Students Against Privatization and Securitization
Research Collective

Bill C-9 – The *Combatting Hate Act*: Escalating Repression in the Political Battle Over Zionism

December 2025

Update January 2026: Bill C-9 Delayed (But Not Cancelled) **3**
Understanding Bill C-9: **6**
What Bill C-9 Aims to Change: 7
The Political Context Influencing Bill C-9 and Its Potential Applications: 9
Bill C-9 In Practice: Real and Symbolic Repression 10
What to Take Away from This Report: 13
Appendix A: Summary of the Legislative Process **15**
Appendix B: Comprehensive Breakdown of the Content of Bill C-9 **17**
Appendix C: Public Responses Opposing Bill C-9 (Suggested Reading) **24**
Appendix D: Zionist Strategies for Bill C-9, Mark Sandler's Seven Recommendations for Amending the Combatting Hate Act **25**

Update January 2026: Bill C-9 Delayed (But Not Cancelled)

On January 26, 2026 the House Standing Committee on Justice and Human Rights quietly voted in favour of postponing further study of Bill C-9. The bill's progress will now be delayed until after Bill C-14, the *Bail Reform and Sentencing Act*, has passed through the committee. So far, only conservative organizations and news outlets have reported on the news: the *National Post*, the Canadian Constitutional Foundation, and *The Catholic Register*, the latter two celebrating on the grounds that they have achieved a victory in protecting free speech and religious freedom.[1] These organizations hope that this represents the first phase of Bill C-9's abandonment.

For opponents to Bill C-9 not approaching the issue from a conservative perspective, this may be an optimistic moment in the short term, but the public should be cautious about what it really means. First, it can be confidently said that while groups across the political spectrum have strongly opposed this bill, not all groups share the same reasons for opposing it. Many right wing organizations regard the bill as a barrier to the continued normalization of genuinely hateful and discriminatory rhetoric and acts in Canada - something that should be opposed alongside increasing police powers. Second, there are likely a variety of external factors that have influenced the government to hit pause on Bill C-9's progress, and they don't necessarily indicate that the government will abandon this project instead of simply delaying it until a better time to push it through.

What are those factors? First, the so-called "ceasefire" in Gaza and advancement of negotiations through Trump's Board of Peace have not stopped the constant IDF violence in Gaza nor have they led to any significant improvement in the living conditions of the average Palestinian in Gaza, but *the war on Gaza is no longer framed as an active conflict in mainstream media*. This has led to a temperature reduction in public protests and opposition over Canada's continued ties to Israel. The core movement of Palestine solidarity continues, but it is not currently at the forefront of the media cycle or public consciousness. This reduces the

[1] "Hate Crimes Bill C-9 on Hold Following Strong Opposition From CCF," News, *Canadian Constitution Foundation*, January 26, 2026, https://theccf.ca/hate-crimes-bill-c-9-on-hold-following-strong-opposition-from-ccf/; Quinton Amundson, "Hate Speech Bill C-9 Delayed," *The Catholic Register*, January 27, 2026, https://www.catholicregister.org/item/3348-hate-speech-bill-c-9-delayed; Stephanie Taylor, "Liberals and Conservatives Vote to Prioritize Bail Bill over Study on Controversial Hate Crimes Law," *National Post*, January 26, 2026, https://nationalpost.com/news/politics/liberals-and-conservatives-vote-to-prioritize-bail-bill-over-study-on-controversial-hate-crimes-law.

immediate need for the Canadian government to look proactive in defending Zionist interests in Canada. Second, the media focus has shifted to Iran's recent protests and controversy over American and Israeli intelligence and militarry intervention in the country, and more importantly to the increase in violence by American ICE and Border Patrol operations in Minneapolis.

The world's attention has been turned to the brutality of American immigration policing under the Trump government. Everyone has seen the extrajudicial public executions of Renée Good and Alex Pretti by ICE and Border Patrol agents amid the broad mobilization of public protests against ICE operations in Minneapolis-Saint Paul. While this is far from the first time that the public has seen American law enforcement kill innocent people in cold blood, the difference here is not only that both of the victims are white, but also that the Trump administration officials responsible for directing ICE operations have defended the killings in a blatant attempt to portray them as a justified patriotic political crusade against "leftwing insurrectionists" and "domestic terrorrists." This very public step up in the rhetoric and action of the Trump administration's war against dissent has created a massive PR fiasco. As of January 26th, Greg Bovino, the Nazi-reminiscent-greatcoat wearing operational commander of Border Control and face of the current ICE operations in Mineapolis has been fired from his job.[2] That means first and foremost that the Trump administration is in major damage control mode and trying to walk back the escalation in publicly visible violence.

Just six days earlier, on January 20th in Davos, Switzerland, Mark Carney gave a speech in which he positioned Canada to the world as a "middle power" that was separating itself economically from the United States AND as a fairer, more just, and more predictable political and economic alternative to the USA.[3] While it had a progressive spin, Carney's speech was really about protecting the economic interests of Canadian big business amid global unceraintly and hostitility from the Trump administration. Nonetheless, Carney and the Canadian government cannot politically afford to follow such a global presentation of a progressive approach with controversy over repressive laws targeting protesters at home. Right now Bill C-9 is too politically costly to push forward. It may continue to be too costly in the near future but that could change at any time.

---

[2] Nick Miroff, "Greg Bovino Loses His Job," The Atlantic, January 26, 2026, https://www.theatlantic.com/politics/2026/01/greg-bovino-demoted-minneapolis-border-patrol/685770/.
[3] "Davos 2026: Special Address by Mark Carney, PM of Canada," World Economic Forum, January 20, 2026, https://www.weforum.org/stories/2026/01/davos-2026-special-address-by-mark-carney-prime-minister-of-canada/.

It would be jumping the gun to anticipate that the current delay to Bill C-9's legislative passage will result in the bill being outright abandoned. Is it a possibility? Yes - but no one should count on it. The chaotic state of international relations that have been influencing Canadian domestic politics for the past few years is not becoming more stable or predictable. The United States and Israel remain ready for kinetic war with Iran at any time, Israel continues its military campaigns in Palestine and surrounding countries, with neighbours such as Syria erupting once again into internal conflict backed by the interests of regional and international powers. Diplomatic and economic relations between countries in the NATO sphere are more tense and unpredicatble than they have ever been. The Canadian state is on a defensive footing, anticipating future conflicts, and states on the defence generally just tolerate less public dissent as a matter of national strategy.

