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The RCMP, in support of the Government of Canada’s (GoC) strategy to ensure critical infrastructure (CI) resiliency, assesses, evaluates and reports on information regarding threats and criminality to Canada’s CI. This intelligence and/or information may be used to assist in the protection of Canada’s CI.

Critical Infrastructure Intelligence Team Assessments are issued to provide critical infrastructure stakeholders with a law enforcement intelligence assessment of current CI protection issues.

This Assessment is current as of 2014-01-24.

KEY FINDINGS

- The Canadian petroleum industry is requesting government approval to construct many large petroleum projects which, if approved, will be situated across the country;
- There is a growing, highly organized and well-financed, anti-Canadian petroleum movement, that consists of peaceful activists, militants and violent extremists, who are opposed to society’s reliance on fossil fuels;
- The anti-petroleum movement is focused on challenging the energy and environmental policies that promote the development of Canada’s vast petroleum resources;
- Governments and petroleum companies are being encouraged, and increasingly threatened, by violent extremists to cease all actions which the extremists believe, contributes to greenhouse gas emissions;
- Recent protests in New Brunswick are the most violent of the national anti-petroleum protests to date;
- Violent anti-petroleum extremists will continue to engage in criminal activity to promote their anti-petroleum ideology;
- These extremists pose a realistic criminal threat to Canada’s petroleum industry, its workers and assets, and to first responders.
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Over the past three years, anti-shale gas criminal activity has occurred in New Brunswick, culminating with the 2013-10-17 violent criminal response to the Royal Canadian Mounted Police (RCMP) enforcement actions. Ensuing criminal actions resulted in six RCMP vehicles burned; weapons, ammunition and improvised explosive devices seized; and the arrest of 40 individuals, including the Chief and council members of the Elsipogtog First Nation. As a result of the RCMP enforcement action in New Brunswick, numerous protests in support of the New Brunswick, anti-shale gas protestors have occurred across the country.

The New Brunswick protests, the most violent anti-petroleum actions experienced thus far in Canada, are indicative of the growing international opposition to the Canadian petroleum projects currently operating, under development, or being planned across Canada. These violent protests are likely an indicator of what the petroleum industry, and the law enforcement community, must be prepared to confront as the development of Canada’s petroleum resources continues and expands.

Non-governmental environmental groups such as; Greenpeace, Tides Canada, and Sierra Club Canada, to name a few, assert climate change is now the most serious global environmental threat, and that climate change is a direct consequence of elevated anthropogenic greenhouse gas emissions which, they believe, are directly linked to the continued use of fossil-fuels. Since greenhouse gas emissions are emitted from fossil-fuel burning, the Canadian petroleum industry, most notably Canada’s Oil Sands, is singled out internationally as a significant contributor to global climate change.

Research and analysis done in support of ongoing RCMP criminal investigations shows those involved in the anti-Canadian petroleum movement have an interest in drawing public attention to, and in building recognition of, the perceived environmental threat from the continued use of fossil fuels.

The publicizing of these concerns has led to significant, and often negative, media coverage surrounding the Canadian petroleum industry. The use of social media, including the use of live-streaming, provides the anti-petroleum movement the ability to bypass the traditional news networks, to control and craft its message, and to promote a one-sided version of the actual events, leading to broadly based anti-petroleum opposition.

From what has been witnessed and experienced thus far, it may be surmised that the issues within the anti-petroleum movement are complex, divisive, controversial, and polarizing. Within the anti-petroleum movement, the Canadian law-enforcement and security intelligence communities have noted a growing pan-national fringe violent extremist faction that is ideologically opposed to the Canadian petroleum industry.

