

Partial response to Colleen Underwood, CBC reporter:

It's absolutely an implicit or winking incitement to violence. It's like in the gangster movies, where they say, you know, 'Nice little pipeline you've got there, would be a terrible thing if something happened to it.' This is totally irresponsible on the part of David Suzuki.

And let me point out a track record of outrageous comments from him that for anybody else would have had him cancelled. Instead, he continues to receive multi-million-dollar contracts from the CBC. You know, this is a guy who said that, about immigration, and I quote, this is from July of 2013, quotes, "Canada is full. Our immigration policy is enough to make you sick. We pillage the countries of the South by depriving them of future professionals, and we want to increase our population. It's crazy." Unquote.

You know, if somebody like Don Cherry had said that Canada is full, and our immigration policy is "crazy," and "sick," he would have been cancelled by the CBC in a New York Minute. But instead the CBC gave David Suzuki millions dollars more in compensation to work for them.

This is the same guy who called for his political opponent, Stephen Harper, the prime minister, to be thrown in jail. He said in February of 2016, quotes, "I really believe that people like the former prime minister of Canada should be thrown in jail." Quote-unquote. Not for corruption but because of a policy difference!

When Donald Trump called for Hillary Clinton to be thrown in jail, he was rightly mocked, ridiculed and vilified. But what's the CBC's response? To give him even more contracts to help sustain his four houses, in which he lives as an environmental hypocrite. So I don't see why the CBC is rushing to the defence of a man who is now implicitly inciting people to ecoterrorism.

If you think David Suzuki's comments detract from something then you should hold him accountable, not me. It's David Suzuki who has raised into this discussion terrorism, political violence. That's not how we solve problems in Canada. We resolve our differences peacefully and democratically, not by threatening to throw our opponents in jail, as he did about the former prime minister of our country.

So I don't know why CBC and others continue to rush to the defence of a man who's anti-immigration, who's called our immigration generosity sick and he's said that it's sick and crazy, that Canada is full, calls for the imprisonment of people in politics with whom he disagrees, and now is basically saying, "nudge-nudge, wink-wink, be a terrible thing if something happened to those pipelines. This is outrageous and should be called out as such."

Full response to questions by Rick Bell, Calgary Sun political columnist:

OK, on the second point, Rick (laughs) I have a very long track record of standing up for responsible energy development against this kind of kookiness. And, hardly anything new on my part. Nor is it anything new on David Suzuki's part. And it is *sad* to see so many of the Laurentian Elites, and others, CBC and others, rush to the defence of this guy, like he's some kind of a saint. He's infallible. He cannot be possibly be criticized, even though he has a track record of saying things that would result in any mere mortal, *uh*, going down the cancel culture, *uuuuuh, up, uuuh*, black hole of history. I mean, as I say, could you imagine if Don Cherry had said that, *uh*, Canada is full, and immigration is crazy, because we want to grow our population. He wouldn't have lasted a New York Minute on Coach's Corner when it was on CBC. They would have fired him right out of the building. Instead, whadda they do with David Suzuki? He said that about immigration in 2013. He gets eight more years of multimillion dollar contracts to pay for his multimillion dollar lifestyle. I'm sick and tired of it. *Aaaand, uh*. Why the double standard? Guy who calls for his political adversaries he doesn't like to get locked up. Does CBC have a policy that it's OK to call for the imprisonment of people you disagree with in a democracy? Is that why David Suzuki continues to grace their airwaves, at enormous taxpayer expense, by the way? So, I'm seriously ticked off about this. And, I, *uh*, still, about the fact that the University of Alberta gave this guy an honorary degree! They wouldn't give anybody else with a track rec – is there anybody else who's anti-immigration that the U of A would give an honorary degree to? And now, implicitly – implicitly, I believe – inciting people to political violence. Enough is enough. This guy was invited to speak to the Alberta's teachers' convention a couple of years ago. They paid him a handsome honorarium. *Ummm*, does he, I mean, *uuuh*, what can he add, usefully, to debate about *anything* when these are the kinds of views that he holds? So it's time that he be held to account in my view, and, *um, ya-ya*-you know, talking about pipelines, right now we have one that is being blocked by groups supported by big U.S. special interests, and if they succeed, hundreds of Indigenous British Columbians will be put out of work. A project that is supported by every one of the 20 elected First Nations band councils along the Coastal Gaslink route, route. So, that's one of the reasons this gets my dander up. Because these are rich people from urban Canada, *uh*, inflicting their fashionable political opinions on often people living in poverty in First Nations communities that just want a shot at, at, at, at a decent living.

Bell asks: Do you think there is a tangible threat that pipelines could actually get blown up?

I think it I think it creates an opinion environment which can be seen as normalizing or providing an apology for, *uhhh*, a rationalization for violence. I think it creates a context that some people could use to rationalize violence, and that's why it's so dangerous. When Donald Trump stood in front of the White House on the 6th of January, and said that we, you have to fight for this country or you might lose it, that was widely seen as indirect incitement to the violence that then followed in the U.S. Capitol Building. How is this any different? Like I say, he's basically saying, 'Nice little pipeline ya got there, terrible thing if something happened to it.' So he shouldn't just be out there doing interviews sayin', oh, he doesn't actually support violence.

He should be walking this whole thing back, apologizing and retracting, without exception, *ummm*, because I can imagine some overcaffeinated young green radical will hear in St. David's words a rationalization of future violence."