Youth Policy Research Program

A New Approach to Online Hate Speech in the Great "White" North

Abstract

Social media platforms have exacerbated the proliferation of hate speech in unforeseen ways by offering hateful groups new platforms to spread their ideologies. Because freedom of expression and hate speech are interconnected, policymakers have remained wary of pursuing strong solutions. Canadian lawmakers have tried to pass the "Online Harms Act" in 2024 and, as of 2026, "The Safe Social Media Act." However, neither has passed: the former was forgotten after prorogation, and the latter continues to face scrutiny. The following essay contends that Canadian policymakers must take a mixed-methods approach to Online Hate Speech, balancing regulatory frameworks with the needs and interests of relevant stakeholders and empowering members of targeted communities to counter these claims with their own content or alternative methods. It consists of three parts. First, it details Canada's current political context vis-à-vis online hate speech and the policymaking issues that have arisen. Next, it compares the three predominant methods for addressing online hate speech: regulatory frameworks, self-regulation, and counter-speech. Finally, the essay proposes that Canadian policymakers adopt an alternative mixed-methods approach that combines the strengths of regulatory frameworks with counter-speech, while ensuring victimized bodies inform future policy-making.

Introduction:

Hate speech remains one of the most complex policy issues decision-makers must address. Two competing factions are constantly at odds. Of course, there are prevailing concerns about the detrimental effects that hate speech has on both the targets vilified by it and on unknowing and malleable individuals. Equally strong are concerns about the encroachment on free speech and how regulating hate speech may create a slippery slope. The perennial hate speech debate has only been exacerbated through social media. Social media platforms have provided a new platform for self-expression, one that extends itself to hateful users online. In a context where individuals increasingly use these platforms as their preeminent source of

information, online hate speech has emerged as a relevant and modern policy issue that falls along the same tensions as hate speech.

Canada is no exception to this, with hate speech becoming especially endemic among young users. This essay argues that Canadian policymakers must take a mixed-methods approach to Online Hate Speech, balancing regulatory frameworks with the needs and interests of relevant stakeholders, and empowering members of targeted communities to counter these claims with their own content or alternative methods. The essay strongly warns against allowing social media companies to autonomously govern hate speech on their platforms, especially given their implicit profit motive to keep inflammatory content online. The essay consists of three parts. First, it details Canada's current political context vis-à-vis online hate speech and the policymaking issues that have arisen. Next, it compares the three predominant methods for addressing online hate speech, based on research and practical experience: regulatory frameworks, self-regulation, and counter-speech. Finally, the essay proposes that Canadian policymakers adopt an alternative mixed-methods approach that combines the strengths of regulatory frameworks with counter-speech, while ensuring victimized bodies inform future policy-making.

Background and Issues in Addressing Online Hate Speech Through Policymaking

Insufficient action and policy have contributed to the proliferation of online hate speech across Canadian users. Section 13 of the Canadian Human Rights Act prohibited any "telecommunication that likely exposed a person or persons to hatred or contempt" because they "belonged to minority groups" based on "race, religion, gender, disability, or sexual orientation" (Mohammadi, 2025, p. 2). The Canadian Human Rights Tribunal's 2009 decision in W*arman v.*

Marc Lemiere set a precedent by concluding section 13 “infringed Lemiere’s protected right to freedom of expression.” In 2013, motion 446 removed section 13 from the CHRC, eliminating the only strict regulation against online hate speech (Statistics Canada, 2024, p. 8)

With scant regulation, online hate speech incidents from 2018 to 2022 have increased 138%. Eventually, in 2024, the Online Harms Act proposed “a regulatory regime to hold social services accountable for reducing exposure to harmful content on their platforms” (Government of Canada, 2024). However, in 2025, the government abandoned it after prorogation. Following prorogation, Parliament introduced “Canada’s Action Plan on Combating Hate” to tackle online hate by empowering communities, enhancing research and data collection, and fostering partnerships, but not a regulatory framework (Government of Canada, 2024)

The federal government, especially the Minister of Justice, is responsible for enacting online hate speech legislation and collaborating with parliamentarians, the Canadian Human Rights Commission, and civil society groups like the expert advisory group on online safety. The federal government has openly stated, "Everyone, regardless of their identity, deserves to feel safe in Canada,” making its objective combating “criminal content and the most egregious and reprehensible types of harmful content online” (Government of Canada, 2024, pg.3; Leblanc & Henault, 2021). The federal government’s “Action Plan” suggests it can achieve this by empowering communities to prevent online hate, providing victims with resources, and building trust between victims and agencies combating online hate speech (Government of Canada, 2025, p. 2).

