of other countries... you had to have identification papers? You had to have them when you went out. The police or the army could ask at any moment for your papers. And if you didn't have them, you'd be in a world of hurt. And they were creating subgroups. The most commonly known one was obviously, is the Jewish population, where they were segregated. And the media was just relentless, so that everyone else would be okay with them being segregated. They were being taught basically to despise and hate, so that nothing would be said with what they were being done. I mean, the Jews in Warsaw, would have been about two months ago would have gotten the notice that they had to relocate to a specific neighborhood that became known as the Warsaw Ghetto. Obviously, they had to have their papers and they didn't have rights. And what was incredible about Canada, then – we haven't decided who we are yet today – but then, we were outraged! We weren't facing identification papers in 1941. We weren't worried about Germany invading North America and imposing subgroups and restrictions and going after our Jewish population. But we were so outraged, that we lined up to volunteer to go overseas, and fight so that other people wouldn't be subjected to

identification papers, and subgroups, and restrictions on their rights. It was absolutely crazy!

And who would have thought then, on December 8, 2021, that we would be here? I know if we, if I, backed up three years to December of 2018, I could not have imagined – you could not have convinced me – that Canada would be the type of place that it is now. It's just absolutely crazy.

7:00

So, I want us to kind of discuss from a legal, philosophical perspective, why we need to change things and why we need to start thinking about this a little differently. And I'm hoping some of my thoughts are going to surprise you as we go on. There are many people on this call that are not familiar with me. So, I'll share just a little bit of, kind of, my journey on how I became really concerned about health rights and people's rights to choose how they're going to treat their own bodies.

I was called to the bar as a lawyer in British Columbia in February of 1995. I'm still a member of the British Columbia Law Society. And I started practicing trying to protect constitutional rights, primarily those in our Charter. So, I've done a lot of criminal defense work, I expect that I've run over 1000 trials in my career. I've been in court lots. Basically, where the rubber meets the road on our rights issues. And I also – a large part of my practice was health law, trying to protect people's rights to make individual health decisions and to access things that they needed. So, but, when I was called to the bar in February of '95, I would describe myself now as a law and order person.

So, you know, I, I thought we had a social contract, I thought the government was there to help us – you know, not perfect, obviously, there's problems – and I definitely bought into the mainstream media narrative on almost every issue. So, I would watch the mainstream media news, and absorb that. And it's not that I didn't have ability to critically think, but I didn't have an understanding that regardless of the source – including mainstream media – that I am being given a narrative, and I should treat it as a narrative. So, I would have been what Cliff High now describes as a “normie” – somebody that just basically accepts most of what the mainstream teaches us, without much critical thought.

One of the things that first kind of got me realizing that there was something wrong, were actually the government Crown Attorneys in court. Because as I was trying to raise constitutional issues and get the courts to care about rights in specific cases, I was always – and I choose the term always purposely – I was always opposed by government lawyers, arguing that we shouldn't have rights, arguing that our rights should be circumscribed. And that challenged me

philosophically because every Attorney General in Canada, federal or provincial, is charged with upholding the law. And that's what we want. We want our Attorney Generals (who run our Crown Prosecution Services) and our Crown Attorneys – we want them to uphold the law. We want them to love upholding the law. We want it to be a passion. Well, our Supreme Law is our Constitution. So, our Constitution Act 1982, section 52, it reads, “the Constitution of Canada is the Supreme Law of Canada, and any law that's inconsistent with it is of no force and effect”. And our Charter of Rights and Freedoms, is in the same act Constitution Act of 1982. So, I would expect that a focus of the government and the Attorney Generals, and the lawyers underneath them, would be to protect our rights and uphold our rights. But I cannot think of a single case that I was involved with where a government lawyer supported the rights. And they would oppose the rights, and voraciously oppose the rights, and sometimes be opposing them in unethical ways. I mean, there would be days, you'd have to go home from court, or to the hotel after court and shower because you felt unclean from what was happening in the courtroom. And, it not just my cases, it's everyone's cases. And through my career, it has become harder and harder and harder to get constitutional relief. I mean, it in some cases, now, you actually have to argue for days in court, even to get the right to argue, you know, your Charter right. You can't even just argue it and prepare for it, you have to get through some gates first. And it's become so difficult, and so expensive, that for all intents and purposes, our Charter rights are for the rich, who find themselves in a good fact pattern. Those two things. So, that's pretty tough.

