INDEPENDENT RESEARCH / PROJECT EXPLAINER

The Evidence Deck

Four working card decks, standards of proof, and the case for an independent inquiry

RCMP / CBSA / Health Canada / VCH / VPD

Prepared for **Great Scott (Scott Gilbert)**
Independent researcher
20 September 2026

A sourced explanation of the project, its testable hypotheses, and the evidence needed for accountability, including private prosecution where legally justified.

Reader guide

The main report contains approximately 7,500 words before the source notes. The four deck names are a proposed working structure, pending verification against the existing project files.

Purpose and status

This report describes the Evidence Deck project, the questions its completed research should answer, and a disciplined route from contested drug-enforcement claims to institutional accountability. Its central subjects are the Royal Canadian Mounted Police (RCMP), Canada Border Services Agency (CBSA), Health Canada, Vancouver Coastal Health (VCH), and, where particular evidence establishes a connection, the Vancouver Police Department (VPD). It addresses Great Scott's hypothesis that some drug-enforcement events or their public presentation may be staged, materially exaggerated, or knowingly misrepresented.

The report preserves that hypothesis as a serious question to investigate. It does not announce that staging, a criminal conspiracy, or grounds to prosecute a particular person have already been established. The materials examined for this report support specific questions about quantities, terminology, attribution, and verification. They do not establish a coordinated criminal scheme by these institutions.

The saved master database, existing card files, underlying laboratory exhibits, and earlier full investigative reports were not accessible for this edition. Project history available in the conversation informs the description, while the public sources listed at the end support the factual and legal discussion. Accordingly, this is an explanatory report and investigation design, not a fresh audit of the complete Evidence Deck. It certifies no current database count, completed batch, or verified checkpoint.

The four deck names below are a working organization proposed for this report. Their names, allocation, and card counts have not been checked against the existing project's authoritative files. References to completed decks describe the intended finished product. Illustrative cards are examples, not claims that corresponding records have already passed validation.

1. The central public-interest question

The Evidence Deck begins with a straightforward demand: when public authorities describe drugs, seizures, laboratories, trafficking organizations, or the effects of an intervention, the underlying evidence should support the words and numbers they use. A dramatic announcement should be traceable to an identifiable event, actual exhibits, a measurement method, and a defensible interpretation. Where the claim concerns criminal conduct, its connection to admissible evidence must also be examined.

Great Scott's concern is that this chain may repeatedly break. A shipment allegation may become a seizure statistic. A street mixture may become a quantity of pure fentanyl in the public imagination. Chemical inputs may become finished production. A theoretical exposure calculation may become a count of lives saved. An agency's participation in an international operation may become a claim to principal credit. These are different transformations, and each needs its own evidentiary test.

The stronger version of this inquiry does not ask readers to choose between blind confidence in institutions and unconditional acceptance of a critic. It asks what happened, how it was measured, who knew what, which statements were justified at the time, and whether later information was disclosed or corrected. Official statements are useful evidence of an institution's public position. Their official status alone does not establish the truth of the underlying event.

The same discipline must apply to criticism. An inconsistency can be real without proving that an event was invented. Missing public records can expose an accountability problem without establishing that no records exist. Market effects can provide an independent check without functioning as a lie detector. The deck's value lies in keeping these distinctions visible while pushing for the records needed to resolve them.

Success would mean that a reader can move from a simple card to its complete source file, see the strongest supporting and opposing evidence, understand what remains unknown, and identify the next decisive test. That reader might be a journalist, defence lawyer, researcher, public official, affected person, or judge. The final answer may differ between incidents: one claim may be verified, another overstated, another unresolved, and another sufficiently supported for a criminal referral.

2. What the Evidence Deck actually is

The Evidence Deck is best understood as a structured evidence system with an accessible card-based presentation. The database holds the detail; the cards explain individual propositions. A card is not a verdict and should not replace the underlying record. It is a compact guide to a question, the evidence relevant to it, the limits of that evidence, and the action that would most improve the answer.

Each incident needs a stable identifier that survives changes to its title or interpretation. The system should separately identify the operation, individual seizures within it, laboratory exhibits, court files, media articles, and later institutional statements. Otherwise, one operation reported repeatedly can become several supposedly independent events. Conversely, several distinct seizures may be incorrectly compressed into one total without a record of what was included.

Every numerical claim needs its original wording, unit, date, scope, and source. Gross shipment weight, net powder weight, chemical content, tablets counted, estimated production, and alleged lifetime throughput belong in different fields. Converting pounds to kilograms can be legitimate; silently converting a trafficking allegation into a physical seizure cannot. Where two sources disagree, the deck should preserve both and record the eventual explanation, if one is obtained.

Source provenance is equally important. Ten articles copied from the same police release are ten publications but usually only one originating account. A journalist's own observation, an analyst's certificate, a contemporaneous invoice, a court finding, and an anonymous claim have different strengths and limitations. The deck should identify which assertion each source supports rather than granting an entire document a blanket reliability score.

The conversation history describes a research workflow involving Canadian and American incident collections, historical seizure research, legal and laboratory follow-up, duplicate adjudication, and recoverable checkpoints. Those are useful foundations. This edition does not claim to have reopened or validated those collections. The historical Saint John weight discrepancy and the uncertain February 1996 Vancouver-context ship identification remain examples of issues that require the actual source records before publication as findings.

An auditable system also preserves changes. A later correction should not erase the earlier claim. Original files, retrieval dates, page references, and version histories allow someone else to reconstruct the research. Cryptographic hashes can show that a saved file has not changed since capture; they do not prove that its contents were true. Similarly, a successful database integrity check establishes structural consistency, not factual accuracy.