We don't know what the near future will bring but Carney's government has certainly not abandoned its Zionist commitments. Even if Bill C-9 gets thrown out of parliament and abandoned, the government will likely seek less publicly visible means to achieve the same policing objectives of cracking down on protests. There are existing laws against protesters on the books already and police can be instructed to get serious about heavily enforcing them without any need for a large and controversial law project like Bill C-9. Bill C-9 is ultimately a blueprint of the Carney government's concerns and priorities over managing public political engagement - the methods may change for addressing those priorities but the priorities will likely remain the same.

Understanding Bill C-9:

In September 2025, The federal government introduced Bill C-9, known as the Combatting Hate Act, to the House of Commons. The full title of the bill is *An Act to amend the Criminal Code (hate propaganda, hate crime and access to religious or cultural places)*.[4] This bill proposes amendments to the Canadian *Criminal Code* that provide new charges and powers for Canadian police departments and crown prosecutors to use to address hate crimes.

The bill, a campaign promise from Carney, is the federal government's attempt to appear proactive against the increase in political tensions amongst members of the public – particularly since the October 7th, 2023 attack on Israel by Hamas and the subsequent genocidal campaign of the Israel Defence Forces against the Palestinians of the Gaza strip. The publically heated issue of Zionism and Palestinian liberation is not the only context for the introduction of this bill - it also comes in the wake of the 2022 'Freedom Convoy' that occupied Ottawa streets protesting against vaccine mandates, and the increase in overt far-right politics across North America.

The main problem for the Canadian state that this bill hopes to address is undoubtedly the problem of mass mobilization across Canada by pro-Palestine, anti-Zionist members of the public. Like university administrations, the Canadian state has been under pressure from Zionist organizations to crack down on these mass protests. Bill C-9 attempts to respond to this pressure by expanding the provisions in the Canadian *Criminal Code* that allow for the criminalization of certain types of public activity including the display of symbols and the act of protesting in public spaces like religious institutions and educational institutions.

Bill C-9 summarizes its contents as follows:

"This enactment amends the *Criminal Code* to, among other things,

(a) repeal the requirement that the Attorney General consent to the institution of proceedings for hate propaganda offences;

(b) create an offence of wilfully promoting hatred against any identifiable group by displaying certain symbols in a public place;

(c) create a hate crime offence of committing an offence under that Act or any other Act of Parliament that is motivated by hatred based on certain factors;

[4] Bill C-9, *An Act to amend the Criminal Code (hate propaganda, hate crime and access to religious or cultural places)*, 1st sess., 45th Parliament, 2025. https://www.parl.ca/DocumentViewer/en/45-1/bill/C-9/first-reading

> **(d)** create an offence of intimidating a person in order to impede them from accessing certain places that are primarily used for religious worship or by an identifiable group for certain purposes; and
>
> **(e)** create an offence of intentionally obstructing or interfering with a person's lawful access to such places."[5]

Even with such a short summary, the legal language of the Bill, both overly vague and legally specific, can be difficult to interpret. A full and comprehensive breakdown of the legislation and the parts of the *Criminal Code* that it refers to and amends is included in this report as Appendix B. This breakdown is recommended reading for anyone who worries that they may be affected by the implementation of this bill.

To understand what Bill C-9 hopes to accomplish, first the language of the bill and its provisions need to be understood, and then they need to be placed in their wider political context.

What Bill C-9 Aims to Change:

Overall Bill C-9 mostly duplicates or strengthens existing laws, making small but signficant changes that hope to promote proactive and frequent enforcement of hate crime laws and laws against protesters. A first key difference introduced by Bill C-9 would add new and separate hate crime charges that could go on someone's criminal record to the *Criminal Code*. Apart from hate propaganda charges (a specific and limited category) current hate crime provisions of the *Criminal Code* only specify that court justices should take hate motivation into account when making decisions on the severity of sentencing for a given crime – for example, assault. If the assault is found to be motivated by hatred this increases the sentence for the crime, but the designation of a "hate crime" motivation for the assault does not appear on the convicted person's criminal record. Bill C-9 hopes to change that by creating new separate hate crime charges that could be added to existing offence charges and that would indeed appear on an individual's criminal record. Because hate motivation is currently taken into account during trial proceedings and not in the initial charges pressed by police, the Canadian Civil Liberties Association has expressed concern that Bill C-9 would lead to police making decisions about possible hate motivation rather than the courts, leading to more frequent misapplication of hate crime charges. They also note that "the new hate crime provision also drastically increases the

[5] *Combatting Hate Act*, ii.

maximum sentence associated with all offences in Canada, if motivated by hatred. In most cases, it doubles the maximum term of imprisonment, and also increases 14-year maximum sentences to life imprisonment."[6]

Other changes proposed by Bill C-9 such as the replacement of mischief charges at religious institutions, schools, and other public places with new charges of intimidation and obstruction are technical legal modifications that strengthen existing laws to provide extra power to the police and to the judiciary. These extra powers include the ability to collect certain kinds of information or impose pre-trial conditions on the person charged, like obtaining DNA samples from the accused or orderingrestrictions on movement and monitoring by electronic surveillance for the accused until the end of trial proceedings. These changes can best be interpreted as providing the state with more powers for intelligence gathering on people suspected of hate-related criminal political activity. It would be easier to keep records on such people to identify them in relation to each other, to collect information on them and to be able to limit their freedom of movement and action before a conviction is even secured in the courts. Considering that this bill has been targeted towards Palestine solidarity protesters those are serious changes.

A final major change proposed by Bill C-9 is the elimination of the requirement that police obtain Attorney General consent to press hate crime charges. In existing Canadian criminal law, for police to charge someone with a hate offence such as "advocating genocide," or "public incitement of hatred," the case for the charges must be presented to the provincial Attorney General who must then formally sign their consent to approve the charges before they can be pressed against the individual in question.

The removal of the Attorney General consent requirement is controversial. Bill C-9 intends that removing this requirement would speed up the process of pressing hate crime charges, removing bureaucratic barriers and encouraging police to more frequently enforce the law. On the other hand, the need for Attorney General consent is viewed as an important safeguard against possible so-called 'frivolous' applications of hate crime law (frivolous applications can be interpreted as entailing both genuinely unserious attempts to lay charges or the attempt to lay charges that contradict the ideological position of the Canadian government

[6] Anaïs Bussières McNicoll et al., "Submission to the Standing Committee on Justice and Human Rights Regarding Bill C-9," Brief to the House standing Committee on Justice and Human Rights, October 21, 2025, https://www.ourcommons.ca/Content/Committee/451/JUST/Brief/BR13696025/br-external/CanadianCivilLibertiesAssociation-e.pdf.

and law enforcement agencies). Bill C-9 will likely be amended so that the Attorney General consent requirement is repealed for charges laid by police but not for charges laid by members of the public in private prosecutions (this technical distinction is explained in detail in Appendix D). If such an amendment were made, police officers could press hate crime charges much more frequently but the application of hate crime charges would be kept in line with the political positions and allegiances of law enforcement.

