



NATIONAL CITIZENS INQUIRY

Winnipeg, MB

Day 2

April 14, 2023

EVIDENCE

Witness 5: Brian Giesbrecht

Full Day 2 Timestamp: 05:40:30–06:25:55

Source URL: <https://rumble.com/v2i6qmk-national-citizens-inquiry-winnipeg-day-2.html>

[00:00:00]

Shawn Buckley

Day two. Our next witness is joining us virtually. Brian Giesbrecht. Brian, can you hear me?

Brian Giesbrecht

Yes, I can hear.

Shawn Buckley

Okay, and we can hear you. I'll ask if you could state your full name, spelling your first and last name for the record.

Brian Giesbrecht

Brian Giesbrecht, B-R-I-A-N, Giesbrecht, G-I-E-S-B-R-E-C-H-T.

Shawn Buckley

And Brian, do you promise to tell the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you God?

Brian Giesbrecht

I do.

Shawn Buckley

Now, my understanding is that you were a provincial court judge in Manitoba for thirty-one years.

Brian Giesbrecht

That's right.

Shawn Buckley

And for 15 of those years, you were the Associate Chief Judge of the Provincial Court in Manitoba.

Brian Giesbrecht

Yes.

Shawn Buckley

And for eight months in 1993, you were actually the Acting Chief Judge.

Brian Giesbrecht

Yes.

Shawn Buckley

You are retired now, and you've been retired for approximately 15 years, but since retiring you have been writing extensively on free speech and Indigenous issues.

Brian Giesbrecht

Yes.

Shawn Buckley

And prior to COVID, you had regular columns in a few newspapers.

Brian Giesbrecht

Yes, I wrote for various publications.

Shawn Buckley

So can you tell us when COVID hit, what happened with your writing?

Brian Giesbrecht

Well, I'm associated with the Frontier Centre for Public Policy and my colleagues and I, fairly early on, began to look particularly at what was happening in Sweden. The approach that they were taking in Sweden seemed to simply make a lot of sense to us. And really what it was, was the traditional pandemic policy that the provinces had followed, in fact, all of the Western world had followed for many decades. So I began writing most of the articles on that. But I began writing articles such as, one was titled "Sweden Is Doing It Right, We're Doing It Wrong," that sort of thing.

And then I teamed up with an emergency planning expert by the name of David Redman; he's known to, I think, a lot of people here. He's done very extensive work in this field and

he's a retired Lieutenant Colonel with the Armed Forces, very experienced in emergency planning. And he had been trying to make some headway in his own province of Alberta, trying to speak to the senior people and basically talking about the emergency plans that had always worked in the past that they'd always used. The lockdown plan is practically the opposite of the normal plan.

So we wrote some articles together and basically what I expected was that there should be some reasonable discussion about which parts of Sweden's approach worked and which didn't. In other words, there would be an objective determination about this. And that's, in fact, what the Swedish architect of the plan, Anders Tegnell, originally said. He said, "Look, this is a good opportunity for everybody because Sweden would be basically like a test tube experiment. We could compare results and we can adjust and say, 'Okay, what's working in Sweden, what is not, and we can transfer that to the other country.'" That didn't happen.

I was very surprised that the reaction was almost uniformly hostile. We had mainstream newspapers, even internationally— *The New York Times* wrote a scathing account about Sweden and how people were just dying like flies. It wasn't true. It's not true. As a matter of fact, Sweden has done at least as well and probably better than most of its European counterparts just by taking its very hands-off approach during the lockdown. They did not close schools. They did not shut down businesses.

Shawn Buckley

And Brian, I'm just going to focus you onto what happened with your writing, as I have to keep witnesses focused today, and so I'm just really curious about what happened to your writing and have you contrast that with, you know, pre-COVID.

Brian Giesbrecht

I get that, Shawn.

[00:05:00]

My point there is that the reaction was hostile. The idea that anybody could take a different view on any lockdown subject seemed to be absolutely discouraged. The mainstream newspapers were particularly harsh on anyone who didn't sort of conform. So that was my experience.

I was writing articles throughout the pandemic and David Redman was making presentations to many people. But people were very divided because there were certainly people interested in what the non-lockdown people were saying, but half of the population at least, seemed to be hostile to any suggestion that things could be done a different way. That was my point there.