The policymaking process of addressing online hate speech is obscured by several interrelated factors related to socio-political norms and mass expenses. For one, parties often

avoid controversial topics like online hate speech, with statistics showing prospective voters favor less stringent policies (Munzert et al., 2025, p.2). Passing legislation to regulate speech is contentious enough, but adding hate speech could spark turmoil over policymakers' definitions and consequences.

Addressing online hate speech may require a regulatory body, like the proposed Digital Safety Commission. Voters remain wary of expanding bureaucracy, as a Canadian Taxpayers Federation poll suggests 47 percent of Canadians want to reduce the number of federal employees (Terrazzano, 2024). The Online News Act has already alienated social media companies in Canada. Meta has not since “made any deals with the Canadian government,” removing its app's news functions to “avoid paying Canadian media” (Bannerman et al., 2023, p. 8). More regulation risks further escalation and could lead to job losses in related sectors.

Nevertheless, 71% of young Canadians consistently engage with online hate speech, underscoring the need for a solution (Statistics Canada, 2024a, p. 1). This is made worse as victims of hate speech often experience psychological symptoms akin to post-traumatic stress disorder in the form of “pain, fear, anxiety, nightmares, and intrusive thoughts of intimidation and denigration” (Saha et al., 2019, p.4).

Regulatory Framework

A regulatory framework includes a clear definition of hate speech, rules services must follow, and a commission to ensure compliance. A suitable online hate speech definition addresses targets and defines hatred. Inspired by Davidson et al. and Cohen-Almagor, hate speech should be defined as bias-motivated, hostile, and malicious language intended to humiliate, insult, or demean a specific group or its members based on their actual or perceived

characteristics (Pukallus & Arthur, 2024, p. 2). Subsequently, a legal framework must require social media services to mitigate harmful content by creating clear user guidelines and tools for reporting and flagging.

Yet Germany's NETZDG bill shows that platforms should not develop tools independently. When given autonomy, Facebook created an inconspicuous page, resulting in significantly fewer reports of hateful content than its contemporaries (Echikson & Knodt, 2018, p. 9). Thus, social media companies should be required to work with designated government bodies to create mechanisms for reporting and flagging hate speech. NETZDG's two-million-user threshold quota also allowed users to migrate to smaller, unregulated pages (Griffin, 2021, p.10). Therefore, the government should establish a 100,000-user quota to regulate all sites. Finally, a commission should be created to ensure compliance by producing bi-monthly reports on online hate-speech activity and imposing monetary fines of 10% of a company's gross global revenue, since without a baseline fee, companies can avoid punishment.

A stringent regulatory framework, with adequate resources for online monitoring, can shield targets from persistent hate-speech threats. Current regulatory frameworks have been successful, as "Andres and Slivko (2023) show a significant decrease in the intensity and quantity of hate speech on Twitter (now X) after the NetzDG came into effect" (Maaß et al., 2024, p. 2). The volume of hateful tweets and severely toxic tweets decreased by 10% and 8%, respectively (Andres & Slivko, 2021, pp. 20-24). Nevertheless, my proposed enhancements to government-social media collaboration and a reduced quota could address these limitations, further reducing online hate speech and enhancing targeted groups' online security.

Regardless, regulating online hate speech can suppress free speech, the "lifeblood of democracy," as people may refrain from expressing themselves. Without it, problems can "fester and erupt in more dangerous forms" (Gorenc, 2022, p. 418). For instance, Parliament's sanctions against the trucker convoy protesters, perceived as a suppression of free expression, led to increased violence against Ottawans (Miller, 2022). Moreover, India's government leveraged the IT Act's power to restrict content harmful to India's sovereignty, prioritizing restrictions on civil society organizations critical of its actions rather than addressing online hate speech (Sombatpoonsiri & Mahapatra, 2024). India's application of the IT Act demonstrates that federal governments can exploit hate speech regulation to suppress free speech.