The Political Context Influencing Bill C-9 and Its Potential Applications:

The introduction of Bill C-9 has provoked responses from across the political spectrum and many different parts of Canadian society. The strongest opposition has come from both civil rights organizations and from right wing free speech organizations and Christian religious organizations. The strongest support for the bill and the political context most likely to influence the passage of the bill comes from Canadian Zionist organizations. Zionist organizations coordinated through CIJA, the Centre for Israel and Jewish Affairs (CIJA) have continued to press strongly for the passage of the bill.[7]

The matter of Attorney General consent, a bureaucratic process that slows down the pressing of hate crime charges, gets to the heart of the main problem that concerns Zionist groups like CIJA: *enforcement*. Hate crime laws already exist, but many pro Bill C-9 Canadians feel that they are not sufficiently enforced and not enforced in the right ways.

A recent CIJA panel discussion briefed the organization's members on Bill C-9 and the development of a coordinated response to the proposed legislation by Canadian Zionist organizations. The panel of Zionist legal experts all agreed that the main problem with current hate crime laws in Canada is not that there isn't sufficient legislation in place to criminalize hatred but that the existing criminal law is not, in their opinions, being appropriately and sufficiently frequently enforced.[8]

---

[7] "Ahead of the Return of Parliament, Jewish Organizations Urge MPs to Strengthen and Pass Bill C-9," CIJA - The Centre for Israel and Jewish Affairs, accessed January 27, 2026, https://www.cija.ca/ahead_of_the_return_of_parliament_jewish_organizations_urge_mps_to_strengthen_and_pass_bill_c_9.

[8] *Community Briefing: Making Sense of Canada's Combatting Hate Act (Bill C-9)*. With the Centre for Israel and Jewish Affairs, Alliance of Canadians Combatting Antisemitism, Lawyers Combating Antisemitism, and Canadian Jewish Law Association. 2025. https://www.cija.ca/community_briefing_making_sense_of_canadas_combatting_hate_act_bill_c9.

They further say that the primary way that they hope to combat lack of enforcement is by educating police officers and crown prosecutors on existing laws and how to identify the difference between speech and action that is protected by the *Charter of Rights and Freedoms* and criminal hate. This education of police and crown prosecutors done by Canadian Zionist lawyers like Mark Sandler and Rochelle Direnfield (two members of the CIJA panel) is ideological education with the specific goal of teaching employees of the Canadian justice system that strong speech against Zionists and Zionism should be considered antisemitism. — Here it is worth saying that there is undoubtedly historical and contemporary anti-semitic use of the terms Zionists and Zionism as 'dogwhistles' or euphemisms for Jews and Judaism. But, the fact that such antisemitic use of the language does exist should not be a justification for blanket criminalization of genuine and principled political opposition to Zionism and the state of Israel as a settler colonial project. —

It should be noted that despite their assertion that enforcement and not lack of legislation is the real problem, the CIJA panel nonetheless supports the passage of Bill C-9 although they are hoping for several amendments to the bill (discussed comprehensively in Appendix D). They also emphasize that Bill C-9 does not, in their opinions, remove the need to press for "bubble legislation" at the provincial and municipal level that would pre-emptively ban (rather than just provide tools for pressing criminal charges) public protests around places like schools and religious institutions. In other words, Bill C-9 is only one part of a broader strategy aimed at suppressing antizionist mobilization. The goal is to continue to entrench and expand the repression of solidarity with Palestine and to make sure that any public opposition to Zionism is increasingly criminalized.

Bill C-9 In Practice: Real and Symbolic Repression

The real question to be asked by students and other members of the university community is *how is this bill likely to actually play out if it is passed into law.* To answer that question it is important to understand that the effects of Bill C-9 are intended to be both real *and* symbolic in terms of limiting public protest.

The effects are intended to be real in that the legislation provides very real tools that would be used by the state to criminalize certain protest actions. On the other hand, the effects are intended to be symbolic, deterring protests by intimidating people with the threat of increased penalties.

On the symbolic side, it is necessary to emphasize that much of what would be criminalized by Bill C-9 is already illegal in Canada's existing *Criminal Code*. The legislation is intended to scare people into not engaging in public protest by increasing public awareness of possible legal consequences. It is easier for the state to have a public that does not engage in public protest because people are afraid of the numerous and complicated possible charges that they might face than it is to actually have to prosecute each person that breaks these laws.

The new charges are also meant to be symbolic in the sense that, despite pre-existing articles of the *Criminal Code* that criminalize many of the same actions, the Federal government will be able to point to Bill C-9 when confronted by concerned parties as a way of saying, "Hey look, we are taking action!"

To understand the real repression entailed in Bill C-9 it is necessary to understand how hate crime accusations have already been used to suppress protests in Canada. The best example for understanding this is the 2023 case of 11 individuals from Toronto who were charged with criminal mischief and suspected hate motivations for protesting against the CEO of Indigo Books' personal financial support for the Israel Defence Forces. The charges were ultimately dropped for many of the individuals arrested, but despite this, they faced massive repercussions even without convictions.

Several of these individuals submitted a briefing to the House of Commons Committee on Justice and Human Rights, the internal body of the House that is currently reviewing Bill C-9 and hearing feedback and recommendations from members of the public.

In their own words here is the case that these individuals have made to the committee, explaining how hate crime accusations were used against them:

> "The Bill proposes to amend the Criminal Code in various ways, including making hate motivated crime a specific offence; and streamlining the process for prosecuting hate crimes by removing the requirement for Attorney General consent for laying hate propaganda charges. The process for prosecuting hate crimes does not require streamlining, it requires more checks and balances. As MP Roman Baber stated during debate in the House of Commons, this Bill 'could be weaponized against every Canadian'.
>
> In our case, we were accused of being "hate motivated", because posters and red paint calling for an end to genocide were stuck on the window of an Indigo Bookstore. Indigo's CEO has long funded volunteers to Israel's Defense Force. She is Jewish. It was argued that we had intentionally selected the date of this political protest to coincide with the anniversary of the Kristallnacht, the landmark pogrom against Jews in Nazi Germany. Despite the unfortunate fact, that date is not well known in Canada, even within the Jewish community.