Shawn Buckley

Okay, I want to switch gears and actually talk about your experience as a judge because being a judge for a full 31 years itself is quite exceptional. And some of us, we walk into a courtroom and the judge is up there in their robes and it's almost like they're in a different world. And I think the average person does not appreciate that judges are part of our community and that they're also influenced by what the political or social trend is at the time. And I'm wondering if you can speak about that and maybe give us some examples, as

when you were a judge, how you felt pressure on you to go certain ways depending on what was happening in the community at the time.

Brian Giesbrecht

Yeah, I can think back to one time, and this was during the 1980s, when what were called the satanic ritual abuse cases were being heard. And there were a couple of sensational cases where children had been coached, I guess, to come up with these stories about satanic sexual abuse, et cetera. There were actually people who spent years in jail as a result of false claims.

In any event, the pressure on people, not just judges but police officers, social workers, et cetera at the time, was to believe all children. In other words, every claim a child made, no matter how preposterous, must be accepted. Now, of course, that's not reasonable. Children don't always tell the truth, neither do adults, but there was a great deal of pressure at the time. But I don't think that that was anything compared to the pressure judges must have been under when this pandemic struck and I'm here as an armchair quarterback. I will be critical of what the Canadian courts did or didn't do. But I am speaking as a private citizen here.

Shawn Buckley

Can I just back you up because I really do want people to understand that judges do feel pressure about what's going on. So you were talking about this time where there was kind of this hysteria about satanic child abuse and pressure on the authorities. Was there pressure on you as a judge to, basically, kind of believe children when they were witnesses in court because of that social pressure?

Brian Giesbrecht

Yes, exactly, and that was just an example that I can think of. But I don't think it was nearly as strong an influence as what it must have been like to be a judge, or really people in any position of authority, when the pandemic struck. Because, of course, people were taken by surprise and everything was new to people, and in most cases, people had not really undergone anything similar before.

Shawn Buckley

And I'm just going to take you back there—

Brian Giesbrecht

So before I criticize, I want to recognize this fact.

Shawn Buckley

So I just want to take you back there because again, I want to make sure that people understand that point. We were talking on an earlier occasion and you expressed to me that you felt similar pressure when spousal abuse became a big issue, and arguably, in the court system, could be described as a political issue. And I'm wondering if you can describe that period and also whether, as a judge, you felt pressure then to basically find that certain witnesses were credible versus other witnesses.

Brian Giesbrecht

Yes, I think so. At one point, again, fairly early on, spousal abuse began to receive a great deal of attention, and it deserved it

[00:10:00]

because for many years the abuse of a spouse was considered no big deal. Well, the law took a turn; it got a lot of attention, as it should have. But then, as the pendulum very often swings too far, there was definitely pressure on people, on judges, to say, “believe all women,” which is just as silly as the idea that you believe all children. All human beings of every gender and age and ethnic group, et cetera, either tell the truth or don’t tell the truth or think they’re telling the truth when they’re not. So there was a great deal of pressure during that time, and judges were very often under pretty strong criticism if the account of an abused woman was not accepted. So that is another example I would offer of something similar, yes.

Shawn Buckley

And then you were sharing with us already that in your estimation the pressure on judges to basically follow the COVID narrative, and appreciating you’re now an armchair judge, but you’re giving us the impression that you felt that that would have been quite enormous pressure on judges.

Brian Giesbrecht

I think so. I think so. The pandemic was a shocking event for everybody. So I expect that judges were just as affected as everybody else. They had to live through things as well. They had to completely adjust their work routines, et cetera. And I think they probably generally were all from the demographic, say middle-aged, upper-middle-income people who were more likely to be within the group of people who perhaps were most concerned or even afraid of the virus. I think statistically that’s true and that the younger people were less afraid and the older people, particularly in the upper income groups, were much more conscious than the other people.

Shawn Buckley

Now, can I ask you, because as a former judge you would be interested in what the courts were doing with COVID— Can you share with us your thoughts on how the courts handled COVID, just even to focus you more concerning perhaps defending the rights that we had under both common law and under our *Charter of Rights and Freedoms*?

Brian Giesbrecht

Well, like many people, I think I’d say I was surprised and quite disappointed with the response of the courts when people did make challenges to the lockdown rules, particularly the most overreaching of the rules. I think, generally, that the citizen expects the judge to stand between him and government overreach. And I have to say that in Canada, I don’t think generally that did happen.

And again, it’s easy for me to criticize because I’m sure it’s very tough hearing these cases, but the response seemed to be, generally, that well, if the government and their health people make some sort of rule, policy rule, then who are we as judges to question that? And

so often, they simply, almost always, they just deferred to the health authorities. And I think that was wrong.