Counter-Speech

Rather than a regulatory framework, many experts suggest counter-speech as a feasible alternative. Counter-speech refers to the "dissemination of messages that challenge, rebut, and disavow messages of bigotry and hatred" to expose hate speech as deceitful. By targeting the "underlying causes that drive hate speech" through promoting "inclusive and intercultural dialogue and social plurality," counter-speech allows for freedom of expression rather than suppressing or sanctioning online hate speech (Gorenc, 2022, p.418)

The government can incorporate counter-speech by creating a "diachronic environment" that establishes an epistemic and moral common ground to combat "ignorance-promoting speakers" and entrench essential facts (Donzelli, 2021, p.80). The government can achieve this through public awareness, campaigns, education, and community initiatives. For instance, the Panzagar campaign, a mobilized Burmese civil society group, engaged in "counter-speech" by

adding images of flowers to hate-speech posts to symbolically remind users to reflect before posting, and by using public events to spread awareness (Yi, N.D., p. 1).

Research by Benesch et al. and Hangartner et al. shows that counter-speech techniques that employ empathy consistently lower the volume of xenophobic tweets (Benesch, 2016, p. 30; Hangartner et al., 2021, p.2). Users within the empathy treatment "sent, on average, 1.3 fewer xenophobic tweets and 91.6 fewer total tweets, and were 8.4 percentage points more likely to delete the original xenophobic tweets" (2). Nevertheless, Schafer et al. show that counter-speech can have a "polarizing effect," creating "group conflict" between those who "attack or support a social group," which can accentuate political divides and increase political identification (Schafer et al., 2024, p. 572). Right-wing participants in the study, when exposed to counter-speech, "increased their stereotype thinking," both implicitly and explicitly, against transgender and Chinese people (569). Therefore, counter-speech may exacerbate hateful sentiments and division rather than creating a safe environment.

Granting Social Media Companies Autonomy

Autonomous social media services can impede online hate speech. Social media companies are better suited to mitigating online hate speech. For one, by leveraging their technological and algorithmic expertise, social media companies can deal with online hate speech more efficiently. For instance, in 2017, Facebook's extensive hate-speech policies removed over 66,000 hate-speech posts weekly and 288,000 monthly (Samples, 2019). Moreover, granting social media companies autonomy removes the burden of creating more bureaucracies to monitor services' actions. Social media companies can also adapt their content moderation strategies and bypass bureaucratic processes. Companies of all sizes can collaborate

on a “principle-based framework”, starting with an agreement “on standards of reasonable and acceptable exposure for content aimed at children and teens” (N.T Lee, 2024).

However, social media companies have refrained from enacting change despite hate speech’s surge online. Companies have opted for a “sporadic rather than systematically proactive approach” (Pukallus & Arthur, 2024, p. 471). A Center for Countering Digital Hate report found that X has failed to comply with its standards since Musk's purchase, allowing “posts that had been reported and identified as hate speech” to remain. Tech companies’ unwillingness is driven by their “drive for profit”, thus prioritizing user engagement and content retention rather than moderation (Karadelija, 2025). For instance, McGill’s Media Ecosystem Observatory found that conservative MPS “garnered 61% more engagement” than their peers because Musk amplifies right-wing content, thus creating “a self-fulfilling cycle or a positive feedback loop” (Dreißigacker et al., 2024, p. 7). Consequently, targets have become more insecure and unsafe.

Furthermore, Shoshana Zuboff argues that social media companies actively extract user data for profit, engaging in what she calls “surveillance capitalism” (Zuboff, 2019). Under surveillance capitalism, companies commodify data and use it to advertise and generate revenue, which, for social media companies, means keeping users engaged. Social media algorithms, powered by user data, shape the content users see. In turn, algorithms can facilitate “behavioral modification” by amplifying incendiary content that reinforces particular understandings and behaviors (8). Social media companies' profit incentive to promote online hate, and their algorithms' potential to amplify it, make giving them autonomy in combating online hate speech a bad idea. option

Youth Policy Research Program

Nevertheless, autonomous social media companies can help safeguard free speech. Facebook and X's initiatives, by creating mechanisms that let users fact-check through community notes and easing content moderation on immigration and gender topics, have reportedly reduced censorship. According to a 2023 Survey by Erik Kaufmann, 78% of Canadians believe political wokeness has gone too far concerning freedom of speech. Removing stringent restrictions can thus increase users' sense of freedom of expression (Kaufman, 2024, p. 38).

The Best Way Forward: A Mixed Approach

Each of the aforementioned methods traditionally used to address online hate speech has its respective merits and problems. It would be remiss to suggest that one approach has a particular advantage over the other. Therefore, a mixed-methods approach that balances the benefits of counter-speech and regulatory frameworks appears most ideal for addressing online hate speech.