> In response, over seventy police officers broke down the doors of nine homes at 5 am, terrifying us, our parents, our children and our community. The police broadcast the news that we were suspected of a hate crime. The newspapers showed our photos and discussed our identities. Some of us lost our jobs, many others were suspended. We received death threats, and some of us moved out of our homes.
>
> This happened because 'hate motivation' is difficult to determine, and vulnerable to moral panics and political biases. The police used the language of hate throughout their media release, although the Crown never attempted to justify that brand. Indeed, the language of hate motivation became its own form of unaccountable punishment. We fear that such operations will happen more frequently if the process is made easier.
>
> We were perceived as guilty before we had any date in court. We agree with Anaïs Bussières McNicoll, Director of the Fundamental Freedoms program at the Canadian Civil Liberties Association, who argues that 'The new hate crime offence risks stigmatizing defendants throughout the entire judicial process, while they are still presumed innocent. The sentencing judge should continue to be responsible for labeling a defendant's motivations and weighing their aggravating impact on sentencing, once a defendant has been found guilty of a criminal offence and all relevant evidence has been heard'".[9]

This case is a critically important example for understanding how Bill C-9 would be enforced going forwards. It is likely that when people protest in good faith for genuine political objectives of justice they are likely to find that hate crime charges are unenforcable in court. Unless major changes to the Canadian state's legislative, executive, and judicial systems take place in the near future, the actual charges that this bill attempts to write into the *Criminal Code* will be subject to the limits of the Canadian constitution (the 1982 *Charter of Rights and Freedoms*) which has significant provisions on the right to freedom of expression and freedom of speech. Additionally, all charges will be subject to the burden of proof in court. Especially in the case of mass protests where charges may be laid against dozens or hundreds of people at any one time, this remains a significant barrier to conviction. Police and crown prosecutors actually need to prove motivation, intention, and responsibility for action in each case.

On the other hand, charges of intimidation and obstruction for protesting in places like university campuses are likely to be easier to enforce and they would likely be more frequently pressed than current mischief charges. It also may be the case that police use mass application of charges as a tactic even if the charges are later dropped. Regardless, the example of the

[9] Sharmeen Khan, Dr. Suzanne Narain, Dr. Stuart Schussler, Macdonald Scott, and Professor Lesley Wood. "Submission to the Standing Committee on Justice and Human Rights Re: Bill C-9." Brief to the House Standing Committee on Justice and Human Rights. October 29, 2025. https://www.ourcommons.ca/Content/Committee/451/JUST/Brief/BR13719261/br-external/Jointly02-e.pdf.

Indigo 11 shows how much just being charged with a crime for protesting in the first place can have extreme consequences.

Could there be changes to the judicial system that make convicting protestors of hate crime charges easier and more frequent for the Canadian state? It is possible. The Canadian state has made major recent changes to the way that immigration and refugee law is enforced, for instance, massively streamlining deportation proceedings.[10] On the other hand, such changes to the way that Canadian citizens are treated by the justice system would likely be resisted by large and powerful interest groups within society including those from the far-right wing with libertarian viewpoints, similarly to American free speech organizations defending the first amendment. Sadly, few large and powerful interest groups tend to defend the rights of refugees and immigrants, but a wider array of society with different political views and affiliations is likely to challenge major changes to the application of Canadian law to the freedom of speech and expression of Canadian citizens. Any change to this current status quo would likely be provoked by geopolitical changes on a dramatic scale - it is possible that this will happen, but it is impossible to predict.

What to Take Away from This Report:

- There are always risks to protesting. These risks will undoubtedly increase with the passage of Bill C-9 but it is worth remembering that the passage of such a law is meant to deter action by threatening criminal charges that may not stand up in court. Protesters may find themselves more frequently charged with crimes even if they are not subsequently convicted of them. Even if Bill C-9 does not become law, there is likely to be increased enforcement of existing laws that enable the criminalization of public protest.
- The struggle over legal and political norms in Canada represented by Bill C-9 is ultimately more politically determined than it is legally determined. The application of law is influenceable and changes are possible through public pressure. Just as Zionist organizations have been mounting pressure campaigns to ensure that the Canadian state universally adopts the policy that Anti-Zionist political positions are inherently reflective of

[10] Zena Olijnyk. “Legal Experts Warn Proposed Immigration Bill Marks Shift Away from Rule of Law.” *Canadian Lawyer*, December 16, 2025. https://www.canadianlawyermag.com/practice-areas/immigration/legal-experts-warn-proposed-immigration-bill-marks-shift-away-from-rule-of-law/393520.

Anti-Semitic hatred, it remains possible to fight a political battle against Zionism, against unjust political repression of solidarity with Palestine and to win real gains for Palestinian justice and liberation.

Appendix A: Summary of the Legislative Process

On September 19th, 2025 Sean Fraser, the Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada for the Liberal government introduced Bill C-9 to the House of Commons. At the time that this report was authored, Bill C-9, “An Act to amend the Criminal Code (hate propaganda, hate crime and access to religious or cultural places)” has completed the second reading stage of the legislative consideration process.

The bill is now being considered by the House Standing Committee on Justice and Human Rights (known as JUST), where members of the public, civil society organizations, and non-legislative state bodies (police organizations, ombudspersons etc.) are invited to submit briefs responding to the proposed legislation and give testimony before the committee. JUST was chaired by Liberal MP Marc Miller, former federal Minister of Immigration under Justin Trudeau, but as of December 2, 2025 Miller was called to become Minister of Canadian Identity, Culture, and Official Languages during a cabinet reshuffle and has been replaced by federal Liberal MP James Maloney. Of note to the political content of Bill C-9 is the fact that Maloney is a member of the Canada-Israel Interparliamentary Group (CAIL) and the Canada NATO Parliamentary Associaton, demonstrating his political commitments to NATO national security policy and to Zionism. In fact, only three out of the 10 MPs on the Standing Committee on Justice and Human Rights are NOT members of the Canada-Israel Interparliamentary Group. The committee includes three members who are on the executive of the Canada-Israel Interparliamentary Group including Anthony Housefather (Liberal), the CAIL Chair, Roman Baber (Conservative) CAIL Vice-Chair, and Rhéal Éloi Fortin (Bloc Québécois) CAIL executive committee member and member of the National Security and Intelligence Committee of Parliamentarians. There are no NDP or Green Party members of the JUST standing committee.

