

Bill C-63: The Desperate Act of a Failing Tyrant

Rod Taylor

Leader, CHP Canada

On February 26, 2024, Canada's Liberal Minister of Justice, the Hon. Arif Virani, presented Bill C-63, also known as the Online Harms Act.¹ This legislation—if passed—will subject every Canadian to the most egregious, invasive and unjust restrictions on what has been considered (until now) our God-given and Charter-protected freedom of speech. It is the desperate act of an arrogant Prime Minister seeking to close off every avenue of honest opposition to his self-serving policies and his sense of entitlement.

Justin Trudeau and his cabinet friends can surely sense the deep distrust and dissatisfaction now being expressed openly and angrily by Canadians who may, in the past, have been either supportive or tolerant of his social and socialist agenda. The general sense today is that the Liberal government and their NDP lapdogs have lost touch with reality and are no longer even trying to represent their taxpaying constituents. The top-down imposition of crippling taxation (especially carbon taxes), the lack of attention to basic principles of economics and justice and the caustic and brutal attempts to control our language and thought have finally riled up a population that once cheered the takeover of Parliament by a young man who insisted that the budget would balance itself . . . It didn't.

Bill C-63 is being marketed to Canadians (with the help of the legacy media) as a bill to protect children from online porn and other predatory digital activity. That is nothing but window dressing meant to fool gullible voters. If Mr. Trudeau and his cabinet ministers really cared about protecting young people from harmful sexual content and predatory, abusive activity, they would have taken action against the pornographic content of public school curricula² being pushed in almost every province. Instead of gleefully participating in so-called Gay Pride parades and funding sexual perversion and advocacy, they would have ordered RCMP to arrest nude men publicly committing lewd, shameful acts on Canadian streets in front of young children.

If they cared about child abuse and protecting young people from harm, they would have outlawed the promotion and distribution of puberty blockers, cross-sex hormones and the harmful, experimental "gender reassignment surgeries" that are ruining lives and condemning many to pain, dysfunction, infertility, overwhelming sadness and regret and a tragic increase in suicides.³

No, C-63 is not about protecting children. That is simply window dressing, a subterfuge meant to cover their nefarious intentions. The real intent of the bill is to eliminate the publication of all opinions that do not support this government's ideology and agenda. The deeper and darker elements of this bill deal with so-called "hate speech." The danger lurking in the details is that Liberal Prime Ministers, Liberal MPs (with their NDP tagalongs), Liberal-appointed Senators, Liberal-appointed judges, Liberal-appointed Human Rights Commissioners, bureaucrats, college professors and Liberal-paid media will be the ones deciding what constitutes "hate." We saw, during covid protocols and mandates how easily and quickly the media, police forces and even judges can be co-opted into siding with a corrupt government to ignore science, to ignore violations of charter rights, freedom of speech and freedom of the press.

In a very long, convoluted and wide-ranging text, Bill C-63 goes from child protection to the duty of social media platforms to remove content deemed offensive or in violation of the Act. It ascribes penalties and establishes structures for reporting and enforcing compliance. And buried in the lengthy text, it throws in the definition of "hate speech." Much of what it says came directly from the Whatcott Supreme Court case.⁴ It's just as confusing now as it was then. It says:

Definition of hate speech

In this section, **hate speech** means the content of a communication that expresses detestation or vilification of an individual or group of individuals on the basis of a prohibited ground of discrimination.

Clarification – hate speech

For greater certainty, the content of a communication does not express detestation or vilification . . . solely because it expresses disdain or dislike or it discredits, humiliates, hurts or offends.

Does that “greater certainty” help you to understand the subtle difference between “detestation or vilification” and a word or action that only “expresses disdain or dislike . . . or that discredits, humiliates, hurts or offends”? I am absolutely certain that every judge or police officer or executive of a social media platform will have a hard time parsing out that language to ensure that the legitimate free speech of writers who are motivated not by hate but by biblical and biological facts will not be curtailed. The vagueness of human emotion and the extent to which hate—or any emotion—motivates a person’s thinking is not measurable, hard science. And the extent to which personal opinions and deeply-held biases might motivate a judge or a human rights commissioner to condemn or convict the publisher of a statement is also hard to measure. But it’s not hard to predict. The Prime Minister and his cabinet have already shown their willingness to distort facts to fit their narrative. And their stable of compliant, tax-funded functionaries have also demonstrated a remarkable ability to adopt new rules of conduct when the old ways become inconvenient.

Bill C-63 would financially reward anonymous complainants and burden the “guilty-until-proven-innocent” writers of content with legal fees and massive fines. It would punish those who are merely accused (not convicted) by biased and anonymous complainants. Meanwhile, in Canadian streets today, there are people blocking roads, targeting Jewish homes, businesses and synagogues and literally calling for the death of Jews⁵. . . but this government, that claims to be protecting us from hate, does nothing. The Online Harms Act must be stopped. The PM’s goal is clearly to instil fear and to eliminate dissent. If he succeeds, more Canadians will spend time in the Gulag; our grandchildren will wonder what “free speech” was like and why we allowed it to be taken from us. CHP Canada stands with you for the protection of children and the protection of all Canadians from hateful acts. That would include the hateful intent of this government to deprive thoughtful and morally upright Canadians of our God-given freedoms. The Justice Centre for Constitutional Freedoms (JCCF)⁶ has a good petition circulating which we urge our members to sign.⁷

You can be part of the solution to government overreach. Join CHP Canada⁸ today. If already a member, consider being a candidate, a campaign volunteer or a donor. You are needed!

Footnotes

¹ www.parl.ca/DocumentViewer/en/44-1/bill/C-63/first-reading

² action4canada.com/sexually-explicit-books-in-schools/

³ www.thecentersquare.com/california/article_c510ab4c-e237-11ee-b691-57a7d516f1e8.html

⁴ www.fasken.com/en/knowledge/2013/03/litigationanddisputeresolutionbulletin-20130313

⁵ www.jpost.com/diaspora/antisemitism/article-791235

⁶ www.jccf.ca/online-harms-act-threatens-free-expression-in-canada/

⁷ www.jccf.ca/petitions/

⁸ www.chp.ca/get-involved/

The Christian Heritage Party of Canada

www.chp.ca • NationalOffice@chp.ca • 1-888-VOTE-CHP (868-3247)

PO Box 4958, Station E, Ottawa, Ontario K1S 5J1

Authorized by the Official Agent of the Christian Heritage Party of Canada and may be copied.