Each card should carry a status such as confirmed within stated limits, partly supported, contradicted, unresolved, or withdrawn. It should explain that status in words. A single confidence percentage would conceal too much: a public statement can be unquestionably authentic while its drug quantity remains unverified. The system needs separate judgments about authenticity, factual support, causal interpretation, and legal relevance.

Finally, the deck should maintain a record of adverse evidence. A corrected weight, a laboratory result supporting police, or a court finding rejecting an allegation belongs beside the original concern. Researchers should be able to see what changed the assessment. A project built for accountability must be capable of correcting its own mistakes promptly and visibly.

3. The four working card decks

Deck One: Seizure claims and event reconstruction

This deck asks what authorities said happened and what records establish actually happened. Its principal material is the history of cocaine and other significant seizures, with particular attention to RCMP and CBSA involvement and comparable American operations. It follows an incident from initial announcement through inventory, analysis, charges, judicial proceedings, and final disposition of exhibits.

A useful card might examine whether a much-publicized quantity was physically seized, inferred from communications, attributed to earlier shipments, or projected from production capacity. Another might compare the weight in the initial release with the net weight later recorded in court. A third could separate a border interception from subsequent controlled delivery and domestic arrests so that the same drugs are not counted repeatedly.

The deck should record the agency that discovered the shipment, the agency that held it, the laboratory that analyzed it, and the agency that announced it. These roles may overlap, but they should never be assumed to be identical. It should also distinguish where drugs were seized from where they were allegedly destined. A shipment intercepted abroad and described as Canada-bound is not automatically a Canadian domestic seizure.

If the project retains a 52-card presentation format, the cards can be selected to cover recurring claim types and representative incidents. That would be an editorial format, not a limit on the database. Thousands of records may be necessary to support a small number of readable cards. This report does not claim that 52 validated cards already exist in this deck.

Deck Two: Chemistry, testing, and drug language

This deck asks what a substance was, what was actually measured, and whether the public language faithfully communicates that result. Its central distinction is between identification of fentanyl in a sample and measurement of the amount of fentanyl present. It also separates fentanyl from its analogues, carfentanil, non-opioid sedatives, fillers, and products sold under street names.

The deck follows the transition from a field suspicion to screening, confirmatory identification, quantitative testing, and any expert interpretation. A suspected identity should remain marked as suspected until the relevant evidence supports a stronger statement. A negative result must be interpreted with the method's limitations in view, just as a positive screening result should not be assigned more specificity than the method permits.

Questions include whether a sample was representative of the whole exhibit, whether different packages were pooled, whether percentages refer to the same measurement basis, and whether a report concerns finished drugs or chemical inputs. The scientific questions should be reviewed by appropriately qualified independent experts. The deck should record the method actually used rather than treating a laboratory's general capabilities as proof that every capability was used on every sample.

This deck also accommodates Great Scott's concerns about GHB, Xanax, drug-facilitated assault terminology, and the gap between a product's name and its actual contents. Those subjects should have distinct records and research questions. They should not be treated as corroboration of the fentanyl hypothesis simply because both involve disputed language.

Deck Three: Markets, supply disruption, and public claims of impact

This deck asks whether events described as major enforcement successes produced independently observable effects. Ryan Wedding's alleged network and the reported Montreal cocaine price increase provide a potential comparison case. The purpose is to examine timing, scale, geography, price, purity, availability, and duration rather than to assume that one announcement caused one market movement.

The deck should preserve transaction-level observations wherever lawful and ethically obtainable, while protecting identifiable sources. It should separate wholesale from retail prices, cash from credit, Canadian from American dollars, and product weight from active-drug content. Repeated reports from the same informant should not be treated as independent observations. A dealer's quoted asking price is not necessarily the price of a completed sale.

Historical RCMP-associated seizures could then be compared with other enforcement events using a predefined selection rule. The comparison must include cases with visible disruption, cases without visible disruption, and cases with inadequate data. Otherwise, the research could select only the events that favour a preferred conclusion. A missing price series should be reported as missing, not converted into proof of no effect.

Deck Four: Institutional knowledge, decisions, and accountability

This deck asks who had responsibility, what information reached them, what they did, and what legal or policy consequences followed. It links the first three decks to decision records held by enforcement agencies, health authorities, regulators, laboratories, and service providers. It distinguishes a scientific mistake from an administrative failure, a policy disagreement, and intentional misconduct.

Its strongest cards would identify a specific proposition, an official's actual role at the relevant time, the information available to that person, and the consequential decision or statement. Evidence of notice matters: an internal laboratory warning received before a public announcement has a different significance from criticism submitted years afterward. The record should also preserve any explanation, correction, or reasonable alternative interpretation.

The accountability deck is where a possible prosecution can eventually be assessed. It should organize evidence by the elements of a particular offence and include missing elements and potential defences. Titles and organizational prominence do not establish criminal responsibility. A chief executive, minister, laboratory scientist, or police spokesperson should not be selected as an accused merely because that person is visible.

4. Questions the finished system should answer

The following examples describe answerable research questions rather than promised conclusions. A completed card should state the relevant population and time period, give the sources used, and disclose the proportion of cases that remain unresolved.

What proportion of announced fentanyl seizures have accessible confirmatory testing, and what proportion have quantitative results? The answer must distinguish publicly accessible records from all records that may exist. A low public-access rate would demonstrate a transparency limitation. It would not, by itself, establish that the unobserved seizures were never tested.