The JUST committee must produce a report that studies the bill clause by clause and recommends amendments based on the public briefs and testimonies. Their report will be sent back to the main house to be read and debated during which time further amendments may be made to the wording of the bill before it is put to a vote in the house. If it passes in the house it must proceed to the senate for a further three rounds of reading and debate before being granted royal assent by the governor general. The time frame for this entire process can vary, but just as an example, Bill C-3, *An Act to amend the Citizenship Act*, one of the Liberal government’s most recent bills was first read in the House of Commons on June 5, 2025 and

received royal assent on November 20, 2025. This time frame included the House of Commons' summer closure period from June 20th- September 15th, so there was no debate on Bill C-3 between June 5th and September 22nd. The bill took approximately three months of actual legislation time. The House of Commons closes for a winter break from December 12, 2025 until January 26, 2025 suggesting that unless the process is suddenly rushed to pass before the winter closure, Bill C-9 could complete the legislative process in February of 2026.

Appendix B: Comprehensive Breakdown of the Content of Bill C-9

For anyone interested in a full picture of the proposed laws put forward by the bill, a careful close reading alongside the sections of the Canadian *Criminal Code* that are referenced and amended by Bill C-9.

Bill C-9 summarizes its contents as follows

"This enactment amends the *Criminal Code* to, among other things,

(a) repeal the requirement that the Attorney General consent to the institution of proceedings for hate propaganda offences;

(b) create an offence of wilfully promoting hatred against any identifiable group by displaying certain symbols in a public place;

(c) create a hate crime offence of committing an offence under that Act or any other Act of Parliament that is motivated by hatred based on certain factors;

(d) create an offence of intimidating a person in order to impede them from accessing certain places that are primarily used for religious worship or by an identifiable group for certain purposes; and

(e) create an offence of intentionally obstructing or interfering with a person's lawful access to such places."[11]

*"**(a)** repeal the requirement that the Attorney General consent to the institution of proceedings for hate propaganda offences;" refers to the article of Bill C-9 stating that "Subsection 318(3) of the Act [the Criminal Code] is repealed."*[12] In Section 318 of the *Criminal Code* on Hate Propaganda offences, subsection 318(3) states that "No proceeding for an offence under this section shall be instituted without the consent of the Attorney General."[13] This provision of the *Criminal Code* has required that for any Canadian to be prosecuted for a Hate Propaganda offence, the consent of the Attorney General (of the province where the criminal case would proceed) to give written consent for the charges to move forward in the justice system. This provision has been in place to act as a safeguard against inappropriate applications of the law and, given the seriousness of charges of hate propaganda, to ensure that such charges are only pressed in cases where they are truly warranted. The repeal of this provision is proposed in Bill C-9 with the justification that removing the necessity of the Attorney

[11] *Combatting Hate Act*, ii.
[12] *Combatting Hate Act*, 1.
[13] *Criminal Code* (R.S.C., 1985, c. C-45), 318(3). https://laws-lois.justice.gc.ca/eng/acts/C-46/FullText.html

General's consent for hate propaganda proceedings will remove a bureaucratic barrier to the enforcement of hate propaganda laws. In other words, this repeal intends to make it easier for the state to charge people with and prosecute them for violations of the hate propaganda laws. The idea is therefore that police would be given the liberty to press hate propaganda charges without having to seek official approval from the highest provincial prosecutor first, leading to more frequent applications of hate propaganda charges and therefore greater enforcement of the laws on the books. This would also open the door to more frequent private prosecution where an individual not affiliated with law enforcement can make a case to the police or court system that someone should be tried for a particular crime. Privately initiated prosecutions for hate propaganda offences would also not require prior approval of the charges by the attorney general, increasing the frequency at which this mechanism could be used. Various interest groups across the political spectrum oppose this provision of Bill C-9 or wish to see it heavily modified, either through a mandated speeding up of the existing process of Attorney General approval or through limiting necessary approval only to private prosecutions and therefore ensuring that private citizens couldn't press hate propaganda charges without approval but police could.

"***(b)*** *create an offence of wilfully promoting hatred against any identifiable group by displaying certain symbols in a public place;*" refers to the section of Bill C-9 that proposes an amendment to section 319 of the *Criminal Code* that includes the crimes of "Public incitement of hatred," "wilful promotion of hatred," and "wilful promotion of antisemitism."[14] Bill C-9 proposes the addition of a crime of "Wilful promotion of hatred - terrorism and hate symbols" which states that "everyone commits an offence who wilfully promotes hatred against any identifiable group by displaying, in any public place, (a) a symbol principally used by, or principally associated with, a *listed entity*, as defined in subsection 83.01(1); (b) the Nazi Hakenkreuz, also known as the Nazi swastika, or the Nazi double Sig-Rune, also known as the SS bolts; or (c) a symbol that so nearly resembles a symbol described in paragraph (a) or (b) that it is likely to be confused with that symbol." This section provides defences against conviction saying that it will not be considered a hate crime "(a) if the display of the symbol was for a legitimate purpose, including… journalism, religion, education or art, that is not contrary to the public interest; or (b) if, in good faith, the display of the symbol was intended to point out, for the purposes of removal, matters producing or tending to produce feelings of hatred toward an identifiable group in

[14] *Criminal Code*, 319.

Canada."[15] In the Canadian *Criminal Code*, an "identifiable group" is defined as "any section of the public distinguished by colour, race, religion, national or ethnic origin, age, sex, sexual orientation, gender identity or expression, or mental or physical disability."[16] A "listed entity" refers to any organization placed on the Canadian list of "terrorist" organizations.[17] Concerns from the public interest groups on this provision of Bill C-9 focus on the intense vagueness of the definition of "a symbol that so nearly resembles a symbol… that it is likely to be confused with that symbol." This could mean anything and would likely lead to police being afforded the discretion to arrest people and press charges in inappropriate cases. The other concern from civil liberties organizations focuses on the political nature of the Canadian terror organization list. Muslim and Palestinian organizations are disproportionately represented on the list and if a genuine hate group isn't listed then there is no legal recourse for the display of their symbols.

