

C.L.E.A.R.



Common Law Education and Rights

Criminalizing Dissent: Suppressing Freedom of Expression in Canada, Pt. 2

David Lindsay

CLEAR - Common Law Education and Rights

Clearbc.org

In Part 1, I outlined the nature, importance, and core elements of freedom of expression in Canada. I now turn to exposing the various methods being weaponized by our corrupt Governments at all levels to undermine this fundamental freedom.

A well-known tactic is the cancellation of events by venue owners under pressure from woke, Government subsidized activists. These cancellations often come at the last minute, after travel and other arrangements have been made, and are usually based on false or defamatory claims.

My first encounter with the suppression of free expression in this manner came decades ago, when a colleague and I were scheduled to speak at two Ottawa churches about the dangers and unconstitutionality of usury (interest) in Canada's monetary system. Both churches abruptly cancelled without warning, at the last minute. The reason? Local woke lawyer Richard Warman, acting professionally, contacted the venues and urged them to silence us based on his false accusations. Warman's baseless allegations were deeply disturbing and marked my first exposure to how targeted disinformation and falsified reputational attacks can chill lawful, peaceful discourse on Government policies.

In 2024, I was scheduled to speak in Castlegar, B.C., at a venue where I had previously spoken twice without issue. Days before the event, a woke individual affiliated with a Federally funded 2LGBTQ+ group in Nelson, contacted the venue owner, threatening public protests and business losses if the event proceeded, notwithstanding the topic of my presentation was completely divorced from any nexus to these groups or their agendas. Despite his past support and familiarity with my message, the owner cancelled at the last minute. This reflects a growing trend: using intimidation to suppress lawful public expression.

Freedom-oriented groups and individuals across the country, such as the We Unify group in Victoria and Action4Canada, have faced similar attacks and cancellations, illustrating one of the most effective, and disturbing modern tactics for suppression of free expression: Government-subsidized, woke individuals or groups pressuring and intimidating venue owners to cancel contractually prearranged events. These groups or individuals are sufficiently distanced from the actual Government, with the exception of Government funding/subsidies, to allow them to claim no involvement. This is akin to hiring a contractor to demolish your neighbour's house whom you are constantly arguing with, and then insisting you bear no responsibility because you never swung the hammer or worked the equipment yourself.

These “*wokers*” often threaten venues with protests, public backlash, financial losses, or falsely label presenters as racists or extremists — tactics based on economic intimidation and harm. Fearing reputational damage or future business losses, venue owners frequently cancel, often at the last minute. The result: these attacks are intentionally timed just days before events, aiming to force last-minute cancellations and leave insufficient time to secure an alternative venue, causing scheduling disruptions and non-refundable travel and other costs.

These cancellations are often followed by press releases to, or prejudicial media coverage from Government-subsidized, woke mainstream media, which quickly spread the narrative — typically without verifying the allegations. One mainstream media outlet echoes another, amplifying false claims and defamatory labels against the speaker. The result is a distorted and adverse public perception, with no real opportunity for the speaker to respond or correct the record. This pattern reveals a broader reality: expression that challenges Government interests — particularly conservative views or criticism of official misconduct — is routinely marginalized by state-backed actors, special interest organizations and complicit media.

This conduct is not merely disruptive — it carries serious legal consequences. These noted private individuals, often act as *de facto* proxies for Governments through public funding or subsidies. Depending on the language and intent of such wokers, such actions may constitute criminal offences under the *Criminal Code*, including libel (as Richard Warman came very close to finding out), intimidation or extortion. At a minimum, they are civil wrongs, including (inducing) breach of contract and potentially defamation. Both the wokers issuing these threats and complaints, and venue owners (including Governments) who yield to them should face civil liability. This conduct must not go unchallenged or unpunished.