How often do weights change between announcement, laboratory reporting, and court proceedings? The system should classify explanations such as packaging removal, moisture, sampling, separate shipments, correction, or unresolved discrepancy. Its denominator should include all eligible cases examined, not just examples with dramatic differences.

How often does a stated quantity refer to finished drugs, theoretical output, or alleged throughput? This question directly tests whether public comparisons aggregate unlike things. It can produce a defensible correction even where there is no evidence of dishonesty: the original ranking may simply be invalid because its categories differ.

Did a supposedly major seizure disrupt the market it was said to serve? The deck should produce a time series with uncertainty, alternate explanations, and a comparison group where possible. It should distinguish an immediate price jump from a lasting reduction in supply. The causal conclusion should remain proportionate to the quality and coverage of the observations.

Who contributed what to the Wedding investigation and apprehension? This requires records of investigative initiation, intelligence development, warrants, arrests, extradition or transfer, and prosecution. A public acknowledgement establishes that credit was given; it does not quantify how indispensable each contribution was.

Did scientific qualifications disappear as a claim moved into policy debate? The system could trace one result from laboratory language to police release, news article, legislative speech, funding application, and public-health communication. The relevant comparison is between the exact propositions at each step. Repetition can amplify a claim without independently validating it.

Did a person continue making a material assertion after receiving reliable contradictory information? This question requires proof of the information, delivery, timing, comprehension, and subsequent statement. It is far more useful for investigating possible intent than simply collecting repeated rhetoric. A correction request sent to a general inbox does not prove that a named official read it.

Which criminal cases may have relied on an identified error? The answer needs an actual case list and a demonstrated link to evidence, submissions, an admission, or a judicial finding. A broad search result containing the word fentanyl cannot establish that the cases share the same scientific problem.

What findings would weaken the staging hypothesis? Examples include independent laboratory confirmation of disputed exhibits, consistent contemporaneous inventories, documented lawful substitutions in controlled operations, or credible explanations for weight changes. The finished deck should make these tests as visible as the evidence supporting concern.

Four illustrative cards

> **Claim card:** Did a reported record seizure count the same consignment twice? Required records: incident identifiers, inventory numbers, transfer documents, and announcements. Decision rule: count one physical consignment once while separately recording investigative actions. Current status in this example: a test design, not an identified duplication finding.

> **Chemistry card:** Did a headline quantity describe mixture mass or active fentanyl content? Required records: certificate, quantitative report if any, sampling plan, and release wording. Decision rule: preserve the mixture quantity and report active content only where measured or transparently estimated. Unknown purity stays unknown.

Market card: Did the Montreal price change begin before or after the relevant Wedding disruption? Required records: dated comparable observations, other supply events, and product characteristics. Decision rule: test several plausible event dates and disclose how the result changes. A temporal association alone does not establish causation.

Accountability card: Did an official knowingly allow a false forensic claim into a judicial proceeding? Required records: the claim, contrary evidence, proof of knowledge, the judicial use, and admissible evidence of intent. Decision rule: assess each offence element separately. An unanswered question does not fill a missing element.

5. Standards of evidence and proof

The deck needs an evidence vocabulary that separates research judgment from legal thresholds. An interesting lead, a defensible public criticism, a basis for laying an information, and proof sufficient for conviction are not interchangeable. The appropriate threshold depends on the decision being made.

A research lead is a question with a plausible factual basis worth checking. It might arise from inconsistent numbers, unclear terminology, or an unexplained change in an account. It should be labelled as a lead and linked to the next verification step. The project should not describe this stage as a legal finding of reasonable grounds.

A supported factual conclusion requires sources capable of establishing the specific proposition. An authentic release can establish that an agency used particular words. Establishing the true drug quantity generally calls for evidence about the exhibit and measurement. Establishing deliberate falsity adds questions of knowledge and intention. The evidentiary demand grows as the proposition becomes more serious.

Reasonable grounds under section 504 concern a person's belief that an indictable offence has been committed, subject to the statutory jurisdictional requirements. This is a legal starting point for laying an information in writing under oath. It is not a finding of guilt, and sincere conviction alone does not supply an objectively adequate basis. [10]

The private-prosecution screening stage is governed by section 507.1. The court considers whether process should issue, with the Attorney General receiving notice and an opportunity to participate. The federal prosecution guidance describes the need for a prima facie case: evidence addressing every essential element. This is not a full trial and does not guarantee that a prosecution will continue. [11, 12]

Crown charge assessment is another distinct decision. British Columbia describes its usual test as a substantial likelihood of conviction followed by a public-interest assessment. Federal prosecution policy and responsibility may apply in other circumstances. The applicable prosecutor and current policy must be identified for the particular proposed charge. Meeting a filing threshold does not bypass prosecutorial review. [13]

Balance of probabilities generally means that a proposition is more likely true than not in a civil proceeding. It must not be substituted for the criminal standard. Nor should an investigator assume that every disciplinary, administrative, or inquiry process uses identical rules; the applicable legislation and procedure need to be checked.