I was comparing this to the decisions that were coming out of the United States. Now I would expect, in something like this, most of the decisions would uphold the government regulations. That only makes sense. But there, they did have a lively and vigorous testing of the rules, and I think that was very necessary and helpful.

I'll just give one example if I can, or maybe two. That judge that struck down the mandate requirement for masks on airplanes in the United States— Well, the government was going to appeal,

[00:15:00]

but they never did. I think the judge actually got the government off the hook on that one because the mask mandate on planes at that time made no sense and did not cause any problems when it was removed. But the fact is that Americans, for many months, were travelling on airplanes while Canadians still had to wear masks on the planes. And for some people that causes real problems, especially on a long flight.

Vaccine mandates were the other example where American courts had struck down several of the most egregious vaccine mandates months and months before these things were finally put to rest in Canada. And those vaccine mandates caused, especially for people who say had previously been infected and didn't need the vaccine in the first place or whatever, they caused tremendous hardship. People lost their jobs while all of this was going on. Well, I do think that if people had the sense that they could go to court and get a fair hearing and have a chance to have the most egregious government policies removed, they would have done so. But I think the feeling was, at least my impression is, that people felt that there really was no purpose in taking something to court here because nothing would happen.

Shawn Buckley

Sorry to break in, but can I ask you to give us a couple of examples, perhaps from Manitoba, of cases that would have given people in Manitoba the feeling that there was really no point in going to court?

Brian Giesbrecht

Well, I was following the church cases and we had, in Manitoba as you know, some situations, for instance, where the Southern Manitoba churches were even going to the extent of holding church services outdoors or sitting in cars and yet the police were still called. Or even the funerals where people were not able to say goodbye to dying relatives. Well, I think that was government overreach. I don't think that even in Wuhan China the government went that far.

Shawn Buckley

Brian, I'm just going to have to stop you and ask if you can turn off your video because your audio is breaking up, and so I think we need the bandwidth so at least we have your video. We just must have a bad internet connection.

Brian Giesbrecht

I'm sorry. Okay.

Shawn Buckley

Yeah. No. Sorry about that, but it's important that we hear what you say. So you're talking about the lockdown case. Can you tell us what happened in that case and why that might have caused Manitobans to think that the court was not going to stand between the state and themselves?

Brian Giesbrecht

Well, just generally, and I'm not putting myself forward as an expert on any of these cases. But I think, just generally, the people who did bring the case to court thought that they had a very legitimate point and basically being able to attend church, especially if it's done outdoors sitting in your car, that would be reasonable. I think that there are many other examples of overreach by the government. For instance, my personal example is going out for a hike in a park and finding that the outdoor hiking trails were closed.

Shawn Buckley

Brian, I just want to focus you because I'm trying to get you to a place we talked about in an interview. So you were telling me about Justice Joyal in the Manitoba lockdown case and about him privileging the Government's position, and so can you please share that with us?

And then I wanted to take you to that Ontario Court of Appeal case and your thoughts on the judicial system generally.

Brian Giesbrecht

Okay. And I don't want to be critical of Justice Joyal. He's an excellent judge. He's a very excellent judge. But just generally, I think that some of the bylaws, some of the rules that were made in Manitoba were particularly unreasonable. And I think that I'll just say this, that citizens should have the expectation that they could go to court and have a reasonable chance of having the judges, and I'm not critical of any particular judge here,

[00:20:00]

have judges look at that and not simply tell them, "Well, whatever the public health authorities decide is good enough for me." So I think I'll leave the Manitoba one at that. I'm certainly happy to discuss that Ontario case, by all means.

Shawn Buckley

Sure, if you can. So before we leave the Manitoba lockdown case, would I be fair in summarizing that it's the fact that there was deference given to the provincial public health authorities and basically accepting that as true without actually testing it, that was the concern?

Brian Giesbrecht

Yes, I think that's right. I would just say that generally, being too quick to simply accept the decision of the public health officials is not something that the judges should do. And I think

that judges probably are having a lot of discussion about the role they played or didn't play during the pandemic. And I just point out once again: it's easy for me to criticize, I didn't have to do it.

Shawn Buckley

Right. Now, so the Ontario Court of Appeal decision we're referring to as *JN v. CG*. Do you want to share your thoughts on that and then your thoughts on what the ramifications are for the court if this continues?