11:54

And then in the area of health, it was even a little harder, because... Well, the purpose of this lecture is not to talk about how our Food and Drug Act and drug laws work. And if you're interested, I'm sure there's other videos of me on the net about that. But suffice it to say that most of us think our Food and Drug Laws and Health Canada, they're there to protect us and have good health outcomes – and it's simply not the case. So, our Food and Drug Law is set up to protect intellectual property rights. It's not obvious at first, but the effect of our law is that to treat any serious health condition – and right now there's a serious health conditions – you have to go through a process that really only chemical drugs with patent protection at the time can get through. I mean, the patent protection can end and the drug is still on the market, but anything natural or anything that doesn't have a patent just isn't there.

Sometimes I've been surprised, I had one case in Calgary where several people died when Health Canada took a treatment away, and then the company is charged criminally. And because it's a criminal file, I'm able to get a whole bunch of disclosure... so I've got Health Canada's internal emails, and I've got, you know, correspondence from other people to them, and back and forth. And I'm able to

piece together what happened. We had the situation where Health Canada was threatening to take a treatment away, and literally hundreds and hundreds and hundreds of ordinary people wrote to Health Canada – called them the whole thing – begging, saying, “look, this is the condition I have, I've taken all your approved treatments, they haven't worked, and literally, I will die if you take this treatment away.” And then there's correspondence from doctors saying the exact same thing, it's just now in the third person: “my patients, I put them on all your approved drugs, and they they're not working for this person. This is working, don't take it away, they'll die.” And then Health Canada took the treatment away, and a bunch of people died. Internally, they know this is happening and you see zero compassion, you see zero care, because all they cared about was – the law. It actually was in that trial where I kind of got woken up that they're not there for our health.

So there's this Health Canada inspector on the stand and I'm cross examining her. I'm trying to set her up for this point I want to go to and so I have a bunch of, you know, preliminary questions. I'm expecting a yes to each one. And one of them was something to the effect, well, ‘Health Canada is there to protect our health’... and she wouldn't agree! She explained that no, Health Canada's there to enforce the law. And you know, afterwards I thought about this and it's like, she right.

So, understand that this health agency, this Department of Health we call Health Canada, is part policeman, and they're there to enforce the law as it is, and the law is there to protect intellectual property rights. To make things even more interesting is most of their salaries, so most of their budget, is paid by the fees they charge the chemical pharmaceutical companies that have the intellectual property rights, for their services. And in their internal correspondence, I will often see the pharmaceutical companies referred to as “the client”. So, these are the people that have the ear of the government on this COVID crisis. But the point I was trying to make is just simply, I learned that the government really doesn't care and Health Canada doesn't care about us as individuals – whether we live or die, whether we suffer – and definitely doesn't care about our right to make personal health decisions.

16:04

And I'm passionate about each one of ours' right to make personal health decisions. The way I reasoned it out is: you're in a body, you're seeing this thing through your eyes, you're hearing my voice through your ears, you're feeling the pressure of the chair through your nerves, and you're in a body. You're having a total experience through the body. If you've got your hand on the table right now, and somebody comes and breaks your hand bones with a sledge hammer, you can describe to the rest of us how you feel, you can describe how you're going into shock and laying on

the floor now, but we can't experience it. It's yours alone. And if it happens to me, it's mine alone. And I don't have the right to tell you what you do with your broken hand, or how you avoid broken hands in the future, or how you treat anything, because you're the one experiencing it. If you're the one that has to experience pain and suffering, you should be the one to decide what to do with it or how to prevent it. And I have a real problem with the idea that some bureaucrat can make life and death decisions for you – or for me. And so, just so you appreciate where I'm coming from philosophically, that was kind of my journey.