Beyond a reasonable doubt is the criminal trial standard. In R. v. Lifchus, the Supreme Court explained that reasonable doubt is grounded in reason and common sense and connected to the evidence or its absence. Probable guilt is insufficient. Absolute certainty is not required. The accused benefits from the presumption of innocence, and the prosecution bears the burden of proving guilt. The deck should never translate this standard into an invented numerical score. [8]

Circumstantial evidence can be powerful, but its interpretation must respect reasonable alternatives. R. v. Villaroman explains why gaps should not be bridged by unsupported assumptions and why reasonable possibilities inconsistent with guilt matter. This protects both accused drug defendants and officials accused of misconduct. Several suspicious circumstances do not automatically eliminate an innocent explanation. [9]

Admissibility adds a further distinction. A useful research source may not be admissible for every purpose at trial. Authentication, hearsay rules, witness competence, expert qualifications, privilege, and disclosure can matter. The finished deck should identify a source's potential courtroom use without pretending that a card, database label, or confidence assessment binds a judge.

6. Ryan Wedding as a comparison case

Great Scott's Wedding argument is that a meaningful disruption of a major supplier should be compared with observable market changes, and that Canadian agencies' claims to credit should be tested against their documented contributions. It also questions whether publicly announced trafficking totals combine unlike quantities or periods. Those are legitimate research questions when each premise is separately established.

The United States Department of Justice's October 17, 2024 announcement described alleged cocaine movements through Mexico and Southern California to Canada and other American locations. It identified an alleged March 2024 delivery of approximately 293 kilograms for eventual distribution in Canada, reported more than one tonne seized during the investigation, and identified RCMP participation alongside American investigators. These are the department's accounts and allegations, not independent findings made by this report. [2]

The FBI's November 19, 2025 account attributed to the US Attorney General an allegation of 60 metric tonnes trafficked annually and described Wedding as Canada's largest cocaine distributor. Its later update states that his apprehension was announced on January 23, 2026. The annual quantity must be recorded as an official allegation unless its evidentiary basis is independently established. [3]

The figures do not justify a settled conclusion that the organization moved only 300 kilograms each month. One identified month or transaction does not establish a constant monthly rate, and publicly described transactions may be only part of an alleged organization. Conversely, the much larger annual allegation should not be accepted merely because it came from a senior American official. The same scrutiny applies on both sides of the border.

The arithmetic is worth making explicit. At an assumed constant 300 kilograms per month, annual throughput would be 3,600 kilograms. Reaching 5,000 kilograms would take approximately 16.7 months. A claim of 60 metric tonnes annually implies an average of 5,000 kilograms per month. None of these calculations establishes actual throughput. They show why an event quantity, a monthly estimate, an annual estimate, and a lifetime total cannot be interchanged.

Great Scott's suggestion that a large number may have been assembled from cumulative transactions is therefore a hypothesis to test against the original wording and source calculation. The current sources do not establish that a lifetime total was falsely presented as a single shipment or annual flow. Nor does the absence of an identified 5,000-kilogram seizure prove that a 5,000-kilogram monthly-flow allegation is false: throughput and seizures measure different things.

The February 5, 2026 Montreal report by Eric Thibault and Felix Seguin described a wholesale kilogram price of about C$35,000 compared with C$18,500 roughly two months earlier, relying on its investigative sources. Its framing mentioned both Wedding and other geopolitical developments. That is a reported market observation with a proposed explanation, not an audited price series or a causal finding. [4]

Using those reported prices, the increase is approximately 89 percent. To test the Wedding connection, the deck should obtain comparable observations before and after disruption, distinguish apprehension from earlier enforcement actions, and examine competing explanations. It should separately investigate Great Scott's Vancouver price observations rather than attaching them to the Montreal figures as if they were one dataset.

Credit should be divided by function. Locating a person, developing a case, arresting suspects, supplying evidence, and prosecuting charges are different achievements. The documented RCMP involvement prevents a fair report from simply declaring that Canada contributed nothing. Public collaboration statements also do not prove that RCMP deserves the greatest credit. Operational records, rather than podium prominence, should determine the assessment.

7. Pure fentanyl, street 'down,' and category errors

Great Scott's language criticism identifies a real analytical distinction: a drug name can describe a molecule, an ingredient detected in a mixture, or a street product. Those meanings overlap in ordinary speech but cannot safely be substituted in quantitative comparisons. The report should ask which meaning applies every time fentanyl is named.

For this project, 'pure fentanyl' should mean material established by appropriate quantitative analysis to consist essentially of fentanyl, with the measured concentration and its basis stated.

It should not mean merely that fentanyl was the only controlled drug reported. An identification report may not list every non-controlled ingredient, and the absence of another reported drug does not establish chemical purity.

'Down' is a market description, not a fixed chemical formula. A product sold under that label must be characterized from the sample actually tested. Street Connections, for example, published a June 2025 alert for a down sample reporting fentanyl together with several benzodiazepines and other ingredients, including a reported fentanyl concentration of 10.9 percent. This provides an illustration of mixture composition, not an estimate of all street products or a substitute for the underlying laboratory certificate. [7]

The basic accounting is simple. In a hypothetical one-kilogram mixture measured at five percent fentanyl by mass, the fentanyl component would be 50 grams. The mixture still weighs one kilogram. Calling it a kilogram of material containing fentanyl preserves both facts. Treating the kilogram as a kilogram of pure fentanyl would overstate that component twentyfold. This is an arithmetic illustration, not a finding about a particular seizure or advice about consumption.

