

Blame Canada? Justin Trudeau Creates Blueprint for Dystopia in Horrific Speech Bill

Life sentences for speech? Pre-crime detention? Ex post facto law? Anonymous accusers? It's all in Justin Trudeau's "Online Harms Bill," a true "threat to democracy"

By [Matt Taibbi](#)

Global Research, May 13, 2024

[Racket News](#) 10 May 2024

Region: [Canada](#)

Theme: [Law and Justice](#), [Police State & Civil Rights](#)

All Global Research articles can be read in 51 languages by activating the Translate Website button below the author's name (only available in desktop version).

To receive Global Research's Daily Newsletter (selected articles), [click here](#).

Click the share button above to email/forward this article to your friends and colleagues. Follow us on [Instagram](#) and [Twitter](#) and subscribe to our [Telegram Channel](#). Feel free to repost and share widely Global Research articles.

[Global Research Wants to Hear From You!](#)

On February 21st, Canadian Prime Minister Justin Trudeau gave a [press conference](#) in Edmonton, announcing his government's decision to introduce the Online Harms Act, or Bill C-63. It was described in Canadian media as a "[bill to protect kids](#)" that would stop the "[exploitation of children](#)," and Trudeau's curt speech focused solely on minors. The scarf-clad PM angrily dismissed criticisms the bill might have a broader focus.

"I look forward to putting forward that Online Harms bill, which people will see is very, very specifically focused on protecting kids, and *not* on censoring the Internet," he said sharply. "I think everyone, wherever they are in the political spectrum, can agree that protecting kids is something governments should be focused on doing."



[Click here to watch the video](#)

Soon after, on February 26th, Trudeau's government introduced the bill. Canada's stable of retreating, credulous on-air personalities announced its rollout like the arrival of penicillin. "Tonight, *Web of Harm*," [gushed](#) CTV's Omar Sachedina. "Tackling online dangers and safeguarding children... The long-awaited framework for protecting the vulnerable..."

There was little initial uproar. What could be wrong with increasing child safety, or "protecting the vulnerable"?

Then people read the bill.

"If you look at the purpose of this law, it's actually quite noble and most lawyers would agree with it," says Canadian attorney Dan Freiheit. "Online safety, protecting children's physical and mental health." But the actual text?

"It's wild," Freheit says.

Trudeau was lying when he said C-63 was "very, very specifically focused on correcting kids." The purview of the Online Harms Act extends far beyond speech, reimagining society as a mandated social engineering project, creating transformational new procedures that would:

- enlist Canada's citizens in an ambitious social monitoring system, with rewards of up to \$20,000 for anonymous "informants" of hateful behavior, with the guilty paying penalties up to \$50,000, creating a self-funded national spying system;
- introduce extraordinary criminal penalties, including *life* in prison not just for existing crimes like "advocating genocide," but for any "offence motivated by hatred," in theory any non-criminal offense, as tiny as littering, committed with hateful intent;
- punish *Minority Report* pre-crime, where if an informant convinces a judge you

“will commit” a hate offense, you can be jailed up to a year, put under house arrest, have firearms seized, or be forced into drug/alcohol testing, all for things you haven’t done;

- penalize past statements. The law gets around prohibitions against “retroactive” punishment by calling the offense “continuous communication” of hate, i.e. the crime is your failure to take down bad speech;
- force corporate Internet platforms to remove “harmful content” virtually on demand (within 24 hours in some cases), the hammer being fines of “up to 6% of... gross global revenue.”

Things you’re saying, things you’ve already said, things an administrative judge thinks you *might* say, all barred, with neighbors deputized as enforcers? Good times. Leave it to Trudeau, a frequent trailblazer in new forms of [illiberalism](#) in the digital age, to come up with this quantum leap downward on the rights front. C-63 is a Frankenstein’s Monster combining the worst censorship ideas already deployed by supposed ally government-in-laws like Europe’s [Digital Services Act](#), Australia’s updated [Australian Communications and Media Authority Act](#) (ACMA), and Scotland’s [Hate Crime and Public Order Act](#), which saw [7,152 complaints](#) in its first week when the law took effect last month.