Those within the movement who are willing to go beyond peaceful actions primarily employ direct action tactics, such as civil disobedience, unlawful protests, break and entry, vandalism, and sabotage. Some of the more violent prone extremists advocate the use of arson, firearms, and improvised explosive devices.
When discussing Domestic Issue-based Extremism, in its Counter-Terrorism Strategy, Public Safety Canada noted that:

"Although not of the same scope and scale faced by other countries, low-level violence by domestic issue-based groups remains a reality in Canada. Such extremism tends to be based on grievances—real or perceived—revolving around the promotion of various causes such as animal rights, white supremacy, environmentalism and anti-capitalism. Although very small in number, some groups in Canada have moved beyond lawful protest to encourage, threaten and support acts of violence. As seen in Oklahoma City in 1995 and in Norway in 2011, continued vigilance is essential since it remains possible that certain groups—or even a lone individual—could choose to adopt a more violent, terrorist strategy to achieve their desired results."  

Violent incidents such as: the bombing of the vehicle belonging to a vice president of the Canadian Petroleum Products Institute in Quebec; the series of gas pipeline bombings in Northern B.C.; the firebombing of the Edmonton residence of the retired Syncrude president and chief operating officer; the arrest of a Montreal man for making threats against the shale gas industry in Quebec, and Alberta; and, the destruction of petroleum equipment and threats to petroleum personnel in New Brunswick, clearly illustrate the nature of criminal threats confronting the Canadian petroleum industry.

As witnessed in New Brunswick and Ontario, direct physical confrontation with petroleum facility staff, private security staff, the general public and law enforcement is occurring. Disturbingly, in New Brunswick, the persons arrested on 2013-10-17, were in possession of weapons and improvised explosive devices that, according to reporting, the violent extremists planned to use.

Natural resource exploration and development projects - most notably on disputed aboriginal land - have historically been a contentious issue within many aboriginal communities. Due to the environmental and land use implications, some factions of the anti-petroleum movement, most notably in New Brunswick, Ontario, and British Columbia, have aligned themselves with violent aboriginal extremists. In general, members of this aboriginal extremist faction do not have support within their own communities, where traditional protest activity is often restricted to non-violent types of actions such as site blockades.

Current social media monitoring in support of ongoing criminal investigations indicate an increasing number of postings that include violent rhetoric associated to the New Brunswick, anti-shale gas protests. The linking of this violent rhetoric with the demonstrated violent protest actions, and the seizure of weapons and improvised explosive devices, can indicate the law enforcement community is one step closer to facing the threat of severe bodily harm from violent extremists.

As witnessed with the anti-shale gas protests in New Brunswick, the anti-Enbridge Line 9 Project protests in Ontario, and the opposition to the Northern Gateway Pipeline Project in British Columbia, local issues quickly attract support from across North America. In some cases, the arrival of outside influence, financial support, and direction can inflame an already tense environment. Additionally, isolated issues have the potential to escalate from local to national very quickly, often resulting in criminal activity among supporters across the country.

Criminal investigations to date indicate the most likely targets include: petroleum extraction and processing facilities, pipelines, equipment and offices, private residences of petroleum officials,
and, hotels used by the field workers, financial institutions which support the petroleum industry, the railway industry, and as witnessed at the National Energy Board hearings in Toronto and Montreal, the regulatory process. Currently, New Brunswick, and British Columbia, face the most significant anti-petroleum criminal threat. However, as the petroleum industry expands its operations across Canada, criminal activity associated to the anti-petroleum movement will increase nationally.

The nature and extent of the criminality will depend on the location of the petroleum project, the associated perceived environmental threat, other contentious issues affecting the communities, the criminal intentions and capabilities of the participants, and their willingness to challenge the petroleum industry.

Regardless of the source, or nature, criminal actions targeting the Canadian petroleum industry, intended to cause harm or not, represent a credible threat to the health and safety of the workers, the general public, the activists, the natural environment and the facility's operations.

Within an industry where accidents and malicious human-induced activity could result in deaths and damage to the environment, there is no room for error. If violent environmental extremists continue to engage in unlawful activity, it jeopardizes the health and safety of its participants, the general public and the natural environment.

Law enforcement, and other first responders, face the challenge of additional burden on their resources, and of ensuring the safety of their members, of company employees, of the general public, including those engaged in "peaceful assembly".

BACKGROUND

According to the Canadian Association of Petroleum Producers (CAPP), the world relies on an energy mix that includes oil, coal, natural gas, hydro, nuclear and renewables. All forms of energy production must increase to meet growing demand.