Recently in Nova Scotia, and throughout Canada on his nationwide tour, a U.S. Christian singer, Sean Feucht, was booked to play a concert in Halifax at the York Redoubt, a 230-year-old site operated by Parks Canada, i.e.: the Federal Government. Due to threats of protests and complaints from leftist organizations against the conservative singer, the Federal Government cancelled the event in that park, i.e.: breached their contract with the singer. If this was a singer for 2LGBTQ+ organizations under similar threats of protests, the Government would simply have hired security, as they should have done for this singer. Instead, the Government revoked Feucht’s permit at the last minute.¹ Many other venues in Canada did likewise.

The level of discrimination against Christianity and conservatism runs deep in the Maritimes, it appears. No sooner did Halifax pull Feucht’s permit, then the City of Charlottetown did likewise. This City cancelled Frucht’s concert while simultaneously promoting Pride Fest, claiming that the City “...stands in full support of our diverse and vibrant 2SLGBTQ+ community.”²

Moncton, New Brunswick followed immediately after, cancelling Feucht’s permit for his concert in that City, with the City calling Feucht’s views, “*hateful.*” The National Capital Commission followed immediately after by refusing to issue a permit in Gatineau, Quebec, just outside Ottawa. Western Canadian cities of Abbotsford and West Kelowna also cancelled this tour. This exemplifies the lowest of Government lows: falsely identifying Christianity and conservative views that founded this once great country as hateful, to support cancellation of permits for events, where it does not approve of

the content. No charges or human rights complaints were laid in this instance, implying the Constitutionality of both the messages and content.

Such troubling actions in this case, resulting from Government cancellations, must somehow be Constitutionally challenged, or this is going to be much worse. Canadian Governments and media have convinced Canadians that public spaces cannot be used for messages that some people, even most people, may not approve of. As one interviewed woman in Gatineau said, *“My issue isn’t that his values don’t align with mine or that I have a difference of opinion politically. It’s that it’s a public space...If it was in a private arena or a private room, I wouldn’t be upset by that.”*ⁱⁱⁱ Of course, to no surprise, no one who supported the singer was interviewed for the article.

This statement underscores a societal misconception of the nature and Constitutionality of freedom of expression, especially in public places, where, as previously stated, the Government has a duty to make such spaces available for forms of lawful expression, including Christian principles enshrined in the Charter. The SCC has repeatedly said that these public spaces are Constitutionally protected for all forms of speech, no matter how unpopular they may be.

This increasing type of Communistic behaviour by Governments and venue owners, who cancel such events and commit breach of contracts, and the increasing illiterate Canadian public on the importance of this freedom, depressingly illustrates how little courage Canadians now show in the face of adversity, threats, or attacks on their rights and freedoms. Passive acquiescence and fear have replaced courage and bravery as the norm in Canada, frighteningly leaving very few Canadians to *“stand on guard for thee.”* We must respond decisively against these abuses. Otherwise, expression can be suppressed by mob tactics rather than legal principles.

The second method of attacking freedom of expression is direct use of the mainstream media itself. Many rely heavily on Government funding and are reluctant to challenge Government orders.

In the spring of 2020, we held a peaceful demonstration outside the CBC office in Kelowna, protesting its refusal to report evidence contradicting the official COVID-19 narrative promoted by the B.C. Government and Provincial Health Officer Bonnie Henry. I was approached by Rob Gibson, a journalist from Castanet, who admitted that Castanet — like other media outlets — had been instructed by the Provincial Government not to give *“a platform”* in their media to voices such as ours, critical of the Governments’ COVID policies. Effectively, the B.C. NDP Government imposed a media blackout on dissent.

This pattern of state-imposed media suppression continues. Unless dissent can be portrayed negatively, it is frequently ignored or misrepresented. The full scope of topics suppressed by Government influence remains uncertain, but conservative or right-leaning perspectives are grossly and disproportionately silenced or vilified.

This underscores a fundamental danger: when media outlets rely on Government funding, they face a clear conflict of interest. They are unlikely to challenge the very institutions that sustain them. As a result, mainstream media often falsely portray those who advocate for freedom or question Government narratives as *“racist,” “extremist,”* or otherwise disreputable people — using repetition and stigma to embed these false associations in the public mind.