Trudeau’s creation is a turbo-charged social surveillance law aimed first at forcing big platforms like Facebook and Twitter to “self-police,” but secondarily targeting individuals and doling out civil and criminal penalties for speech and thought on a scale not seen anywhere. What constitutes hateful conduct? While the bill newly defines hate speech as “likely to foment detestation or vilification” of Canada’s growing list of protected groups and individuals, Canadian lawyers interviewed were generally unsure of what the standard might look like in practice.

“It’s impossible to know what exactly it’s going to mean,” says [Bruce Pardy](#), Executive Director of [Rights Probe](#). “So you’re going to have to rely upon the court in a criminal prosecution, or the human rights tribunal in a human rights proceeding, to put their own interpretation on that, and figure out where the line is.”

Despite being split on how serious the immediate impact might be (“We’re not looking at prisons full of people doing life for misgendering” said one), most attorneys seemed to agree C-63 will be a game-changer if passed, aimed beyond speech at the very concept of individual rights, chipping away at ideas like the presumption of innocence and the right to face one’s accuser, and using traditionally dubious tools like *ex post facto* laws.

On one level, it’s not surprising, given Canada’s historically diffident attitude toward rights — the first section in the country’s [Charter of Rights and Freedoms](#), ironically introduced when Trudeau’s father Pierre was Prime Minister, is essentially a giant loophole — but this Prime Minister appears determined to swap out Canada’s reputation for brotherhood, humor, and generosity for a new one based on rigidity and collective paranoia.

Whereas Canada is founded upon principles that recognize the supremacy of God and the rule of law:

Guarantee of Rights and Freedoms

1. The *Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms* guarantees the rights and freedoms set out in it subject only to such reasonable limits prescribed by law as can be demonstrably justified in a free and democratic society.

RIGHTS, BUT: Canada guarantees the right to freedom of expression, but “only to such reasonable limits... as can be demonstrably justified.”

There’s a long backstory of important recent laws and Supreme Court cases that helped push Canada down a path toward C-63, but this bill still stands apart as a unique problem, and only a few domestic media outlets have been willing or able to criticize it. One of those is *Rebel News*, whose founder Ezra Levant says Canadians could really use America’s help in sounding the alarm. “Canadians need to fight for our own freedom, but the Canadian political and media establishment are obsessed by what U.S. journalists and politicians have to say about us,” Levant says. “So any attention Americans can bring to this civil liberties bonfire really makes a difference. Frankly, we need your help.”

[Click here to read the full article on Racket News.](#)

*

Note to readers: Please click the share button above. Follow us on Instagram and Twitter and subscribe to our Telegram Channel. Feel free to repost and share widely Global Research articles.

The original source of this article is [Racket News](#)
Copyright © [Matt Taibbi](#), [Racket News](#), 2024

[Comment on Global Research Articles on our Facebook page](#)

[Become a Member of Global Research](#)

Articles by: [Matt Taibbi](#)

Disclaimer: The contents of this article are of sole responsibility of the author(s). The Centre for Research on Globalization will not be responsible for any inaccurate or incorrect statement in this article. The Centre of Research on Globalization grants permission to cross-post Global Research articles on community internet sites as long the source and copyright are acknowledged together with a hyperlink to the original Global Research article. For publication of Global Research articles in print or other forms including commercial internet sites, contact: publications@globalresearch.ca

www.globalresearch.ca contains copyrighted material the use of which has not always been specifically authorized by the copyright owner. We are making such material available to our readers under the provisions of "fair use" in an effort to advance a better understanding of political, economic and social issues. The material on this site is distributed without profit to those who have expressed a prior interest in receiving it for research and educational purposes. If you wish to use copyrighted material for purposes other than "fair use" you must request permission from the copyright owner.

For media inquiries: publications@globalresearch.ca