The International Energy Agency advised that, global demand will increase 35 per cent from 2010 to 2035, with fossil fuels satisfying the vast majority of that increased demand. China and India's combined consumption projections account for nearly half of the demand forecast. Oil imports for both countries will increase nearly four times in the next 20 years, and surpass the current levels of imports from Japan and the United States combined. Security of supply is also a growing issue. Many of the world's current producing oilfields are mature, and state-owned national oil companies hold 81 per cent of the world's current reserves. These countries develop their own resources to meet their own needs first. Many do not conduct business with foreign investors. In some cases, geo-political stability is a significant factor and investment deterrent. With consumption rising worldwide, and conventional oil supplies declining, the need for a secure supply of oil from unconventional resources like Canada's oil sands will continue to increase.

CAPP further advised that, Canada is uniquely positioned to supply an abundance of safe, secure energy. Canada has the third largest oil reserves in the world: 173 billion barrels that can be recovered with today's technology. Of that number, 168 billion barrels are located in the Oil Sands. Over the past 30 years, Canadian crude oil production has increased to 3.1 million
barrels/day due to growth in supply from the oil sands, now composing more than half of Canada's crude oil production.  

A recent Canada-wide public opinion poll co-sponsored by the Canada West Foundation found that more than 80 per cent of Canadians support continued oil sands development. However, the supporters are relatively evenly divided between those who say that oil sands development should carry on as-is, and those who support a slower pace. (See Appendix A: Canadians Broadly Support Resource Development – But There Are Still Some issues)

Regarding market access, 62 per cent feel that U.S. President Barak Obama should approve the Keystone XL project. The Energy East project (which would send oil from Alberta and Saskatchewan to eastern Canada) and Northern Gateway (which would send oil to Asia via the British Columbia coast) were supported by 50 per cent or more of respondents, with Kinder Morgan's expansion (which would send oil from Alberta to Asia via the British Columbia coast) with 49 per cent support. In addition, almost two-thirds of those polled believe that pipelines are the safest way to transport oil and gas.

Quoting the pollster:

"The message is clear. Canadians overwhelmingly support continued oil sands development, although many believe that the rate of growth needs to be moderated. Canadians strongly support pipelines as the safest transport option and support building pipelines to reach all three major markets tested: eastern Canada, Asia (via pipeline and tanker, of course) and the U.S." 6

However, there is an apparent growing international anti-Canadian petroleum movement. In their literature, representatives of the movement claim climate change is now the most serious global environmental threat, and that climate change is a direct consequence of elevated anthropogenic greenhouse gas emissions which, reportedly, are directly linked to the continued use of fossil fuels.

According to Greenpeace:

"What we do know is that climate change is already harming people and ecosystems. Its reality can be seen in melting glaciers, disintegrating polar ice, thawing permafrost, dying coral reefs, rising sea levels, changing ecosystems and fatal heat waves...Never before has humanity been forced to grapple with such an immense environmental crisis. If we do not take urgent and immediate action to stop global warming, the damage could become irreversible."7

Citing information provided by Richard Heede, who is the Principal of Climate Mitigation Services, Greenpeace noted that:

"...At the same time fossil fuel corporations continue to extract more resources that will continue to damage our climate while they reap the financial benefits at the cost of the environment."8

Since greenhouse gas emissions are emitted from fossil fuel burning, the Canadian Oil Sands (aka: tar sands) and the proposed pipelines that will transport the petroleum products from the Oil Sands, are receiving singular international attention.
"It was several days before media reports and commentary on the havoc caused by typhoon Haiyan in the Philippines finally began to acknowledge a possible connection to anthropogenic climate change... What continues to be almost entirely missing from media analysis is Canada's role in all this, particularly the moral dimensions of the nation's current economic development policies and those of several provinces (e.g., BC, Alberta, Saskatchewan, Newfoundland). The facts, from Washington's Center for Strategic and International Studies, are that: 1) on a per capita basis, historically and at present, Canada stands among the world's top greenhouse gas (GHG) emitters particularly of carbon dioxide (CO2). Canadians are therefore as responsible as anyone else on Earth for human-induced global warming. (To argue that as a nation our emissions are only 2-3 per cent of the global total is specious, essentially a form of denial); 2) the Federal government and several provinces have hitched their economic wagons largely to petroleum, natural gas and coal development/exports. In short, the nation's economic future is tied, as a matter of deliberate policy, to the country becoming a major exporter of potentially catastrophic climate change."