Previous regulatory frameworks, such as NETZDG, have effectively subdued online hate speech. With stricter quotas, collaborative guidelines, and given Germany and Canada's demographic and political similarities, Canada's legislative framework could be even more robust. Nevertheless, a regulatory framework is expensive; the Online Harms Act costs roughly 200 million over five years (Taylor, 2023). Additionally, "the exposure and experience of online hate" has negative impacts on "levels of depression, anxiety, self-doubt and/or confidence" (Dreißigacker et al., 2024, p. 2). With such adverse effects, hate speech no longer seems "merely offensive" but instead "demonstrably harmful". These psychological effects can impede

individuals from pursuing their interests, akin to physical harm, justifying the use of "the power of the state to protect victims from that harm" (Adorney, 2023).

Conversely, tech companies have historically abdicated self-regulation, prioritizing capitalist and ideological ambitions over user safety and dignity. For instance, of 300 X posts depicting Black and Jewish people stereotypically and engaging in Holocaust denialism, 86% remained despite being judged to violate X's community standards (Pukallus & Arthus, 2024, p. 471). Therefore, these companies should "be legally forced to uphold their community standards" rather than self-regulate (471).

Counter-speech is highly effective in combating online hate speech because it does not seek to suppress expression, unlike government or private-enterprise regulation. Research and experiments by Hangartner et al. suggest that when victimized users engage through empathy-based counter-speech, they can reduce the volume of xenophobic tweets by hundreds of tweets, and users become 8.4 percentage points more likely to delete their original xenophobic tweet (Hangartner et al., 2021). Counter-speech alone is not an adequate solution, as numerous studies reiterate its potential "polarizing effect." USC's study of extremist Reddit boards found counterspeech to either be ineffective or "drive users to join more extremist unmoderated forums," entrenching their hateful views (Lee, 2024).

The federal government should start by establishing stringent regulations that require social media platforms to reduce users' exposure to online hate speech. Next, the federal government should establish a commission to enforce the regulations, report violations, nd administer fines for non-compliance. The federal government should create focus groups to

gather input from civil society organizations such as the National Council of Canadian Muslims, Independent Canadian Jewish Voices, the Federation of Black Communities, and the Canada India Network Society. These organizations each represent the most prolific targets of online hate speech. Additionally, the government should continue to hold circles with Indigenous communities and roundtables with experts such as Dr. Barbara Perry, Pierre Trudel, Bernie Farber, and representatives from social media companies (Government of Canada, 2024). In a similar vein, the use of funding in the form of direct grants to local civil society organizations associated with stigmatized groups can provide targeted communities with the requisite resources to engage in professional counter-speech campaigns (Strong Cities Network, 2024),

Finally, the federal government must directly address the potential ramifications of hate speech. Borrowing from Germany's recent amendment to NETZDG, online content courts present a 'cost-effective solution," wherein a judiciary has the final say in content moderation disputes (Dias, 2022, p.14). Engaging independent content moderators, such as "trusted flaggers" and oversight boards, while "complemented by proper judicial bodies" can protect free speech by establishing a transparent checks and balances system that prevents federal moderation overreach (14)

Conclusion

Ultimately,y online hate speech presents a considerably nuanced political issue with pressing social and political ramifications. Piecemeal or ineffective solutions characteristic of historic engagement with the issue have fallen short of making targeted users feel safer while similarly failing to make users feel like they have freedom of expression. It is important to acknowledge that research in a specific Canadian context is limited, and inferences from other

nations with different socio–political climates had to be made. Regardless, Canadian policymakers have much to learn from their triumphs and pitfalls.

Far-right movements online continue to grow in political legitimacy and popularity, particularly in Canada's southern neighbors. Policymakers must acknowledge these evolving conditions and consider an alternative approach that balances the benefits of regulation and counter-speech to create a broader, more cost-effective policy framework. The Canadian Constitution cites inclusivity and equality as one of the nation's organizing principles. Online hate speech actively jeopardizes those principles and thus requires swift, proactive action not only to address the present but to support the future.

Works Cited

Andres, Raphaela, and Olga Slivko. "Combating Online Hate Speech: The Impact of Legislation on Twitter." ZEW Discussion Papers, No. 21-103, ZEW - Leibniz-Zentrum für Europäische Wirtschaftsforschung, Mannheim, 2021, https://www.econstor.eu/bitstream/10419/248857/1/1785234617.pdf.

Adorney, Julian. "That's a Completely Different Beast from Simply Legalizing Hate Speech." Type Investigations, 22 Feb. 2023, www.typeinvestigations.org/that-is-a-completely-different-beast-from-simply-legalizing-hate-speech.

