



The public consultation window closes on July 22nd. Write and send your custom submission before then to help ensure [Carney's destructive proposal](#) never becomes legislation.

1. Address an email to the following addresses:

- To: engagement@pco-bcp.gc.ca
- CC:
 - i. Prime Minister Carney: pm@pm.gc.ca
 - ii. Your MP: [find their email here](#)
- BCC:
 - i. 350 Canada: 350canada@350.org
(If you are comfortable with us potentially sharing your story/answers!)

2. Create a custom subject line:

- Make your stance CLEAR and be sure to make it YOUR OWN. Batch identical subject lines are easier to filter out and ignore.
- For example:
 - Public opposition to the government's proposal to fast-track destructive mega-projects
 - Whales are more important than pipelines – my opposition to the 'Getting Major Projects Built in Canada' proposal
 - Public consultation submission: NO deregulation, NO destructive major projects, NO trampling Indigenous rights
 - No new pipelines while the country is on fire

3. Write your email:

- Copy-paste the below skeleton into the body of your email, and then fill in your answers before sending.
- We encourage you to include your personal story of being impacted by or anxious about climate impacts.
- We recognize that these engagement questions are frustrating. Get creative, stick to your main concerns, and see template answers below for inspiration.

To Prime Minister Carney, MP [NAME], and the public consultation process,

I am participating in this public consultation because I am gravely concerned about the “Getting Major Projects Built in Canada – Discussion Paper” put forward by the federal government.

[INSERT YOUR PERSONAL STORY OF CLIMATE IMPACTS HERE]

Below are my responses to your public engagement questions:

Question 1: What opportunities do you see emerging from these proposals to improve the assessments and permitting processes related to building major projects?

[INSERT YOUR ANSWER HERE]

Question 2: What are your views/general impressions on these proposals to improve regulatory efficiency related to building major projects faster in Canada?

[INSERT YOUR ANSWER HERE]

Question 3: What do businesses and Indigenous Peoples require to advance major projects within a shorter timeframe under these proposal

[INSERT YOUR ANSWER HERE]

Thank you for taking the time to read my submission. I hope you will listen to me and the many others across Canada who strongly oppose these dangerous proposals.

I look forward to hearing from you.

[NAME]

4. Hit send, and stay tuned for more actions this summer to push back on the pipeline agenda.

TEMPLATE ANSWERS

Question 1: What opportunities do you see emerging from these proposals to improve the assessments and permitting processes related to building major projects?

- *The only “opportunities” here are for wealthy corporations to maximize profits at the expense of everyday Canadians. The proposals in this discussion paper would gut assessments instead of improving them*
- *Robust environmental and safety assessments, careful permitting processes, and meaningful consultation are not barriers to be by-passed – they are essential steps to ensure that projects are only built if and how they can be done safely.*
- *This proposal views vital regulations as red tape to be bypassed. New rules that compress safety reviews by running environmental assessments and construction permits at the same time would rush the process before full impacts are understood. It’s a recipe for disaster and undermines the rule of law.*
- *True improvement to our assessment and permitting process would involve strengthening environmental guardrails, encouraging robust public participation, and aligning all reviews with Canada’s climate commitments.*
- *It is only good to build major projects that actually benefit communities – major projects that endanger the safety of people, wildlife, and the climate should not be built at all, and expediting them past assessments and regulatory processes is reckless and dangerous.*

Question 2: What are your views/general impressions on these proposals to improve regulatory efficiency related to building major projects faster in Canada?

- *I am completely opposed to this framework and call on the government to scrap it entirely. It is outrageous that these measures were even proposed, and the public will not stand for the widespread gutting of legally enshrined protections.*
- *This proposal is dangerous and counterproductive. “Speed” and “regulatory efficiency” are thinly veiled excuses to fast-track pipelines, mines, and nuclear facilities while silencing public voices and removing the guardrails that keep communities and ecosystems safe.*
- *Measures like creating “Special Federal Economic Zones” where development is pre-approved, or exempting new pipelines from Environmental Impact Assessments altogether, are deeply alarming. Rushing approvals does not protect Canadians, it simply accelerates the risks to our health, safety, and shared future while prioritizing corporate profits.*
- *Building major projects faster, at the expense of due consultation, environmental impact assessments, and risk reduction measures, is reckless and dangerous. It does not serve our safety, land, or economy.*
- *Major projects that destroy sensitive habitat, endanger species at risk, and imperil the health and safety of communities should not be built quickly or at all.*

- *My view is that a safe and livable future for my children is more important than cutting corners on massive projects with potentially catastrophic consequences.*
- *I want the government to prioritize selecting major projects that benefit the people – like a renewable east-west energy grid – instead of rushing through projects that benefit corporate shareholders and oil and gas CEOs.*

Question 3: What do businesses and Indigenous Peoples require to advance major projects within a shorter timeframe under these proposals?

- *What Indigenous nations require from the federal government is the strict, unconditional upholding of the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples (UNDRIP), which mandates Free, Prior, and Informed Consent (FPIC). This proposal does the opposite.*
- *By forcing a rigid, compressed timeline onto complex reviews, this framework treats the legal duty to consult as a bureaucratic bottleneck to be managed for corporate convenience. Real progress is built on a foundation of trust, respect, and early consent—not on a ticking clock that cuts communities out of the loop. True consent cannot be obtained if the timeline is pre-established and the outcome is pre-determined.*
- *Meaningful consultation with Indigenous nations requires respecting their legally enshrined right to reject projects on their lands. It cannot be a sham process designed to force development at all costs.*
- *If this government wants to support a genuinely stable economy for everyone, it must stop subsidizing the volatile fossil fuel sector – propping up more oil and gas development drains the public purse, enriches private sector billionaires, and costs consumers. We need a sustainable future, not climate chaos.*
- *Instead of giving regulatory gifts to fossil fuel companies, the federal government should tax their excess profits and reinvest those funds to support a just, renewable energy transition that respects Indigenous jurisdiction and leadership.*
- *Forcing dangerous projects onto communities without their consent is not a laudable end goal, regardless of time frame.*