The law introduces another distinction. The Controlled Drugs and Substances Act expressly extends references to controlled substances to substances containing them. A mixture can therefore be legally relevant as fentanyl-containing material even when it is far from pure. A drug conviction does not automatically fail because a percentage was not reported. The actual charge, identity evidence, knowledge, conduct, and contested issue must be examined. [18]

Health Canada's current Drug Analysis Platform explains that quantitative purity analysis covers a small subset of submitted samples and that submission-based data may not represent the broader illegal supply. Its 2017 summary expressly cautioned against using its sample statistics to estimate street availability. These are published methodological limitations. They justify checking how the data are later used; they are not admissions that laboratory results were fabricated. [5, 6]

The deck should insist on distinct fields for gross weight, net mixture weight, tested portion, active content, and uncertainty. Where a quantitative result is absent, the correct entry is unknown. Borrowing a typical street concentration to fill a missing seizure result would manufacture precision. Combining different analogues into one fentanyl-equivalent total requires a justified method and should never happen silently.

Risk language also needs care. Concentration is not the only determinant of harm; exposure, route, tolerance, uneven distribution, and co-occurring depressants can matter. A mixture with lower fentanyl content is not thereby safe. Correcting exaggerated purity language must not be used to dismiss the hazards of the actual mixture. The question is whether the particular risk claim is supported, with its assumptions visible.

The Falkland example

The RCMP's October 31, 2024 Falkland release reported 54 kilograms of fentanyl and additional drugs and chemical inputs. Its 95.5-million potential-dose claim expressly combined fentanyl with precursors. The release also described an estimated C$485 million in denied profit and a separate methamphetamine export interception involving CBSA assistance. Those statements should be assessed as agency claims, with each quantity kept in its own category. [1]

The central audit should therefore request separate calculations for seized finished material and projected production. It should ask what was measured, what was inferred, what assumptions converted inputs into output, and how uncertainty was treated. It should also ask whether the monetary figure describes revenue, profit, wholesale value, or hypothetical retail sales. These are different economic quantities.

The correct critique cannot simply attribute the full dose figure to the 54-kilogram inventory when the source says it combined finished material and precursors. Nor should a projection be presented as a count of actual people whose deaths were prevented. A theoretical exposure-equivalent figure is not a population model of consumption, replacement supply, exposure, or mortality.

Great Scott's additional concern is whether the site demonstrated synthesis or primarily downstream processing, mixing, packaging, or storage. This requires qualified examination of the laboratory report, scene documentation, residue analysis, and equipment context. Photographs selected for publicity may be incomplete. A pill press does not alone establish synthesis; an incomplete photo set does not establish that synthesis was absent. No operational drug-production instructions are needed to ask an expert to classify the evidence.

The report does not certify the current Falkland court disposition. Recent search results indicated possible later proceedings, but the authoritative court record was not obtained. Any final card must reconcile the indictment, admitted facts, relevant exhibits, and judicial reasons before making claims about what the case ultimately proved.

8. Testing the staging hypothesis fairly

'Staging' must be defined before it can be tested. It can refer to arranging genuine seized objects for photographs, misdescribing genuine evidence, presenting a reconstructed event without disclosure, or inventing an event or exhibit. Those possibilities differ enormously. A display table assembled after a lawful seizure is not, without more, proof of evidence fabrication.

The inquiry should examine at least four competing explanations. First, the event and core claims may be substantially accurate, with ordinary uncertainty or incomplete public disclosure. Second, genuine enforcement may have been accompanied by careless or exaggerated communication. Third, particular people may have deliberately misrepresented evidence or impact. Fourth, an event or significant exhibit may have been fabricated. Evidence must discriminate among these possibilities.

For each disputed incident, the records should be organized chronologically. What existed before the announcement? Which exhibits were logged? When were samples taken and tested? What draft statements circulated? Who authorized the final account? What changed when laboratory results or court proceedings became available? A timeline can reveal whether an apparent contradiction is explained by new information or instead persisted after correction became possible.

Physical continuity is central. The inquiry should reconcile exhibit labels, photographs, weights, sample submissions, custody transfers, retained samples, and disposal records. It should also examine whether lawful controlled deliveries, substitute substances, or operational demonstrations account for apparently inconsistent material. Any such explanation must itself be documented rather than presumed.

The CBSA component should distinguish border discovery, targeting information, laboratory work, transfer to police, and subsequent public reporting. It should establish whether imported, exported, and transit goods have been separated. An overseas seizure linked to a Canadian investigation should remain distinguishable from material physically removed from a Canadian domestic market.

Where the hypothesis involves a repeated institutional pattern, the research needs a defined comparison population. The project should select incidents through transparent rules before evaluating whether they fit the theory. It should compare discrepancy rates by era, substance, agency role, and record availability. Otherwise, a collection of exceptional cases can misleadingly imply a universal practice.

Evidence supporting deliberate misconduct could include an authenticated instruction to alter a known quantity, knowing substitution of an exhibit without lawful explanation, or a demonstrably false account linked to judicial use. These are hypothetical examples of probative evidence, not allegations that such records have been found. Evidence supporting ordinary error might include contemporaneous recalculation, transparent correction, or independent confirmation of the underlying seizure.

Motive should not be assumed. Budget incentives, reputation, political advantage, or organizational self-protection are possible topics for investigation, but an institution's benefit from publicity does not establish a criminal agreement. If a coordinated scheme is alleged, the deck must identify evidence of coordination, shared knowledge, and the unlawful objective. Similar rhetoric alone is insufficient.

An independent reviewer should test both the agency account and the investigator's interpretation. The reviewer should receive contradictory evidence, unresolved records, and methodological limitations. Independence means being able to reject the staging hypothesis if the evidence does not support it, while also being willing to identify wrongdoing when reliable evidence does.

9. Implications for court cases

If a material forensic or factual error is established, its implications could extend beyond the announcement that exposed it. The relevant question is which proceedings relied on the same result, assumption, witness, reporting practice, or exhibit. The deck should build those links carefully and resist claims that an unspecified mass of convictions is automatically invalid.