As stated by Bill McKibben, in his Rolling Stone article titled: "The Fossil Fuel Resistance":

"As the world burns, a new movement to reverse climate change is emerging - fiercely, loudly and right next door... After decades of scant organized response to climate change, a powerful movement is quickly emerging around the country and around the world, building on the work of scattered front-line organizers who've been fighting the fossil-fuel industry for decades. It has no great charismatic leader and no central organization; it battles on a thousand fronts. But taken together, it's now big enough to matter, and it's growing fast... Americans got to see some of this movement spread out across the Mall in Washington, D.C., on a bitter-cold day in February. Press accounts put the crowd upward of 40,000 - by far the largest climate rally in the country's history. They were there to oppose the Keystone XL pipeline, which would run down from Canada's tar sands..."

And, as noted by Martin Pelletier, Portfolio Manager at TriVest Wealth Counsel Ltd.,

"...the environmental movement is gaining momentum in its fight against oil sands development. We believe many Canadians continue to underestimate just how influential the anti-oil sands movement is. Some have compared it to the anti-Vietnam movement in the 1960s both in scale and voracity. The difference is that this movement is funded by organizations with very deep pockets, such as the Rockefeller Brothers Fund, the William & Flora Hewlett Foundation and the Tides Foundation."

The movements' objectives include exposing what it sees as the harmful effects of the petroleum industry's operations, and to ultimately shut down the Canadian petroleum industry.

As stated by Greenpeace:

"We exist to expose environmental criminals, and to challenge government and corporations when they fail to live up to their mandate to safeguard our environment and our future."
"Greenpeace is calling on oil companies and the Canadian government to stop the tar sands and end the industrialization of a vast area of indigenous territories, forests and wetlands in northern Alberta.""\(^1\)

The Tar Sands Solutions Network, which is identified as a growing international network of organizations including First Nations, environmental groups, landowners, farmers, scientists, community leaders, academics, and grass roots groups located throughout North America and Europe set its goals as follows:

"Our focus is stopping the expansion of the Canadian tar sands and its infrastructure of pipelines and tankers, growth that is out of control and happening without consistent care, oversight, or debate. More importantly, building Keystone is an integral part of the oil industry's reckless expansion of the tar sands, and commits us to 50+ more years of fossil fuel dependence that will cause climate catastrophe.""\(^4\)

The Increasing Impact of Social Media

The anti-Canadian petroleum movement which is, in part being led by sophisticatedly organized and financed non-governmental activist groups, has engaged within a significant anti-Canadian petroleum campaign. (See Appendix B: Environmentalists’ deep pockets dwarf Canada’s campaign to win approval for Keystone pipeline.)

Main stream and social media are used to amplify the movement’s message, focusing its attention on the Canadian energy sector; with the intended audience appearing to being, politicians, regulators, investors, and the general public.\(^15\)

The movement is aiming its messaging to: mobilize young people, or as stated by Dr. Alan McHughen, University of Oxford, England;

"Unfortunately, the junk dealers and anti-technology NGOs use social media skillfully, and they recruit impressionable students each year to help “save the planet.” This domination of the Internet and the free workforce of volunteers overwhelm the efforts of legitimate scientist educators, few of whom actually have public education or outreach in their job descriptions."\(^7\)

According to Dr. Patrick Moore, a co-founding member of Greenpeace, who now speaks out against it, the movement’s message is crafted to negatively portray large corporations. As stated by Dr. Moore within his article titled: "Environmentalism for the Twenty-first Century", when discussing the extreme factions of the environmental movement:

"They rejected consensus politics and sustainable development in favour of continued confrontation and ever-increasing extremism… the movement’s tendency to abandon science and logic and to get the priorities completely mixed up through the use of sensationalism, misinformation and downright lies… They are anti-business. All large corporations are depicted as inherently driven by greed and corruption."\(^7\)