A third method of attack on expression lies in legislation. This began with the introduction of “*hate speech*” laws — a concept that deserves its own, distinct, independent in-depth analysis. At its core, hate speech regulation most often targets beliefs and opinions that diverge from Government-approved narratives, particularly on issues such as immigration, cultural identity, and national history. Rather than challenging the validity, truthfulness or accuracy of certain opposing views, Governments seek to silence them outright.

Freedom of expression fundamentally includes the right to express strong disagreement — even hate — so long as it doesn’t incite violence, torts, or crimes. Historically, moral condemnation, including hatred of evil, is rooted in religious and philosophical traditions. Yet Governments have steadily expanded the definition of hate speech to include dissenting political views — particularly criticism of COVID policies, immigration, and the Government-driven cultural transformation.

This was evident during the Trucker’s Convoy, where at least one Government operative was clearly embedded to display an allegedly offensive flag — later amplified by mainstream media to falsely portray freedom supporters as extremists or racists.

Promoting traditional Canadian values or national pride is now routinely labeled - even legislated - as racist or hateful. For example, the Waterloo Regional District School Board recently claimed that using the word “*family*” reflects “*white supremacist*” language rooted in Canadian culture.^{iv} Even the RCMP — who lack jurisdiction in the Provinces under sections 91 and 92 of the *Constitution Act, 1867* — have deceptively declared that people who “*hold traditional views*” are linked to extremism and have been “*radicalized.*”^v

Governments are now extending beyond speech regulation to imposing geographic limits on expression — particularly in spaces they seek to ideologically shield, such as schools, hospitals, and religious institutions. The Federal Government has announced plans for fall 2025 legislation that would criminalize protests near these public sites by establishing “*bubble zones.*” These “*bubble zones*” and criminalization of protests around schools, hospitals, and other institutions is another step toward authoritarianism.

The implications are serious. Protests held 100 metres away from intended audiences lose effectiveness — they prohibit the ability to effectively share information, engage the public, influence public opinion, and communicate opposition directly. This renders protests symbolic but ineffective, undermining the core purpose of effective expression. The real goal is to make protests against our own Governments invisible, and therefore, ineffective.

Government claims that such laws are necessary to prevent intimidation or harassment are often exaggerated, subjective or based on isolated incidents, many of which involve conflicts among immigrant groups, not peaceful protests against our own Governments. Importantly, existing legal tools already address any real threats, including laws on harassment, intimidation, incitement, violence, nuisance, and public order.

Criminalizing peaceful protests is a dangerous step toward repression. It sets a precedent for outlawing all dissent that challenges Government policy. We are nearing a point where, as in regimes like China, only state-approved narratives will be allowed in the public sphere, delivered by Government-funded media. England offers a stark example: the erosion of its culture, history, and freedoms has reached

the point where criminals are released from jail to make room for citizens expressing opposition to Government policies such as immigration. It stands as a sobering warning for Canada. These actions permit treason by officials enabling them to overthrow our culture and laws, while banning all opposition. Examine what is occurring in Canada right now – does this look familiar to you?

In Part 3 of this series, we will continue our examination of the weapons Governments are using to limit and prohibit freedom of expression.

¹⁴ <https://globalnews.ca/news/11298841/sean-feucht-maga-parks-canada-york-redoubt-nova-scotia/>

¹⁵ <https://globalnews.ca/news/11299917/sean-feucht-maga-worship-permit-revoked-halifax/>

¹⁶ <https://www.ctvnews.ca/ottawa/article/ncc-cancels-upcoming-gatineau-que-concert-by-controversial-us-musician/>

¹⁷ <https://www.junonews.com/p/exclusive-school-board-trains-staff>

¹⁸ https://www.junonews.com/p/rcmp-sergeant-links-traditional-values?utm_source=substack&utm_medium=email