17:20

Now, tonight I'm not wanting to take sides on COVID because people have different opinions. People have different opinions on a whole part of this, and they have different opinions on vaccination. I actually think there's some bigger issues that we're all going to agree with regardless of what side we're on, and that are more important for us to discuss – because we're only going to solve this together, and we're only going to solve the really important parts together. So, let's start talking about some philosophical issues that we need to talk about.

18:03

And one of the first ones is: how, actually, should we, as a society, address a serious health crisis? I mean, we're talking facing assault. So, let's imagine it's 10 years from now, and it took us a couple more years to get through COVID, and we did, and all the restrictions ended, and we struggled to get our economy back going. But, you know, things are kind of feeling like, let's say, 2017 – let's even take some distance away from 2019. But, you know, things are feeling pretty back to normal. Then all of a sudden Ebola escapes from the country of Congo, and it's really infectious, and it's spreading around the globe, and people are dying, and no Canadian is divided on whether or not this is a health crisis. Okay, we're facing it, and a lot of us are going to die. But the question now is, the philosophical question is: okay, we're facing a real crisis, how should we best face it to get the best health outcomes possible?

Because one approach we could take is that why don't we have open debate? Let's all agree to be respectful. But why don't we allow people to talk about different treatments, and different options, and different approaches, and share different information? I mean, obviously, there's going to be the fringe people out there, there always are. But, what about an open and respectful debate? What about actually allowing different strategies? I mean, what if Toronto took one strategy and Montreal took another strategy? Actually, wouldn't that be wise? We're facing a crisis where a whole bunch of us are going to die. One strategy might work better than others. And we might save lives if we learn that, but we can only know if we

don't take a one size fits all situation? Well, I mean, do you think that might lead to good health outcomes?

20:09

There's another approach that we could take. We could actually say, no, we're going to have the government tell us what the narrative is, and the government tell us the only solution. We're going to narrow ourselves into a single thing. In fact, it's so important that we follow that single course of action, that we need to censor other opinions. And we actually need to make sure that other people don't listen to other opinions. So, we'll have to create some very negative terms for people that don't agree with the government narrative or are taking other positions, so that we ridicule them. So, I mean, right now we have the term "anti-vaxxer". Well, I hope you appreciate that that term is deliberately negative, so that people that are accepting the government narrative – and I'm not here to criticize the government narrative, I'm just talking about the best approaches for us to take – so, if you keep hearing "anti-vaxxer", "anti-vaxxer", and that's being ridiculed, you're actually being conditioned to close your mind. It doesn't hurt a person that has a different opinion than you. But, it actually conditions you so that if somebody starts voicing an opinion that falls in with what you've been told this pejorative term relates to, that you actually will close your mind. You have to ask yourself, is that good for me to allow me to be manipulated to close my mind?

So, that's how we're choosing to face this current situation with COVID is with censorship, with ridiculing different voices, and with really only having a one size fits all. I think we need to ask ourselves – and again, this has nothing to do with whether you agree or disagree with how we're dealing with it – but are we going to get the best health outcomes in any health crisis by, basically, censorship and stilling other voices and just having a specific narrative? I mean, I think most of us are totally surprised. I can't tell the difference between the mainstream media and the government. The message is exactly the same. There's hardly any deviation. So, this is a philosophical issue that that we need to get through. Because for us to have the best outcomes here, we have to have respectful dialogue. We have to hear other opinions. We have to have an open mind. Which means we even have to be aware of labels, and how they affect how we approach people and whether it closes our minds or not.

22:48

We need to talk about: what are the ramifications of taking away fundamental rights from those who aren't acting the way we want them to act? Because that's happening right now. I mean, the government is saying the treatment approach we want you to take is you get vaccinated once, you get vaccinated twice... we know it's not long before you have to get vaccinated a third time. And if you do this, then

we will grant you some privileges. But if you don't do this for whatever reason – and I mean, it could even be a reason that those that are totally supporting this find reasonable like, you know, I just want to wait a little longer and see how this plays out, because it really is new, it's an experimental treatment, I just want more time – well, those people, they don't have the same privileges. They are now second-class citizens. I'm not even talking about those that are adamantly opposed for other reasons. They're now second-class citizens. There's no denying it. It's like the Jewish people in World War II, being removed privileges. They were second class citizens. We now have two classes of citizens in Canada, which is quite astounding. But then, philosophically, what are the ramifications of this? So, my understanding is actually the majority of Canadians support this kind of loss of privileges for people that are not doing one, and doing two, and waiting then the two weeks so that they can get their identification papers. Majority of Canadians are supporting this. And I think they're not thinking this through. You see it's easy to support without thinking. It's easy to support, “okay, you've got to get one, then you've got to get two, and then we'll give you some privileges”, when you think that's the right health decision. Right?