Brian Giesbrecht

Yeah, as I recall, in that particular case, a mother who had custody of children did not want to have the two children she had custody of vaccinated, and she had definitely done her homework. She was obviously a very capable person and the separated father went to court and wanted to have the children vaccinated. Now, I read the decision of the motions judge and I was totally impressed. I thought that judge really took a lot of time to objectively review the evidence, and the judge came to the decision that the woman, as she had custody after all, should have the right to decide whether those children were vaccinated or not.

But when it was taken up to the Court of Appeal, and not to be too smug here or too quick to judge, but I think that the Court of Appeal basically just said, "Whatever the provincial authorities decide, that should stand." So I would be critical, if I'm right about that, that they gave too much deference to the provincial health authorities. And just because it was under the name of health or emergency, they didn't properly look into the findings that the motions judge made and the evidence that the wife in that case presented. I would be critical of how they decided that case.

Shawn Buckley

Well, you had said something profound to me when we had a conversation. You had said to me if the Ontario Court of Appeal is saying that you can take what the government says at face value, then you don't need courts. And I'm wondering if you, first of all, remember saying that, and if you do, if you can comment on what you mean.

Brian Giesbrecht

Yes, if the court is simply going to accept any decision that is made by a government official, then what is the purpose of the court? The citizen needs the court to stand between himself and the government and relies on the court to protect civil liberties. And if the court is really not doing that, then I do ask that question, "What is the purpose of the court?" And I think on an even larger scale, I think all of us are going to have to ask: Is Canada still the country we thought it was before the pandemic? In other words, our individual liberties, are they valuable? Or have we somehow decided to give them up whenever a virus comes to call?

[00:25:00]

So I think there are some pretty big questions that we all have to ask ourselves. And I do believe that the legal profession and judges are probably asking themselves these questions right now. And they're pretty big questions.

Shawn Buckley

Brian, I know that the social media team at the NCI is going to be very upset with me if I don't ask you to turn your video on, and then I ask you that question again. Because your answer, I think, is of tremendous importance. And I think people should see you when you say it.

So I brought back to you that in an earlier conversation you had shared with me that if the Ontario Court of Appeal—and I think we could say courts generally—are saying that you can take what the government says at face value, then you don't need the courts. And so if, once again, with your video on, can you comment on what you meant by that and what the ramifications for us as a nation are?

Brian Giesbrecht

I wasn't trying to be disrespectful. But I am suggesting that now that this pandemic episode has passed, everybody has to ask themselves some pretty big questions.

I think judges have to ask themselves whether or not they did play the proper role during the pandemic in protecting people's rights. And the country as a whole has to ask itself the question: Are civil liberties and individual rights important to us any longer? Or are we, after this pandemic episode, wanting to live in a different country where we don't have to exercise individual rights, where we rely upon the government to do everything for us?

So I think these are very big questions, and I've been pondering this for some time because it seems to me that Canada is not the country—right now, as we're emerging from this pandemic—is not the country I think it was before the pandemic started. So I do expect that many people, media people too, and our politicians, are going to have to ask themselves some very, very serious questions about the role they've played during this pandemic. And I live in Manitoba, and Manitoba was, I think in many cases, particularly draconian in some of the rules of law, it must be said. And I refer to the cases where people couldn't even attend their funerals for dying family members, et cetera, or even go to church.

Shawn Buckley

Brian, we have to keep the witnesses a little tight today, and I want to give the commissioners an opportunity to ask you any questions if they have any. And there are questions.

Commissioner Kaikkonen

Thank you for your testimony. Have you ever noticed a time when the world came together as it has in the past three years in one mind—all levels of government, the judiciary, the administrators at school board levels, for example—where everybody seemed to be of one mind except for the people, excepting the people who were arguing that our civil liberties were being deprived?

Brian Giesbrecht

No, this was new to me and it was, to be quite honest, a very frightening experience. And I don't know how to explain it, but it does seem that there was some sort of—I don't know if the various leaders all made this at the same time or how it came about. But I have never experienced such a thing and I do not believe it was a healthy experience.

Commissioner Kaikkonen

And my second question is on social media. Somewhere in the middle of the pandemic, there was a photo circulating on social media that had the Supreme Court judges saying they were all vaxxed in unity. And the message to the people was that the judges were vaxxed, why aren't we? So I just wondered— It seemed to me that there was a lot of posturing in that photo circulating, and I'm going to admit that I don't know the authenticity of that photo. But what are your thoughts on the separation of powers? Because we've always had the legislature on one side and the judiciary on the other.