"*(c)* *create a hate crime offence of committing an offence under that Act or any other Act of Parliament that is motivated by hatred based on certain factors;*" This section refers to a proposed amendment of Section 320.1 of the *Criminal Code* which would change the way that hate motivation is treated in Canadian law. Essentially, in currently existing Canadian criminal law, apart from the specific charges of Hate Propaganda there has been no category of "hate crimes" with which someone can be charged. If, for instance, someone was charged with the crime of assault and they were found to have been motivated by hatred, they would not be charged with a "hate crime" rather they would still be charged with assault and the motivation of hatred would be considered by the court proceedings during sentencing usually resulting in the application of a harsher sentence to account for the hate motivation. Bill C-9 now proposes a new crime entitled "Offence motivated by hatred" specifying that "Everyone who commits an offence… under this Act or any other Act of Parliament, if the commission of the included offence is motivated by hatred based on race, national or ethnic origin, language, colour, religion, sex, age, mental, or physical disability, sexual orientation or gender identity or expression, is (a) guilty of an indictable offence and liable to the punishment provided for… or (b) guilty of an offence punishable on summary conviction"[18] In other words, instead of motivation of hatred being solely considered during the sentencing for the convicted crime, the

[15] *Combatting Hate Act*, 2.
[16] *Criminal Code*, 318(4).
[17] *Criminal Code*, 83.05.
[18] *Combatting Hate Act*, 3.

person found guilty of that crime would now also be charged with the separate crime of "offence motivated by hatred" accompanied by a new maximum penalty requiring their imprisonment for the maximum length of time possible under the original conviction. With these new charges, police would also have to make the decision that they assume hate motivation for a crime in order to press the charge, making that evaluation before the presentation of any evidence in court thus increasing likelihood of the misapplication of hate crime charges. The Canadian Civil Liberties Association (CCLA) argues that this change opens the door to the frequent misuse and abuse of hate motivation charges with serious consequences because according to Bill C-9, for many crimes adding a hate charge "doubles the maximum term of imprisonment."[19]

*"**(d)** create an offence of intimidating a person in order to impede them from accessing certain places that are primarily used for religious worship or by an identifiable group for certain purposes; and **(e)** create an offence of intentionally obstructing or interfering with a person's lawful access to such places."* refers to a section of Bill C-9 that proposes extending the applicability of existing crime categories of "intimidation" and "obstruction or interference with access" to the new category of "building used for religious worship, etc." Existing intimidation offences and obstruction offences in section 423 of the *Criminal Code* are limited to the "intimidation of a justice system participant or a journalist" and the "intimidation – health services" and "obstruction or interference with access" again in relation to health services. The category of "intimidation – health services" along with health services specific obstruction charges were added to the criminal code in 2022 specifically to protect healthcare workers from harassment during Covid-19 anti-vaccination protests. This legal framework is now being expanded to apply to other common gathering spaces. The new offences added to this section read as follows

> "**Intimidation — building used for religious worship, etc.**
>
> **423.3 (1)** Every person commits an offence who engages in any conduct with the intent to provoke a state of fear in a person in order to impede their access to

[19] Anaïs Bussières McNicoll et al., "Submission to the Standing Committee on Justice and Human Rights Regarding Bill C-9," Brief to the House standing Committee on Justice and Human Rights, October 21, 2025, 8-9. https://www.ourcommons.ca/Content/Committee/451/JUST/Brief/BR13696025/br-external/CanadianCivilLibertiesAssociation-e.pdf.

(a) a building or structure, or part of a building or structure, that is primarily used

(i) for religious worship, or

(ii) by an identifiable group, as defined in subsection 318(4),

(A) for administrative, social, cultural or sports activities or events,

(B) as an educational institution, including a daycare centre, or

(C) as a residence for seniors; or

(b) a cemetery.

Obstruction or interference with access (2)

Every person commits an offence who, without lawful authority, intentionally obstructs or interferes with another person's lawful access to a building or structure, or part of a building or structure, referred to in paragraph (1)(a) or to a cemetery."[20]

The bill then clarifies that there will be an exception to this law, specifically stating that

"No person is guilty of an offence unders subsection (2) by reason only that they attend at or near, or approach, a building or structure referred to in paragraph (1)(a) or a cemetery for the purpose only of obtaining or communicating information."

This final section of the bill also repeals the criminal charge category of "Mischief relating to religious property, educational institutions, etc." This section of the *Criminal Code* makes it a crime to destroy or damage property, and to obstruct, interrupt, or interfere with the use of that property and is a specific charge for hate motivated mischief aimed at gathering places.[21] The language included in the definition of the existing mischief charge that Bill C-9 proposes to repeal already protects the same place categories as proposed in the new intimidation and obstruction charges. The duplication of the old law in a new set of charges necessitates asking the question: why get rid of these mischief convictions and replace them with intimidation and obstruction? There is perhaps an answer in the next provisions of the Bill C-9 - provisions that may easily be overlooked as they introduce no new crimes or procedures, only modifying existing ones. Sections 8, 9(1) and 9(2) of Bill C-9 ensure that the new criminal charges of

[20] *Combatting Hate Act*, 5.
[21] *Criminal Code*, 430 (4.1), (4.101).

"intidmidation – building used for religious worship, etc." and obstruction of the same places would be included in *Criminal Code* provisions that grant special prosecutory powers to the Crown. This includes sections **487.04** adding this new category of intimidation to criminal categories for which it is possible to request a warrant to take a DNA sample for forensic DNA analysis. It also modifies sections of the *Criminal Code* regarding interim release or 'bail' where the accused can leave police custody for the duration of their trial proceedings. Bill C-9 would add the new intimidation and obstruction charges to section 515(4.1) that mandates that a judge prohibit the possession of firearms and other prohibited weapons and section 515(4.3) that allows a judge to impose bail conditions including

> **"(a)** that the accused abstain from communicating, directly or indirectly, with any victim, witness or other person identified in the order, except in accordance with any specified conditions that the justice considers necessary;
>
> **(a.1)** that the accused abstain from going to any place or entering any geographic area specified in the order, except in accordance with any specified conditions that the justice considers necessary;
>
> **(a.2)** that the accused wear an electronic monitoring device, if the Attorney General makes the request; or
>
> **(b)** that the accused comply with any other condition specified in the order that the justice considers necessary to ensure the safety and security of those persons." [underline added here for emphasis].