The first category concerns identification. Was the substance proved to be the controlled drug alleged, and was the result linked to the exhibit attributed to the accused? A defect here can have a different significance from uncertainty about purity. The case record may also contain admissions, other expert evidence, or additional proof that must be considered.

The second category concerns quantity and interpretation. A weight discrepancy may be immaterial to one issue but crucial to another, such as the alleged scale of trafficking or a sentencing submission. The inquiry should identify exactly where the disputed quantity entered the case. It must not assume that every public number was repeated under oath or accepted by the court.

The third category concerns search and arrest foundations. If a disputed assertion was used to obtain judicial authorization, counsel would need the actual application, supporting record, timing, and materiality analysis. A later scientific correction does not automatically prove that the original officer acted dishonestly. The question includes what the officer knew or reasonably relied on at the relevant time.

The fourth category concerns sentencing. Section 724 of the Criminal Code distinguishes agreed facts from disputed facts and requires the prosecution to prove aggravating facts beyond a reasonable doubt. A contested claim about extraordinary potency, production, or distribution scale should therefore be examined in its actual sentencing context. The report cannot determine the outcome without that record. [19]

The fifth category concerns credibility and disclosure. Evidence that a witness knowingly supplied inaccurate information could matter in other proceedings, but that connection must be legally assessed. One mistaken news quotation does not establish a witness-wide pattern of dishonesty. The deck should record judicial findings accurately, including whether a court found deliberate falsity, unreliability, a limited error, or no misconduct.

To identify potentially affected cases, researchers should start from the disputed laboratory batch, exhibit numbers, analyst, officer, or calculation method. They should then seek lawful access to the corresponding case records and arrange qualified review. Search results, surnames, or shared terminology alone are too weak to establish a meaningful connection.

Possible responses may include further disclosure, expert review, correction of submissions, an appeal, or an appropriate miscarriage-of-justice review process. Availability, deadlines, standing, and the governing procedure must be checked for the individual case. This explanatory report is not a substitute for that legal assessment and is not itself a court filing.

The public-interest principle is substantial: when the state relies on drug evidence to restrict liberty, the evidence should be accurately described and open to proper challenge. That principle supports examining flawed cases. It also requires avoiding a premature claim that everyone associated with an imperfect announcement committed an offence.

10. Implications for public policy and health institutions

Policy debates may use forensic language to justify enforcement, treatment, prescribed alternatives, supervised consumption, emergency spending, or changes in public-space rules. The deck should ask whether the evidence actually supports the policy proposition being advanced. A finding that a street sample contains fentanyl does not, by itself, establish the effectiveness of any particular intervention.

Great Scott's critique of safe-supply policy should be framed through separately testable questions. Which program and medication are being discussed? What outcome was promised? What happened to participants and comparable non-participants? How were mortality, hospital use, diversion, treatment engagement, and quality of life measured? Which adverse findings were available to decision-makers, and what changes followed?

The project should distinguish prescribed safer-supply initiatives, opioid agonist treatment, supervised consumption, drug checking, and detoxification. These are different services with different purposes. Evidence about one should not be used as if it determines the performance of all the others. A program may have benefits, harms, implementation failures, or mixed results that require a more specific conclusion than universal success or universal fraud.

Health Canada's laboratory role should also be separated from its regulatory and funding roles. A scientific limitation in a sampling system does not establish wrongdoing in drug authorization, and a disputed funding decision does not establish that an analyst falsified a certificate. The accountability deck should identify the particular unit, statutory function, decision, and responsible people before assessing an alleged failure.

For VCH, the relevant records might include program evaluations, contracts, clinical governance documents, incident reporting, disclosure to patients, and responses to identified risks. These are proposed research targets, not assertions that misconduct appears in those records. A fair inquiry should also preserve evidence of safeguards, improvements, and benefits where they are documented.

Claims about pharmaceutical influence, patient inducements, or kickbacks require transaction-specific evidence. A lawful research honorarium, treatment incentive, commercial payment, and corrupt benefit are not interchangeable categories. The project should ask who paid whom, for what purpose, under what agreement, with what disclosure, and in connection with which duty or decision. Suspicion of influence should not be published as an established bribe.

Public reporting should make denominators visible. A percentage of submitted samples is not necessarily a percentage of the street supply; a percentage of program participants is not necessarily a population effect. Changes over time may reflect testing, recruitment, geography, or reporting rather than a change in underlying conditions. The deck should require the original study and data definitions before relying on a headline result.

If a policy argument used a materially misleading claim, correcting that claim remains worthwhile even when criminal intent cannot be proved. Accountability can include transparent evaluation, revised guidance, independent audit, restored access to records, and correction of the public record. Criminal prosecution addresses particular offences; it cannot replace the separate work of improving policy.

11. From inquiry to a possible private prosecution

Great Scott wants the investigation to lead to a private prosecution if the evidence establishes criminal wrongdoing by people within the RCMP, CBSA, Health Canada, VCH, or VPD. That objective can be stated firmly while keeping the decision tied to identifiable offences and admissible evidence. An organization-wide accusation is not a substitute for a properly particularized case.

The first step is to identify a proposed accused, the conduct alleged, the date and location, and the offence that conduct could satisfy. Legal advice is needed about who can properly be charged. A government department, police force, health authority, corporate body, and individual official have different legal statuses. Criminal liability of an organization or the Crown cannot be assumed simply by placing its familiar institutional name on a document.