So, let's say somebody thinks “no, this is actually – even if the government wasn't pushing this – no, I want to get one and I want to get two, and this is what I want to do.” It's pretty easy to support this, but think through the loss of privileges. We already know we're getting at the point, we're going to need three. Well, what if it keeps going? And you need four? And you need five? Well, you know, what if at four your child had a really bad time with the fourth one? And now the government's saying you're going to need five or your kid can't go to school? I mean, you really don't have a choice here. How are you going to feel about it then? Is this one of those cases where first they came for the Jews, then they came for the gypsies, and list goes on, and then finally they came for me? The principle that the government can choose what fundamental health decisions you make – that's what's happening right now. I mean, it's not it's not law yet. It's not mandatory yet, in Canada, but some other Western democracies are making it mandatory. It very well could happen here.

And we all know, even though it's not law, that you must get vaccinated. I mean, the government's creating relentless pressure to do this. Don't tell me this is voluntary. When if you don't, you can't access services that you could before; when you're clearly a second-class citizen; and where many people are losing their jobs over this. I mean, this is compulsion.

26:33

So, we're in a situation where the government is dictating fundamental health decisions. Well, if we allow this, the government is going to continue doing this, and

it may have nothing to do with COVID next time. It could be completely different. But, what are you going to think when all of a sudden, you're not agreeing with the government? Because do you understand what you're allowing? You're allowing the government – you're saying, “It's okay”, if you're supporting this, and you're not resisting this. You're saying it's okay for the government to tell me and my children, that they must take any treatment that the government says we should take. That's what's happening. And that, my friend, is slavery.

You know, if you're a cow in the field and you got the tag in your ear, the farmer decides what treatment you're going to get. If you're a slave – and we have slaves in 2021, we've got a lot of slavery in the world, and obviously, in North America with a history of slavery – well, the slaves don't get to decide what treatments they get. The slave master decides. That's what slavery is. Slavery is control over somebody's body.

You wouldn't think of giving me control over your health decisions. You wouldn't think of letting anyone else on this call, have control over your health decisions, or the health decisions for your kids. But you're allowing the Government of Canada to dictate fundamental health decisions for you. That's slavery. And if we let that go, if we let that continue – and this again, it has nothing to do whether you agree with what the government saying. But the government isn't saying, “this is what we think is best, please decide”; the government is basically coercing us into this.

28:37

You are submitting to slavery. And you have to take a step back, take a deep breath, maybe have a nip of scotch and go “Okay, what does this mean going forward? I totally agree with this now. But what does this mean if I set this precedent”? Because we're setting a precedent. This is not something that's ever happened in Canada before. This is a Brave New World – except it's not a softer police state, as Mr. Huxley spoke of, I think it's more towards Mr. Orwell's.

29:11

You know, when I was preparing for this, it just came into my mind yesterday, and I couldn't shake it: the show Logan's Run, the movie, not the series. And for those of you who never saw it, it's an old 70s sci-fi movie, and there's a city that's basically under this dome construction and it's sealed. You're not supposed to be able to get out of the city. And as a way of managing the resources, they would basically kill everyone at age 30. So, it was a city of young people. And what they would do is they would implant a stone in your palm and when you're young, it's green, like everything's good. But as you got older, it turned red and then it would start flashing and you were supposed to turn yourself in and go through this ritual killing with the belief that you were being renewed. And for those that didn't think

getting killed at 30 was a good idea, they'd try to escape the city, and they were called runners. And that was the exciting part about the movie. And I just thought, well, how is that different than us giving the government the right to choose what health decisions we make? Because if we can say that, well, they can mandate that we have to do something, the government can also say, we can't have something. We're giving them control.