[00:30:00]

And what was that picture circulating around social media doing in terms of promoting the government narrative as opposed to that perceived independence of the judiciary?

Brian Giesbrecht

Well, just generally, I believe from the start that vaccination should be a personal decision. Without going into the vaccine too much, because I'm not a medical doctor or a scientist, but I mean, it was known from the beginning that people who chose to be vaccinated would still be infected and could still spread the disease just like unvaccinated people. So there was never a reason in the first place to somehow demonize unvaccinated people, people who chose for whatever reason they cared not to be vaccinated. And I think the campaign, which was more than just a health campaign, became something quite unhealthy when people were pushed and more than pushed into choosing vaccination. And here in this province, Manitoba, we saw what was almost a demonization of people who were called anti-vaxxers. And this was particularly targeted. It was quite ugly against the people of southern Manitoba and even our main newspapers seemed to—

Shawn Buckley

Brian, can I just—

Brian Giesbrecht

I have to say, the politicians sort of took aim at these people.

Shawn Buckley

David, can I have the mic for a second?

So, Brian, sorry, but I think the Commissioner was asking you really about whether it was appropriate for the Supreme Court of Canada to pose saying that they were vaccinated because then they're basically participating in politics. And traditionally, we've had a separation between the legislative branch of government and the courts that are supposed to be apart. And so, I think the Commissioner was asking you to comment on what seems to be the courts engaging in a political message in support—

Brian Giesbrecht

Yes, and I apologize for not being clear, but I'm agreeing. I'm saying that this campaign, which even included the judges in this vaccination claim, this is not something that should have been done, and it contributes to division. It did not contribute to anything healthy. So I'm agreeing with this person; I'm sorry to make it too long of an answer.

Commissioner Kaikkonen

And I just have one more question. When you think of, and you alluded to this, the newspapers being bought off and independent reporters being dismissed as professors of false information— How do ordinary people influence the judiciary, apart from going to court and having legal precedent set that will go against the populace in the future? How do they influence judges to say that there is a different side to the narrative?

Brian Giesbrecht

Yeah, I don't think that there is any very simple answer. If the courts aren't available to people and if politicians are not willing to listen to the point of view of someone who does not accept the prevailing narrative, then there are very few options. And I think that's what we see. What we've seen, I think, is we've seen basically half the country feeling that they've been not listened to and not treated very well and the other half wanting, at times, even more restrictions.

I'm sorry I don't have a real answer there, but what I'm saying is that it's just a plea for people to try to be more objective and not get caught up in some type of groupthink-type of thing, which I think happened during this pandemic, particularly once we got into the idea that everybody had to be vaccinated. I think that's when things really went off the rails.

Commissioner Kaikkonen

I want to say thank you.

Commissioner DiGregorio

Thank you, Justice Giesbrecht,

[00:35:00]

for giving us your testimony today. We had a witness in Toronto, Mr. Pardy, who talked to us a little bit about— Well, he covered a few things: one being the deference being given by the legislature to the administrative state; paired with the deference that courts have been giving to the administrative state, which I think you've touched on today; and paired with maybe some weaknesses within our Charter that we weren't expecting, having led to the results of where we are today. And when I questioned him on how to address these particular positions, he seemed to think that addressing the legislative deference to the administrative state and even possibly, although not realistically, amending the Charter was a good way of approaching it.

I'm wondering if you have any recommendations on how the courts could look at addressing the significant amount of deference that has arisen.

Brian Giesbrecht

Well, I don't know that I have any recommendations. I'm just suggesting that the judges, in their discussions, should be thinking a great deal about the role that they did play or didn't play during the pandemic: Do they feel that they properly protected civil liberties? Or do they feel that perhaps they gave too much deference to provincial policies, even ones that were quite extreme?

So I'm not sure if I have any suggestions as far as different laws or anything like that is concerned because I don't think that's what is required. I think there needs to be a little more attention given to the individual rights of Canadians. And I really hope, as a Canadian, I hope that we haven't entered a time when we're going to lay down our carefully acquired civil liberties whenever there is any type of a health threat. That's my personal hope.

Commissioner DiGregorio

So you're suggesting really a self-reflection exercise by the courts and the judges?

Brian Giesbrecht

Yes, I am.

Commissioner DiGregorio

Thank you.