The crime of Mischief relating to religious property, educational institutions, etc. is already a serious criminal charge in the Canadian system that is punishable with jail time of up to 10 years depending on the severity of the crime, *but the mischief charge does not give the crown these additional prosecutory powers included in the new intimidation and obstruction charges that would facilitate the crown to mandate the collection of surveillance on and the restriction of the movement and activity of the persons charged before a guilty verdict is established in court.* The intimidation charge also makes a dangerous legal framing that impinges on free speech and the right to freedom of expression. The charge criminalizes "intending to provoke fear" - something which is arbitrary and difficult to measure and which can only be proven in court. Police could use the justification that a protest makes someone scared or uncomfortable to arrest peaceful protesters. According to the Canadian Civil Liberties Assocation, that's a huge problem because it is "likely to lead to arbitrary enforcement by the police, particularly in the context of protests." The CCLA emphasizes that "the fact that a protest creates an uncomfortable experience for

some does not cause it to lose its peaceful nature, let alone its constitutional protection."[22] The arbitrary nature of how this charge could be enforced and the fact that the charge of intimidation comes with additional legal powers to limit the freedoms of the accused and impose surveilance on the accused before a trial has even taken place to establish guilt makes this aspect of Bill C-9 particularly dangerous and particularly consequential for anyone engaging in protest actions.[23]

[22] McNicoll et al., *Submission Regarding Bill C-9*, 3-4.
[23]

Appendix C: Public Responses Opposing Bill C-9 (Suggested Reading)

The most comprehensive recommended reading for a legal opinion on civil liberties and Bill C-9 is the briefing submitted to the House JUST Committee by the Canadian Civil Liberties Association:

McNicoll, Anaïs Bussières, Canadian Civil Liberties Association, and Howard Sapers. "Submission to the Standing Committee on Justice and Human Rights Regarding Bill C-9." Brief to the House standing Committee on Justice and Human Rights. October 21, 2025. https://www.ourcommons.ca/Content/Committee/451/JUST/Brief/BR13696025/br-external/CanadianCivilLibertiesAssociation-e.pdf.

For further reading, see the following three excellent briefs submitted to the House JUST Committee:

IfNotNow Toronto, Independent Jewish Voices, Jewish Faculty Network, Jews Say No to Genocide, and United Jewish People's Order. "Submission to the Standing Committee on Justice and Human Rights Re: Bill C-9." Brief to the House Standing Committee on Justice and Human Rights. October 23, 2025. https://www.ourcommons.ca/Content/Committee/451/JUST/Brief/BR13707636/br-external/Jointly01-e.pdf.

Rita Wong. "Brief Re: Bill C-9." Brief to the House Standing Committee on Justice and Human Rights. November 27, 2025. https://www.ourcommons.ca/Content/Committee/451/JUST/Brief/BR13787639/br-external/WongRita-e.pdf.

Sharmeen Khan, Dr. Suzanne Narain, Dr. Stuart Schussler, Macdonald Scott, and Professor Lesley Wood. "Submission to the Standing Committee on Justice and Human Rights Re: Bill C-9." Brief to the House Standing Committee on Justice and Human Rights. October 29, 2025. https://www.ourcommons.ca/Content/Committee/451/JUST/Brief/BR13719261/br-external/Jointly02-e.pdf.

Appendix D: Zionist Strategies for Bill C-9, Mark Sandler's Seven Recommendations for Amending the *Combatting Hate Act*

On the matter of Israel and Zionism, at least seven zionist groups have submitted briefs to the JUST committee including, the Centre for Israel and Jewish Affairs, Allied Voices for Israel, B'Nai Brith League for Human Rights, the Canadian Jewish Law Association, Canadian Women Against Antisemitism, the Canadian Antisemitism Education Foundation, and the Alliance of Canadians Combatting Antisemitism. Allied Voices for Israel (AVI), a student organization, largely ignores the actual legal framework proposed by Bill C-9, in fact, it is not clear that the authors have read the bill. Their agenda is therefore quite explicit and not couched in legal language and the boundaries of Canadian constitutional jurisprudence. They request that the federal government urge the provinces to have all university faculty members be trained on the IHRA definition of anti-semitism, a definition that explicitly equates opposition to Israel and Zionism with anti-semitism.[24] They also request that the government "must urge provinces to better understand anti-Zionist speech as hate speech contrary to Canada's *Criminal Code*," writing that "the government must help provinces identify that anti-Zionism is antisemitism." They then request that "the government must urge provinces to deliver consequences to radical students and faculty." While they don't propose it as an official recommendation, they also write that

> "To prevent any further harm to both Jewish and non-Jewish students, the Government of Canada must identify tokenized Jewish organizations not representative of the community that actively work in pursuit of Jewish suffering, and deliver just consequences to students and faculty disseminating hateful rhetoric in opposition to Canada's Criminal Code and Student Codes of Conduct."[25]

With this statement they seem to be asking the Federal Government of Canada to identify anti-Zionist Jewish organizations and to specifically include them in the project of criminalizing political opposition to Zionism. If this is the case then they are publicly calling on the government

[24] Allied Voices for Israel, "Submission to the House of Commons Standing Committee on Justice and Human Rights on Combatting Antisemitism (Anti-Jewish Hatred) on Canadian University Campuses," Brief to the House standing Committee on Justice and Human Rights, October 27, 2025, 2 https://www.ourcommons.ca/Content/Committee/451/JUST/Brief/BR13737241/br-external/AlliedVoicesForIsrael-e.pdf; "What Is Antisemitism? | IHRA Working Definition," *IHRA*, accessed December 9, 2025, https://holocaustremembrance.com/resources/working-definition-antisemitism.
[25] "Allied Voices for Israel, "Submission to the House of Commons," 1.

of Canada to criminalize the actions and opinions of Jewish groups that disagree with them on the matter of Israel.

Other zionist organizations working with more advice from legal experts have submitted briefs that instead focus more specifically on the actual language and provisions of Bill C-9's proposed amendments to the *Criminal Code*. In the same way that civil society organizations opposed to the bill like the International Civil Liberties Monitoring Group and the Canadian Civil Liberties Association submitted similar briefs and coordinated their efforts with an open letter,[26] Zionist organizations have collectively brought forward largely the same recommendations. In October of 2025, a group of legal experts discussed this coordinated approach and their recommendations in a community briefing via video seminar hosted by the Centre for Israel and Jewish Affairs.

See:

> *Community Briefing: Making Sense of Canada's Combatting Hate Act (Bill C-9)*. With Centre for Israel and Jewish Affairs, Alliance of Canadians Combatting Antisemitism, Lawyers Combating Antisemitism, and Canadian Jewish Law Association. 2025. https://www.cija.ca/community_briefing_making_sense_of_canadas_combatting_hate_act_bill_c9.