Fabricating evidence, section 137: this provision addresses fabrication intended to mislead and intended for use as evidence in an existing or proposed judicial proceeding. A false media claim is not automatically this offence. The necessary connection to fabricated material, intended judicial use, and the accused's state of mind must be established. [14]

Perjury, sections 131 to 133: a relevant knowingly false statement made with intent to mislead under the legally required formal conditions may engage perjury. A contradiction or an unsworn press conference does not automatically qualify. The Code also contains a corroboration requirement for conviction that must be considered when assessing the evidence. [15]

Obstructing justice, section 139: intentional efforts to obstruct, pervert, or defeat the course of justice may be relevant where supported by evidence. The inquiry would need to identify the particular conduct and its intended connection to justice. Delay, poor administration, or disagreement with a critic is not automatically obstruction. [16]

Breach of trust by a public officer, section 122: R. v. Boulanger requires more than an error or an unpopular decision. Its framework includes official status, a connection to official duties, breach of the office's standards, a serious and marked departure, and an intention to use the office for an improper purpose rather than the public good. A title or policy failure alone does not prove these elements. [17]

Other offences, including fraud, corruption, secret commissions, or criminal negligence, should be assessed only where their specific elements fit the evidence. They should not be added to make an allegation sound more serious. In particular, a failure to investigate or disagreement about health policy does not automatically establish a criminal omission, legal duty, requisite fault, or causal connection to harm.

The prosecution file should contain an allegation-by-allegation evidence matrix. For each element, it should identify the supporting exhibit, witness, authentication route, anticipated admissibility issue, contrary evidence, and missing proof. A separate chronology should show how the accused's knowledge and intention would be established. A compelling institutional narrative can still fail if one essential element has no supporting evidence.

Section 504 permits an information under oath on the stated statutory basis. Section 507.1 provides judicial screening. Federal prosecution guidance explains that the Crown may intervene and can enter a stay after an information has been sworn. A private information therefore does not guarantee a privately controlled trial, nor should it be used simply to obtain investigative powers that the informant lacks. [10, 11, 12]

Where institutional conflicts are credibly raised, the request should identify them precisely and seek an appropriate independent investigative or prosecutorial arrangement. It should not assume that every prosecutor is implicated merely because government institutions are under scrutiny. A decision not to proceed should be examined through its reasons and available lawful review mechanisms, not automatically counted as evidence of a cover-up.

12. The work needed before a charging decision

A practical next stage would select a small number of high-value incidents whose critical records can be obtained. Each should have a clear alleged misstatement, identifiable decision-makers, and a realistic test capable of confirming or refuting it. Beginning with the entire institutional history risks producing an enormous narrative without a chargeable event.

For a seizure case, the priority package is the original announcement, inventory, analyst's certificate, quantitative report if one exists, sampling record, continuity documents, relevant court materials, and later corrections. For a policy case, the priority package is the decision record, evidence available at the time, risk assessments, conflicts disclosures, and documented response to subsequent findings.

Records requests should identify the documents needed to resolve a specific issue. Requests for calculations and definitions may be more useful than broad requests for every communication about a controversy. A refusal or redaction should be preserved with its stated basis and any review outcome. It should not be treated as an admission about the underlying facts.

The project should then obtain independent scientific and legal review. The scientific review asks whether the measurement and interpretation are defensible. The legal review asks whether the evidence supports a particular offence, whether it is admissible, and whether the proposed accused is correctly identified. These are complementary tasks; neither can be replaced by confidence in the overall hypothesis.

Before publishing a named allegation, the relevant person or institution should receive a precise opportunity to respond to the evidence. The question should identify the disputed statement and requested explanation, not demand that they disprove a sweeping conspiracy. Responses, corrections, non-responses, and the limits of any non-response should be recorded fairly.

The final report should classify outcomes expressly: verified claim, corrected error, unresolved discrepancy, supported misconduct concern, or prosecution referral supported by an element-based assessment. A finding against prosecution does not erase a demonstrated policy problem. A finding of policy failure does not automatically supply criminal intent. The project should be able to report either result without treating it as defeat.

13. Closing position: accountability, including prosecution where justified

Great Scott's position is that the pattern he perceives is serious enough to require an independent inquiry, and that a private-prosecution route must remain available if the institutions responsible for enforcement or oversight fail to act on a properly supported criminal case. This report preserves that demand. It does not certify his present belief as a judicial conclusion.

The inquiry should follow evidence into the RCMP and CBSA wherever their records establish a relevant role. It should examine Health Canada and VCH where laboratory practice, regulatory decisions, program governance, or public representations create specific questions. VPD should be included where a particular incident, statement, witness, or evidentiary act connects it to the alleged wrongdoing. Institutional inclusion is a question of evidence, not association.

There is a strong public-interest case for refusing unsupported certainty from any direction. Agencies should not be permitted to rely on dramatic drug quantities without a defensible account of what those quantities mean. Critics should not be permitted to substitute suspicion for proof of fabrication. The Evidence Deck can make that standard practical by exposing the original claims, testing their foundations, and recording the consequences of any established error.

The ultimate objective is a record capable of withstanding independent scrutiny. If it establishes that identifiable people fabricated evidence, deliberately misled judicial proceedings, obstructed justice, or criminally abused public office, the appropriate response includes prosecution. Where ordinary enforcement does not advance a properly supported case, a carefully prepared private information should be considered with qualified legal assistance and full disclosure of adverse evidence.