Bannerman et al., "The TechLobby Annual Report for 2023." TechLobby, 2023, www.techlobby.com/annual-report-2023.

Benesch, Susan. Counterspeech on Twitter: A Field Study. Dangerous Speech Project, 2016.

Cavaliere, Paolo, Digital Platforms and the Rise of Global Regulation of Hate Speech

(September 18, 2019). Edinburgh School of Law Research Paper No. 2019/29, Available at SSRN: https://ssrn.com/abstract=3456141 or http://dx.doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.3456141

D. Hangartner, G. Gennaro, S. Alasiri, N. Bahrich, A. Bornhoft, J. Boucher, B.B. Demirci, L. Derksen, A. Hall, M. Jochum, M.M. Munoz, M. Richter, F. Vogel, S. Wittwer, F. Wüthrich, F. Gilardi, & K. Donnay, Empathy-based counterspeech can reduce racist hate speech in a social media field experiment, Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U.S.A. 118 (50) e2116310118, https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.2116310118 (2021).

Dias, Talita, Tackling Online Hate Speech through Content Moderation: The Legal Framework Under the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (June 30, 2022). Bahador, Hammer and Livingston (eds), Countering online hate and its offline consequences in conflict-fragile settings, Syracuse University Press, forthcoming, 2024), Available at SSRN: https://ssrn.com/abstract=4150909

Donzelli, Silvia. (2021). Countering Harmful Speech Online. (In)effective Strategies and the Duty to Counterspeak. Phenomenology & Mind. 20. 76. 10.17454/pam-2007.

Dreißigacker, A., Müller, P., Isenhardt, A., *et al.* Online hate speech victimization: consequences for victims' feelings of insecurity. *Crime Sci* 13, 4 (2024). https://doi.org/10.1186/s40163-024-00204-y

Echikson, William and Knodt, Olivia, Germany's NetzDG: A Key Test for Combatting Online Hate (November 22, 2018). CEPS Policy Insight, Available at SSRN: https://ssrn.com/abstract=3300636

Elections Canada. "The Electoral Cycle." *Elections Canada*, 21 Jan. 2025, www.elections.ca/content.aspx?section=ele&dir=cycle&document=index&lang=e. Accessed 25 Mar. 2025.

Gorenc, N. Hate speech or free speech: an ethical dilemma? *International Review of Sociology*, *32*(3), 413–425. https://doi.org/10.1080/03906701.2022.2133406, 22 Oct. 2022

Government of Canada. "Bill C-63: An Act to Enact the Online Harms Act, to Amend the Criminal Code, the Canadian Human Rights Act and An Act Respecting the Mandatory Reporting of Internet Child Pornography by Persons Who Provide an Internet Service and to Make Consequential and Related Amendments to Other Acts." *Government of Canada*, 30 May 2024, www.justice.gc.ca/eng/csj-sjc/pl/charter-charte/c63.html. Accessed 25 Mar. 2025.

Government of Canada. "Combatting Hate in Canada." *Government of Canada*, 21 Jan. 2025, www.canada.ca/en/canadian-heritage/services/combatting-hate.html. Accessed 25 Mar. 2025.

Griffin, Rachel. New School Speech Regulation and Online Hate Speech: A Case Study of Germany's NetzDG. SSRN Electronic Journal, 2021, ff10.2139/ssrn.3920386ff. Ffhal-03586791f

Hangartner et al. (2021). Empathy-based counterspeech can reduce racist hate speech in a social media field experiment. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America*, *118*(50), e2116310118. https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.2116310118

Karadeglija, Anja. "Conservative MPs Get More Online Engagement than Liberals

and NDP Combined, Study Finds." The Globe and Mail, 12 Mar. 2025.

Kaufman, Eric. *The Politics of the Culture Wars in Contemporary Canada*. 1st ed., vol. 1, *MacDonald Laurier Institute*, 2024. pp. 1-86.

Lee, Nicol T. "Can Social Media Companies Engage in Self-Regulation." *BBB National Programs Center for Industry Self-Regulation*, vol. 1, no. 1, 2024, pp. 1–52, https://assets.bbbprograms.org/docs/librariesprovider5/default-document-library/research/2024_turnerlee_social-media-self-regulation.pdf. Accessed 25 Mar. 2025.

Lee, Stephanie. "The Surprising Ineffectiveness of Countering Hate Speech on Reddit." *USC Viterbi*, 28 Oct. 2024, viterbischool.usc.edu/news/2024/10/the-surprising-ineffectiveness-of-countering-hate-speech-on-reddit/. Accessed 26 Mar. 2025.