30:33

And if we're giving them control over fundamental health decisions – basically deciding what we can and can't do – do you think that that's going to lead to good health outcomes for you and your family? It very well could lead to early death for many people. I mean, I'm sorry – I work with these people and have for decades – I wouldn't trust Health Canada to be making health decisions for me. And if you do, that's great. But you have to have the right to make fundamental health decisions. And this is just going in a tremendously scary direction.

31:09

You know, when you get one of these health passports – and isn't that an Orwellian term, it's ID papers, I'm sorry, it lists dates and treatments, and then has a QR code that scanned and pings to your provincial government computer, and it pings back and says, “yeah, this is valid, that person is allowed the privilege to eat at your restaurant, or whatever it is” – have you thought about how dangerous it is for the government to be told what restaurants you're eating at and when? And this isn't going to be [only] provincial. I mean, it was in the news, probably a good month ago that all the provinces – of course all the provinces, we have no dissent on anything from any government – all the provinces, and the federal government have agreed we're going to have a national database for our vaccine passports.

And actually, some of the contracts, as I understand were pre-COVID – for the infrastructure. If you think for a second that this is going to disappear after COVID, I've got some really nice oceanfront property in Saskatchewan, it's unusual because of the palm trees, so talk to me afterwards. I think you're absolutely crazy. We're going to a social credit system.

32:32

For those of you who don't know about the Chinese social credit system: it's basically, everyone has a score. So, the government publishes – they want their citizens to know – they publish, well, these behaviors are good and if you do this list of behaviors your score goes up; and these are bad, and if you did these behaviors your score goes down. So, you might be trying to get on the subway to go to work on Tuesday morning and you're refused because on Monday evening

you posted something on social media that the government found offensive, and your [social] score's gone below what you need to have the privilege of accessing the subway. And this is today, in China – December 8, 2021 – they're in a social credit system where they're being totally tracked and controlled by a police state. And that's what our QR codes on your passport is the precursor of.

33:33

We're going into a police state. We're giving away those freedoms that we found were essential enough to fight and die for in the second world war: not having ID papers, not being segregated into different groups, not having privileges doled out for good behavior.

So, [NHPPA] published [a Discussion Paper] and I [decided], well I'll talk about: is this legal, is it not legal? What about this needing ID papers and having the government dole out privileges? So, we have restrictions for people that don't do what the government wants.

We've all been under house arrest. But thank goodness, you know, 700 or 650 days ago, we were told it was only for 15 days to flatten the curve... and off we go, you know, it was only two weeks, so who cares?

You know, restrictions on travel. If you don't have your ID papers now, you can't leave Canada even if you're going to a country that's "fine", and you can't come back. And when I say "fine", [I mean] the [other] country doesn't care whether you do or don't [travel].

34:40

So, is this legal? Well, the short answer is no. But, I'll walk you through some of our fundamental rights and freedoms that are written on a piece of toilet paper we call the Charter of Rights and Freedoms that our government is using to clean their behind with.

My favorite section: seven. Pre-COVID, it was our strongest Charter right. Section seven just reads that "everyone has the right to life, liberty, and security of the person, and the right not to be deprived thereof except in accordance with the principles of fundamental justice". And so it's life, liberty, and security of the person the courts have interpreted as, you know, being able to make fundamental health decisions. It's absolutely clear that that is being violated by these mandates.

35:33

What about Section two, 2C of our Charter, freedom of assembly. But we've all been locked down. And unless you have your ID papers, you can't assemble in

large groups with other people whether they have their papers or not. We don't have freedom of assembly at all. Although if you have your papers, you can go into large crowds, and abandon in some places.

35:58

Oh, I have to read this one. Most of the ones I have memorized, but this one doesn't come up often for me: 6.1. "Every citizen of Canada has the right to enter, remain in, and leave Canada." Whew! You haven't got your ID papers, you're not coming to Canada, and you're not leaving Canada. I wonder how long it is until you can't leave your province, even by car? Because you have to admit, it'd be somewhat exciting to have roadblocks at the provincial borders. It's something we can look forward to.