The present material supports targeted investigation and rigorous verification. It does not yet establish that any named institutional employee should be charged. The need now is to complete the evidence trail so that a decision to prosecute, correct, reform, or close an allegation rests on demonstrated facts. If the evidence demands prosecution, institutional status should provide no exemption from the law. The standard remains the same for everyone: a specific allegation, a fair process, and proof to the level the law requires.

Sources and reading notes

Sources were consulted for this edition on 20 September 2026. Police and prosecution releases are cited as evidence of their published claims, not independent verification of those claims. Statutes and judgments support the legal explanations. Dynamic pages may change. This source list is not a substitute for the archived, exhibit-level record the completed deck will need.

[1] RCMP, Federal Investigators take down the largest, most sophisticated drug superlab in Canada, October 31, 2024. Agency account of Falkland, reported quantities, projected doses, and CBSA assistance.

https://rcmp.ca/en/news/2024/10/federal-investigators-take-down-largest-most-sophisticated-drug-superlab-canada

[2] US Department of Justice, 16 Defendants Charged in Superseding Indictment Alleging Bulk Shipments of Cocaine to Canada, Four Murders, October 17, 2024. Prosecution allegations, specific delivery, reported seizure total, and participating agencies.

https://www.justice.gov/usao-cdca/pr/16-defendants-charged-superseding-indictment-alleging-bulk-shipments-cocaine-canada

[3] FBI, Reward Raised for Ten Most Wanted Fugitive Ryan Wedding, November 19, 2025, with April 16, 2026 update. Source for attributed annual-throughput and market-position claims and apprehension-announcement date.

https://www.fbi.gov/news/stories/reward-raised-for-ten-most-wanted-fugitive-ryan-wedding

[4] Eric Thibault and Felix Seguin, TVA Nouvelles, Crime organise: le kilo de cocaine a Montreal coute maintenant deux fois plus cher qu'avant l'arrestation du nouveau El Chapo, February 5, 2026. Reported prices and the article's proposed explanations; not a controlled causal study.

https://www.tvanouvelles.ca/2026/02/05/crime-organise-le-kilo-de-cocaine-a-montreal-coute-maintenant-deux-fois-plus-cher-quavant-larrestation-du--nouveau-el-chapo

[5] Health Canada, Drug Analysis Platform: Data sources and limitations. Scope of quantitative testing and limitations of submitted-sample data.

https://health-infobase.canada.ca/drug-analysis-service/data-sources-limitations.html

[6] Health Canada, Drug Analysis Service: Summary report of samples analysed 2017. Published warning against using the sample counts to estimate street availability.

https://www.canada.ca/en/health-canada/services/health-concerns/controlled-substances-precursor-chemicals/drug-analysis-service/2017-drug-analysis-service-summary-report-samples-analysed.html

[7] Street Connections, Drug Alerts, June 17, 2025 entry. Provider's report of composition of a sample sold as down; underlying certificate not obtained for this report.

https://streetconnections.ca/drug-alerts

[8] R. v. Lifchus, [1997] 3 SCR 320, especially paragraphs 36-39. Criminal reasonable-doubt standard. Supreme Court judgment indexed at the linked source.

https://decisions.scc-csc.ca/scc-csc/scc-csc/en/item/1543/index.do?iframe=true&pedisable=true&q=Scott&site_preference=normal

[9] R. v. Villaroman, 2016 SCC 33, especially paragraphs 30-42. Circumstantial evidence and reasonable alternative inferences.

https://decisions.scc-csc.ca/scc-csc/scc-csc/en/item/16078/index.do?iframe=true&pedisable=false&q=williams&site_preference=normal

[10] Criminal Code, section 504. Laying an information and jurisdictional conditions.

https://laws-lois.justice.gc.ca/eng/acts/C-46/section-504.html

[11] Criminal Code, section 507.1. Judicial screening of a private information and Attorney General participation.

https://laws-lois.justice.gc.ca/eng/acts/c-46/section-507.1.html

[12] Public Prosecution Service of Canada, Federal Prosecution Deskbook, 5.9 Private Prosecutions. Screening, prima facie evidence, Crown intervention, and stays.

https://www.ppsc-sppc.gc.ca/eng/pub/fpsd-sfpg/fps-sfp/tpd/p5/ch09.html

[13] Province of British Columbia, BC Prosecution Service. Published charge-assessment framework. The current case-specific policy should be checked before filing.

https://www2.gov.bc.ca/gov/content/justice/criminal-justice/bc-prosecution-service

[14] Criminal Code, section 137. Fabricating evidence.

https://laws-lois.justice.gc.ca/eng/acts/c-46/section-137.html

[15] Criminal Code, sections 131-133. Perjury, punishment, and corroboration.

https://laws.justice.gc.ca/eng/acts/C-46/page-23.html

[16] Criminal Code, section 139. Obstructing justice.

https://laws-lois.justice.gc.ca/eng/acts/c-46/section-139.html

[17] R. v. Boulanger, 2006 SCC 32, especially paragraph 58. Breach-of-trust elements; judgment and summary reproduced by vLex. The official or certified judgment should be obtained for a litigation package.

https://ca.vlex.com/vid/r-v-boulanger-d-681406957

[18] Controlled Drugs and Substances Act, section 2(2), read with the relevant offence and schedule. References to substances containing controlled substances.

https://laws-lois.justice.gc.ca/eng/acts/c-38.8/section-2.html

[19] Criminal Code, section 724. Information accepted and disputed facts at sentencing, including proof of aggravating facts.

https://laws-lois.justice.gc.ca/eng/acts/c-46/section-724.html