Commissioner Drysdale

Good afternoon. I have a couple of questions on some specific things that I believe you said. And the first one is, you were talking about, in a number of instances, how judges feel pressure. You are part of the community; you feel pressure. What do you mean by the judges feel pressure? Maybe that's a silly question, but I want to know. You mean pressure to be fired from their jobs? Do you mean pressure to be ridiculed and oppressed? What were you talking about when you said judges feel pressure, sir?

Brian Giesbrecht

Well, judges are sort of under the public eye every minute of the day. It actually is a very high-pressure job because the judge is absolutely aware that everything he does and says is being very carefully scrutinized. So I think it's fair to say that a judge might feel even more pressure than somebody in a less high-profile type of job. So that's what I meant by judges feeling pressure.

Commissioner Drysdale

I'm actually asking more specifically and I'll let you know why I'm asking.

We had testimony earlier today by a gentleman by the name of Rick Wall. He and his wife own a trucking firm that employs 40 people in Winkler, I believe he said. Now, he, at least in his opinion, recognized that there was something going wrong in this country, and he and his wife sat down and they literally discussed losing everything. But on the principle of what they knew was right, they proceeded with the risk of losing everything, not just for themselves, but for their 40 employees and their families.

So my question is, I can't imagine a pressure stronger than that, sir. And I'm wondering, if I understand what you were saying, you were talking about political pressure on a judge and I'm talking about real pressure. I'm talking about losing everything you own and still doing what you think is right. Can you comment on it from that perspective, sir?

Brian Giesbrecht

Well, I take your point,

[00:40:00]

and I'm certainly not suggesting that the pressure any individual judge would feel when hearing a case involving pandemic restrictions would be anything like that or anything as serious as the knowledge that you're going to lose your life, et cetera. So, no, I wasn't meaning to compare it to any particular person; I'm simply trying to explain why it may be that Canadian judges generally did not play nearly as active a part as their American counterparts did. There was no vigorous testing of the restrictions, et cetera. So I'm not meaning to suggest that the person you're describing was not under much more pressure than any particular judge deciding a case.

Commissioner Drysdale

Would you agree with me that certain vocations within our society are granted certain privileges, and along with those privileges comes special responsibility? And I point out a police officer. A police officer carries a gun, has the ability to take away your freedoms, at least temporarily, so in my mind there's a significant additional responsibility that we have on those people.

Do judges fall in that category of special privileges, special responsibilities, more than the average person like myself for instance?

Brian Giesbrecht

Yeah, I would agree generally that the more power one has, the greater one's responsibility is, if that's what you mean. Yes, I do accept that.

Commissioner Drysdale

One last thing I wanted to ask you about is— I believe you also said in your testimony that people thought there was no point to go to court. And I bring that up because— And I honestly don't recall who told me this, it may have been a judge, that apart from the obvious functions of a court, the court also acts as a pressure relief valve to society. In other words, things are going wrong in society and people feel that they can go to the courts and get relief.

And if the country of Canada and the society that we live in was being affected to its very fibre—and that's what has been testified here today by other witnesses—if our very fabric of our society was under pressure and they could not go to the courts to relieve that pressure or get some kind of remedy, would you say that was dangerous for the safety of our society when they have no way to get justice, no way to get protection from the administration?

Brian Giesbrecht

Yes, I would agree with that. I'd also add that the other function of the court there is to act as a break on some of the excesses of the legislature. And if the lawmakers had the knowledge that a judge would strike down an unnecessary restriction, the legislators probably wouldn't have put in nearly as many restrictions as they did. If I can just give a

personal example: I think I mentioned going for a hike in a public park and finding that all of the trails had been closed, which makes no sense to anyone.

And again, I don't want to be touting the American system, but I think the American legislators were more aware of the fact that if they made ridiculous restrictions, they would not be allowed by a court. And unfortunately, in Canada, I don't think that they felt any pressure from the courts at all. And consequently, some of their—and I would say that the vaccine mandate for flying and taking a train in Canada was an example of a ridiculous requirement that served no purpose and hurt many people—but I think if the legislators knew that such unreasonable restrictions would be struck down, they would not have put them in place in the first place.

Commissioner Drysdale

Thank you. Thank you for your service to your country.

Shawn Buckley

Thank you and there are no further questions. So Justice Giesbrecht, we thank you so much on behalf of the National Citizens Inquiry for giving your important testimony today.

Brian Giesbrecht

Okay, well, I'd like to say you're doing a very useful job, and I wish you the best.

[00:45:25]

Final Review and Approval: Margaret Phillips, August 10, 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/>