Others exaggerate the Oil Sands’ environmental footprint, and references reports that challenge the safety and integrity of the petroleum industry,\(^16\) and the hydraulic fracturing process.\(^19\)
Quoting Caroline Fraser, from her report of 2011-07-11, titled: "Tapping Social Media's Potential To Muster a Vast Green Army":

"A rapidly expanding universe of citizens' groups, researchers, and environmental organizations are making use of social media and smart phone applications to document changes in the natural world and to mobilize support for taking action."26

Brittany White, a graduate student in the School for Resource and Environmental Studies at Dalhousie University and a Research Assistant at the Social Media Laboratory, concluded a study to determine how Twitter is used by environmentalists to discuss a current Canadian environmental issue: the Northern Gateway Pipeline. She found that environmentalists are turning to Twitter more and more, and that Twitter is predominantly used by environmentalists to: (1) disseminate information and (2) to organize action on the Northern Gateway Pipeline.27

In her conclusion, Ms. White reported that Twitter is actively used by environmentalists to move beyond the government and mainstream media filters to raise their own voices and to spread their own messages about environmental issues. Thus, environmentalists are no longer confined to simply waving banners and yelling through megaphones: they have gone online.28

As noted on the Greenpeace webpage:

"The collective power of the Internet and social media is as much a part of campaigning to protect the environment as taking peaceful direct action."29

Quoting Corey Padveen, Director of Social Media at 12 Marketing International, from his "Social Media Case Study":

"Charities and not-for-profits have been resorting to social media in a big way. This is in large part due to the fact that social media is a great way to share important information and quickly have it spread to interested communities. Of the charities using social media, Greenpeace is among the more recognizable. Furthermore, the Greenpeace social media initiatives are not simple Facebook posts or tweets, there is a very calculated effort on the part of Greenpeace to use social media to their benefit."30

Furthermore, Volker Gäßner, head of the Greenpeace press office in Hamburg Germany, advised that,

"...we live in a fast-paced world, and people don't have the time to engage on environmental issues...Due to the tremendous amount of information it is becoming very important for NGOs to tell their own story, in their own words. We need to reach relevant influencers, introduce them to us and our projects and ensure that they can help spread the word to attract as many supporters as possible. This way we can all work together and solve environmental problems."31

During Greenpeace's occupation of Shell Canada's Albian Oil Sands facilities, and its breaching of Canadian Parliament Building security, it used live-streaming to provide full coverage of its actions, by-passing traditional media reporting.32
By all accounts, the movement has mobilized a percentage of society to at least question the Canadian petroleum industry, and may have resulted in increasing opposition to the industry. An Environics Research poll commissioned by the Council of Canadians found that a majority of Canadians (62 per cent) support a moratorium on all fracking for natural gas until all the federal environmental reviews are complete. 27

Financing

According to Dr. David Keith, who teaches physics and public policy at Harvard University, environmental organizations such as the Environmental Defense Fund, the Natural Resources Defense Council and the Sierra Club are raising US$300-million to US$400 million a year in the U.S. alone from foundations and wealthy individuals to bankroll their fight for climate change action, and defeating Keystone XL is high on their agenda. (See: Appendix B: Environmentalists’ deep pockets dwarf Canada’s campaign to win approval for Keystone pipeline.)

According to the Financial Post, publicly available Revenue Canada and U.S. Internal Revenue Service (IRS) tax return information indicates the environmental movement in Canada is receiving substantial financial support from influential U.S. philanthropic organizations such as the Gordon and Betty Moore Foundation, the William and Flora Hewlett Foundation, the David and Lucile Packard Foundation, the Pew Charitable Trusts and the Rockefeller Brothers Fund, which have collectively donated approximately $190 million (U.S.) into the Canadian environmental movement over the last decade. (See: Appendix C: U.S. foundations against the oil sands, and Appendix D: New U.S. funding for the war on Canadian oil.)