This appendix breaks down the recommendations from Mark Sandler, member of the CIJA community briefing panel, criminal defence lawyer, former National Chair and former Senior Counsel of B'nai Brith, and current chair of the Alliance of Canadians Combatting Antisemitism.[27]

Sandler summarizes his recommendations as follows,

> "**(1)** Support the creation of the new intimidation and obstruction offences"[28]

Sandler and other CIJA affiliated individuals and organizations who have submitted briefs regarding Bill C-9 emphasize on this matter that the new offences proposed in Bill C-9 are "not "bubble legislation" (that is, legislation at the provincial or municipal level designed to prevent

[26] CCLA. "Civil Society Groups Demand Federal Government Rethink Bill C-9." *CCLA*, October 6, 2025. https://ccla.org/press-release/civil-society-groups-demand-federal-government-rethink-bill-c-9/.
[27] *Mark J. Sandler, LL.B., LL.D (Honoris Causa) – Criminal Defence Lawyers*, accessed December 9, 2025, https://criminal-lawyers.ca/mark-j-sandler/.
[28] Mark J. Sandler, "Written Submissions by Mark Sandler on Bill C-9 Standing Committee on Justice and Human Rights," Brief to the House standing Committee on Justice and Human Rights, October 2025, 8 https://www.ourcommons.ca/Content/Committee/451/JUST/Brief/BR13670357/br-external/SandlerMark-e.pdf.

intimidation or obstruction before it takes place, rather than criminalize it after the fact.)"[29] Sandler and CIJA advocate *both* for these proposed new sections of the criminal code to be implemented *and* for municipal and provincial bubble legislation to prohibit protest in the immediate area of certain public spaces. The bubble law model originated with the passing of bans on protest directly outside of abortion clinics to prevent the intimidation and harassment of women seeking abortion care.

> "**(2)** Support the creation of the new hate offence
>
> **(3)** Recommend amendment of the definition of 'hatred' to perfectly align with the Supreme Court of Canada's definition"[30]

This recommendation, echoed by various other parties who also support the implementation of Bill C-9 propposes that the definition of 'hatred' in the bill replicate exactly the definition of hatred decided in the landmark 1990 supreme court case R. v. Keegstra.[31] That definition has already withstood constitutional scrutiny and replicating it exactly in the language of the new law would serve to ensure that no new legal challenges could target the constitutional validity of that definition of hatred.

> "**(4)** Support the creation of a new offence of displaying terror symbols, subject to the amendments proposed in these submissions"[32]

Sandler argues that the language in the provision criminalizing the display of symbols associated with the Nazis or groups listed as terrorist entities by the Canadian state does not go far enough because in order to successfully prosecute someone for having committed the offence, the crown must prove that not only was the symbol displayed, but that its display was specifically motivated by the intent to promote hatred against an identifiable group. Sandler advocates for the simple criminalization of displaying these symbols in public *without the need to prove that their display was motivated by hatred.*

Sandler also proposes amendments to the language that would more clearly prevent possible criminalization of swastika usage by Hindu, Bhuddist, and Jain communities and

[29] Sandler, "Written Submissions on Bill C-9," 1-2.
[30] Sandler, "Written Submissions on Bill C-9," 8.
[31] R. v. Keegstra (Supreme Court of Canada December 13, 1990), https://decisions.scc-csc.ca/scc-csc/scc-csc/en/item/695/index.do.
[32] Sandler, "Written Submissions on Bill C-9," 8.

differentiate it from the hazenkreuz or the nazi version of the swastika that has been rotated 45 degrees.

> "**(5)** Oppose the repeal of s. 430(4.1), the bias, prejudice or hate-motivated mischief offence"[33]

Sandler argues against the repeal of the crime of mischief motivated by bias, prejudice, or hate "relating to religious property, educational institutions, etc." Sandler's argument rests on the fact that proving bias or prejudice in court is easier than proving hatred. The Canadian government, therefore, should not remove a statute of the criminal code that currently enables easier prosecution of the types of crimes that the bill intends to target. Sandler recommends that the mischief charges remain on the books in addition to the new charges of intimidation and obstruction, giving police and crown prosecutors a wider variety of charges that they can press against possible offenders.

> "**(6)** Oppose the removal of the Attorney General's consent requirement or, in the alternative, ensure that the consent requirement is retained only for private prosecutions"[34]

Sandler proposes either eliminating this provision from Bill C-9 altogether or eliminating the Attorney General consent requirement for crown prosecutions but not for private prosecutions. In Canada, usually it is the police who charge someone with a crime. Alternatively, although it is rarely used, it is possible to initiate a prosecution for a crime as a private citizen by applying for approval to do so through the court system and presenting a case that you have "reasonable grounds to believe that another person has committed a criminal offence."[35] In this case a judge must approve your application to initiate the prosecution and the crown prosecution can then at any time take over the prosecution or override any process or decision made in the process of the private prosecution. The Public Prosecution Service of Canada explains that "The right of a citizen to institute a prosecution for a breach of the law has been called 'a valuable constitutional safeguard against inertia or partiality on the part of authority.'"[36] Sandler's opposition to the removal of the Attorney General consent requirement for private prosecutions in particular is explained in the CIJA briefing on Bill C-9 where Sandler stated that "[he]

---

[33] Sandler, "Written Submissions on Bill C-9," 8.
[34] Ibid.
[35] Ontario Court of Justice, "Guide for Applying for a Private Prosecution," accessed December 16, 2025, https://www.ontariocourts.ca/ocj/files/guides/guide-private-prosecution-EN.pdf.
[36] Department of Justice Government of Canada, "5.9 Private Prosecutions - PPSC," September 2, 2014, https://www.ppsc-sppc.gc.ca/eng/pub/fpsd-sfpg/fps-sfp/tpd/p5/ch09.html.

predict[s] that if the attorney general's consent is removed then we're going to see private prosecutions against Zionists attempted… attempted for supporting Israel for allegedly supporting genocide and the like."[37]

(7) Support the creation of the offence of wilful promotion of terror groups/activities"

Sandler writes that

> "Parliament should create a new offence (wilful promotion of terrorism) that addresses extremists who publicly promote terrorist activities or the activities of a terrorist group.
>
> More specifically, such an offence would criminalize the conduct of those who, by communicating statements other than in private conversation, wilfully promote terrorist activities or the activities of a terrorist group….
>
> This offence would focus on promotion of and support for terrorist activities or terrorist groups (already defined in the Criminal Code), rather than requiring a determination of whether that promotion or support is based upon hatred directed against an identifiable group, such as Jews.
>
> This approach would also solve the deficiencies in the current proposed 'display of symbols' offence. *For example, whenever terrorist symbols such as Hamas or Hezbollah flags are displayed, the accused under the proposed legislation, if enacted, will argue that they don't hate Jews, only Zionists. This should be irrelevant if they are displaying symbols to support prohibited terror groups.*" [italics added in this report for emphasis]

[37] *Community Briefing: Making Sense of Canada's Combatting Hate Act (Bill C-9)*, with Centre for Israel and Jewish Affairs et al., 2025, https://www.cija.ca/community_briefing_making_sense_of_canadas_combatting_hate_act_bill_c9.