36:36

How about Section 9, "Everyone has the right not to be arbitrarily detained or in prison". I mean, I guess it's not arbitrary if you don't have COVID, and you've tested negative, but you know, you're not double-vaxxed, so you still have to go to the camp. Pretty sure that's coming.

Section 15 are equality, that everyone's equal before the law and equal benefit of the law. We've already had, you know, talk about perhaps health services being denied to those who are not willing to get their passports.

37:09

So the short answer is, this is completely illegal. It's outrageous. We haven't even talked about the Nuremberg Code or the civil law. This is absolutely outrageous. Our Supreme Law of Canada is just being treated like toilet paper. Absolutely.

And it's funny, like when it was first BC had announced, by a specific date, we're going to be requiring these passports for government employees. Then it was within a week or two Alberta came out with the same policy and you know, a forward date. My phone started ringing off the hook. I couldn't get anything done. Because a whole bunch of people are just calling and calling. And you know, you got to talk to them, and try and calm them down. Basically, the conversations I would have were, "Yeah, I mean, this is absolutely illegal. But, you're not in a situation – I'll just exempt the naturopathic doctors, I think that they have an argument that they might be able to get an injunction, but for most people – no, you're not going to be able to get an injunction. So, you're not going to be able to solve it before you're fired. And yeah, you can start a court case, and if the law is followed, years down the road, you're likely to get some financial compensation that this was illegal. But, that's not going to help you now."

38:35

And the reality is – because you're trying to help people is – like you do know this is just a tactic to force more people to get the jab. And they're just going to do other tactics. And they have. I mean, I just talked about the travel restriction where, you know, I'm sorry, it's December, and next month is January, and I think, pre-COVID, most of the country would be in Mexico. That's why the streets were deserted when it was cold. It's not that it was cold, it's just we were all down south. But we're not doing that anymore. It's just another tactic. It's just another tactic, and they will keep coming.

39:12

And I was trying to get people to think differently. It's like, this isn't a legal problem, because the government isn't acting legally. The government is acting aggressively. There's a war on your rights. There's a war on your freedom. I'm convinced that I'm not sure really what's going on. But the government is acting adversarially. The government is acting illegally. And I don't think the Queen's Courts are going to solve this. I don't think they are.

Some things are helpful because learning the truth allows you to decide who you are going to be in relation to the new truth. Because if you believe one thing, you're going to act as if that's true. But when your mind has changed, you change.

I thought we had rights in this country. I thought we had the rule of law. I thought that – well, it's been a while, I was going to say I thought the government respected rights but no, I thought we've been in a soft police state for a long time and that there were two sets of laws. But I think it's clear now that the government's against our rights. I think we can all agree with that. And I think it's clear that the government is against open discourse on issues like COVID. And I think it's clear that, that we're in a police state.

40:37

So what do we do? How do we adjust to this?

The first thing we need is we need dialogue, like we're having now. And we need to realize that we need to be stopped. We can't be divided. Who cares? Really, who cares how you feel on COVID? And who cares if you have a passport or you don't have a passport? You know, I'm living in Alberta right now and one thing that just really caught me was: one day we're all in shops without masks on, we're all together, there is no division between people that have gotten the two and people that only have one or none, no division at all. And even this meme of "different", that wasn't there. And then bang, it's just like a switch goes off. We're back on masks, and then all of a sudden we have subgroups – and we're actually getting

real hatred between the two groups so quickly. I'm just shocked. I'm shocked, like, how can we be brothers and sisters on Monday and be in opposite groups are potentially going to harm each other on Friday? And we're all wearing masks again, which makes us all afraid and nervous. Like how, how the heck do we do this?

42:06

So, we've got to stop supporting this. I'm speaking now more to people who have their passports because – but I'm speaking to all of us – our actions are allowing this.

I've heard of some businesses the person, the business owner, just said, when the passport requirement came in, "I'm not doing this. I'm not like an SS Nazi soldier requiring papers from my clients and asking them to disclose health information that is actually illegal for me to ask for."