As an example, according to the Financial Post, a review of the 2008 U.S. tax returns shows, Tides Canada paid two coastal First Nations a total of $27.3 million (U.S.) in a single grant. This grant was to reportedly “fund conservation planning projects and conservation initiatives” and was earmarked for the Nuxalk and the Lax Kw’alaams, which, according to the same reporting, was to pay for “Mobilizing First Nations Against Climate Change in B.C.” and for “support of Coastal First Nations to hire a co-ordinator to engage with government, industry, environmental groups, media and the public regarding the proposed Enbridge Gateway tar sands pipeline.” (See: Appendix C: U.S. foundations against the oil sands, and Appendix D: New U.S. funding for the war on Canadian oil.)

As noted in the East-West Energy Chronicle, on 2010-10-05:

"... huge American charities are funding environmental activism in Western Canada. These funds are having an impact on political decisions that are of nontrivial importance to the future of Canada's energy industry. Interestingly, the funding cited is directed to organizations that are waging a PR war not only against the oil sands, but also against tanker traffic in the coastal area between Vancouver Island and Alaska, the disallowance of which would foreclose the possibility
of Canada diversifying hydrocarbon exports away from its current single export market, the USA."  

**Criminal Activity Associated to the Anti-Petroleum Movement**

"...to hold radical views is not a crime. The Constitution provides strong protection of individual beliefs and free speech. Only when these turn to criminal incitement and violent action or manifest intent to engage in violence is there cause for legal intervention..."  

Police investigate criminal activity and NOT:

- freedom of conscience and religion;
- freedom of thought, belief, opinion and expression, including freedom of the press and other media of communication;
- freedom of peaceful assembly; and
- freedom of association.  

Police act on reasonable and probable grounds that someone has, or someone may commit a criminal offence.

An example of this evolution is the May 2010 firebombing of an Ottawa Royal Bank of Canada (RBC) branch, whose parent company is a key financial backer of the Oil Sands, and a sponsor of the 2010 Winter Olympics.

As posted to many independent websites, the following communiqué is attributed to the attackers of the RBC branch:

"...RBC is now the major financier of Alberta's tar sands, one of the largest industrial projects in human history and perhaps the most destructive. The tar sands, now the cause of the second fastest rate of deforestation on the planet, are slated to expand several times its current size. The games in Vancouver are now over, but resistance continues. An RBC branch can be found in every corner of Kanada..."  

**National Security Criminal Investigations**

This document is the property of the Royal Canadian Mounted Police (RCMP), National Security Program. It is classified specifically to your departmental agency in confidence and for immediate only and is not to be released, copied, reprinted, used or further disseminated, in whole or in part, without the consent of the originator. It is not to be used in official or court proceedings, sub judice or any other legal or judicial purposes without the consent of the originator. Threading, redacting or printing of this document must comply with handling and storage policies as outlined by the Government of Canada for classified information. If your department is not capable of handling this document and needs assistance regarding any restricted information, for any questions concerning the information of this nature, please contact the RCMP National Security Criminal Operations Support Branch, RCMP.
Criminal actions mounted by environmental activists are often planned and executed with the intention of NOT inflicting casualties. Activists are focused on delivering a message, while not inflicting physical harm to living entities, or the natural environment.

Those aligned with the most extreme factions use the Internet to promote and instruct on the use of violent criminal techniques, including arson, vandalism and sabotage. Demonstrated criminal associations associated with this extremist faction includes threats to harm, property, improvised explosive devices, arson, vandalism, sabotage, thefts, and, break and enter, most notably in New Brunswick, Quebec, Ontario, Alberta, and British Columbia.  

Aboriginal Opposition

- Due to the environmental and land-use implications, the anti-petroleum movement, most notably in New Brunswick, Ontario, and British Columbia, has been able to align itself with violent aboriginal extremists.
- The development of Canada's natural resources is amongst the primary concerns within many aboriginal communities.

Natural resource exploration and development projects — most notably on disputed land — have historically been a contentious issue within aboriginal extremist groups, and are often the catalyst for aboriginal/industry/law enforcement confrontation.

In general, violent aboriginal extremists often do not have support within their communities, and traditional protest activity often is restricted to non-violent types of actions such as site blockades.