Leblanc, Christian, and Patricia Henault. "Creating a Safe, Inclusive and Open Online Environment." Government of Canada, 29 July 2021, www.canada.ca/en/canadian-heritage/news/2021/07/creating-a-safe-inclusive-and-open-online-environment.html.

Maaß, Sabrina, et al. "Evaluating the Regulation of Social Media: An Empirical Study of the German NetzDG and Facebook." *Telecommunications Policy*, vol. 48, no. 5, 2024, p. 102719, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.telpol.2024.102719. Accessed 26 Mar. 2025.

Miller, Jackie. "Harassed for Wearing a Mask and Nearly Run Down by a Truck: Ottawa Residents Relive Trucker Convoy Protest." National Post, 24 Mar. 2022, nationalpost.com/news/harassed-for-wearing-a-mask-and-nearly-run-down-by-a-truck

-ottawa-residents-relive-trucker-convoy-protest.

Mohammadi, Monireh. "Free Speech & its Limits: A Study of the Rippling Effects of Hate Speech Laws in Canada." 2025.

Munzert, Simon, et al. "Citizen Preferences for Online Hate Speech Regulation." *PNAS Nexus*, vol. 4, no. 2, 2025, https://doi.org/10.1093/pnasnexus/pgaf032. Accessed 26 Mar. 2025.

Pukallus, Stefanie, and Catherine Arthur. "Combating Hate Speech on Social Media: Applying Targeted Regulation, Developing Civil-Communicative Skills and Utilizing Local Evidence-Based Anti-Hate Speech Interventions." *Journalism and Media*, vol. 5, no. 2, 2024, pp. 467-484, https://doi.org/10.3390/journalmedia5020031. Accessed 26 Mar. 2025.

Saha, Koustuv, et al. "Prevalence and Psychological Effects of Hateful Speech in Online College Communities." *Proceedings of the ... ACM Web Science Conference. ACM Web Science Conference*, vol. 2019, 2019, p. 255, https://doi.org/10.1145/3292522.3326032. Accessed 26 Mar. 2025.

Samples, John, Why the Government Should Not Regulate Content Moderation of Social Media (April 9, 2019). Cato Institute Policy Analysis, No. 865, Available at SSRN: https://ssrn.com/abstract=3502843

Schäfer, Svenja, et al. "Can We Counteract Hate? Effects of Online Hate Speech and Counter Speech on the Perception of Social Groups." *Communication Research*, 2024, https://doi.org/10.1177/00936502231201091. Accessed 22 Mar. 2025.

Sombatpoonsiri, J. & Mahapatra, S. (2024). Regulation or Repression?

Government Influence on Political Content Moderation in India and Thailand.

Statistics Canada. "Online Hate and Aggression among Young People in Canada." *Canadian Taxpayers Federation*, 7 Feb. 2024, www150.statcan.gc.ca/n1/daily-quotidien/240227/dq240227b-eng.htm. Accessed 25 Mar. 2025.

Statistics Canada. "Police-reported Hate Crime, 2022." Statistics Canada, 3 Mar. 2024, www150.statcan.gc.ca/n1/daily-quotidien/240313/dq240313b-eng.htm. Accessed 25 Mar. 2025.

Strong Cities Network. (2024). *Countering hate speech in times of crisis: Considerations for mayors and local governments* [Policy resource / Brief]. Strong Cities Network. https://strongcitiesnetwork.org/resource/countering-hate-speech-in-times-of-crisis-considerations-for-mayors-and-local-governments/.

Taylor, Stephanie Sure, "Liberals' Online Harms Act to Cost $200M Over 5 Years, PBO Estimates." CBC News, 23 Mar. 2023, www.cbc.ca/news/politics/online-harms-act-cost-pbo-1.6788766.

Terrazzano, Fraco. "Poll Shows Canadians Want to Shrink Bureaucracy." *Canadian Taxpayers Federation*, 6 Aug. 2024, www.taxpayer.com/newsroom/poll-shows-canadians-want-to-shrink-bureaucracy. Accessed 25 Mar. 2025.

Yi, Thinzar S. "Flower Speech Campaign." *Beautiful Trouble*, beautifultrouble.org/toolbox/tool/flower-speech-campaign. Accessed 25 Mar. 2025.

Zuboff, S. (2019). *The age of surveillance capitalism: The fight for a human future at the new frontier of power*. PublicAffairs