And they got snitched on. They got snitched on! People phoned the health departments and then the health inspectors know who to target and fine, and fine, and fine. And if it's a restaurant, get the health guys in there – you find some health violation if you look long enough. Just harass to either close down or relent. Let's say we have 100 businesses, and five have stood up, and the other 95 haven't. Well those five get snitched on and the health authorities shut them down or forced them to comply, and now we have full compliance. Why didn't we have 100% of the businesses say no? Because if they all said no, then the government has no power. The government only has power because we're giving them power by doing what they're telling us to do.

43:52

We've already seen in two provinces, they had to back down on firing doctors and nurses because enough stood up. If it wasn't enough, it wouldn't have worked. But enough stood up. So, if you have a passport – and again, I don't care, I don't care where anyone stands on here – but if you go to that restaurant, you're telling the business it's okay that you cave, and now I'm caving, and please scan my QR code so the government database knows that I'm here as it starts to compile my social credit score for the future. If none of us went to restaurants who have passports, the restaurants would stop asking for passports. Do you understand that our actions here are making a difference? And it's hard.

Same with wearing masks. If none of us would wear masks, it would collapse now. I don't even care if you support masks. I don't care if you believe they make a huge difference. That doesn't matter – whether you believe or don't believe. Surely, there are very few people that believe it makes such a significant difference, that

the risk justifies us looking like muzzled animals and scaring each other. It's an act of compliance. And you need to be aware that your actions are why this is working.

Stop using media platforms that censor. Facebook, Twitter, and the like – they censor. I find it funny when you have some experts that the mainstream media has been happy to quote for years, and all of a sudden – they're actually just quoting a study that's come out in a peer-reviewed blue chip journal, and they're just saying, “no, it says this and this”, but that could question the narrative – and all sudden, they're censored, of all people. It's just outrageous. Get off Facebook. Get your social network to move to some other platform. You are giving them the power to control the message by being there.

46:25

Right now, it is almost 100% guaranteed your kids are going to be slaves, and that your grandkids won't even understand the idea – because the education system would teach them that that it's a weird idea that you could make your own personal health decisions, which is actually terribly irresponsible, because we're all social creatures and it's the greater social good that matters – they won't even understand that we would view that as slavery. And right now, you're almost 100% guaranteed to end there if you keep up with your behavior.

We need civil disobedience. We need it. How can there be a social contract when the government is throwing away our fundamental rights and freedoms and acting criminally? We need disobedience.

47:10

I want to read to you a quote from Frederick Douglass. For those of you who don't know who Frederick Douglass is: he was a slave in in the US and eventually got his freedom. He became an author, and he wrote about his experiences – and he had much to say about power.

What I'm going to read to you is true. This is fundamentally true.

And so, Frederick Douglass wrote, “Power concedes nothing without a demand.” “Power concedes nothing without a demand.” So the government will take from you, and will give nothing back unless you demand it back. Our rights have been taken. They are not coming back unless you demand them back.

“Power concedes nothing without a demand. It never did. And it never will. Find out just what any people will quietly submit to, and you have found out the exact measure of injustice and wrong that will be imposed on them.” Find out exactly how far they can push us, and that's exactly how far they'll push us. They won't push us any less. They will push us until we refuse to be pushed anymore. And we've been

pushed into being confined in our homes like criminals on house arrest. Many are being denied rights and privileges that others have. And we are being coerced into giving up our fundamental right to make our own health decisions and decisions for our kids.

49:03

So, what I think we need to do going forward...

Now, I'll end soon, I'm obviously getting too excited. I should let the rest of you get involved, but I can't believe what's happened.

We're not separate. There aren't there aren't two camps. We are Canadians. We are brothers, and we are sisters. And if our children are going to – we're not free – if our children are going to be free, and our grandchildren are going to be free; it is only because you and I are going to demand of power that they be free, and that you and I are willing to pay the price for their freedom. Ours was paid for long ago. We got it for free, and we gave it away for free. The question is: are we going to purchase it back for the next generation?

I'll let us now go into questions and answers. Thank you so much for joining us.