However, based on recent incidents and ongoing criminal investigations, some violent extremists are more likely than others to engage in aggressive confrontation. Analysis of existing intelligence and open source reporting indicates that violent aboriginal extremists are using the Internet to recruit and incite violence, and are actively engaging in direct physical confrontation with private company officials, destruction of private property, and threats of violence to persons and property.

As witnessed with the anti-shale gas protests in New Brunswick the anti-Enbridge Line 9 Project protests in Ontario, and the opposition to the Northern Gateway Pipeline Project in British Columbia, local aboriginal issues quickly attract support from across North America. In some cases, the arrival of outside influence provides financial support, and direction. Isolated aboriginal issues have the potential to escalate from local to national very quickly, often resulting in criminal activity across the country.

As an example, information posted to an anarchist website: “Act for Freedom Now”, on 2014-01-11, unidentified person(s) claimed responsibility for the placement of an incendiary device at a Vancouver financial institution on 2014-01-09. The poster of the information advised that the attack was in support of Canadians arrested in Mexico, and noted:

> Anything that promotes sabotage, which is mischief, which is damage to property, which is in many cases dangerous, is illegal... And there are limits obviously placed on protests and on a person's efforts to express their disdain and their opposition to certain issues.

Justice Minister Peter McKay's response to veiled threats to Canadian petroleum projects. 2014-01-08
"This also comes in a time where Canada's justice minister Peter Mackay is warning activists to not commit illegal actions toward stopping the pipelines. Mackay you can shove your warnings up your fucking ass. The state's and corporations dreams of massive resource extraction will go up in flames of revolt from the streets to late night sabotage and destruction. The need for freedom, anarchy and liberation will destroy this colonial state. Our acts of sabotage are uncontrollable, strategic and successful. This attack on HSBC is only the beginning of sabotage the will and is occurring. We are also in solidarity with Mi'kmaw warriors and other protesters still facing charges and harassment by the RCMP pigs and the Canadian state from anti-fracking protests in Elsipogtog."35

Anti-Shale Gas Protests - New Brunswick

* Current open source research in support of RCMP investigations indicates an increasing number of social media postings that include violent rhetoric associated to the New Brunswick, anti-shale gas protests. This violent rhetoric, with the demonstrated violent protest actions, and the seizure of weapons and improvised explosive devices, could indicate the law enforcement community is one step closer to the threat of severe bodily harm.
* As of 2013-12-13, the RCMP has executed 55 arrests (38 Aboriginal and 17 non-aboriginals), for 81 C.C. offences associated to the New Brunswick anti-shale gas protests.

In 2010, after consultation with and the support of, the Assembly of First Nations Chiefs in New Brunswick (AFN CNB), and with a license from the New Brunswick Government, SWN Resources Canada, Inc. (SWN), commenced natural gas and oil exploration in an area covering 1 million hectares (2.5 million acres).

As reported by the Aboriginal Peoples Television Network (APTN), published under the title: "NB chiefs group, Mi'kmaq district council received contracts from SWN and Irving-owned security firm":

"...The main New Brunswick chiefs organization received a contract from a Houston-based energy company facing fierce opposition from Elsipogtog First Nation residents over its shale gas exploration. SWN Resources Canada also "did everything right" under the consultation process agreed to between the provincial government and the Assembly of First Nations Chiefs in New Brunswick, according to the lawyer for the chiefs organization. The AFN CB has been receiving funding from SWN for the past two years to provide environmental monitoring for the company while it explores for shale gas in the province, said Mike Scully, who is the consultation liaison for the AFN CB. Scully said six people have been hired to follow SWN's workers as they work exploration lines in their search for shale gas deposits. Scully also said that Industrial Security Ltd. (ISL), which is on contract with SWN, issued a subcontract to the North Shore Mi'kmaq District Council for nine people to do "security related work" associated with SWN. Elsipogtog First Nation is not part of the district council which includes seven Mi'kmaq communities in the region. The council includes the communities of Boutin, First Nation, Eel River First Nation, Indian Island First Nation, Potawatomi First Nation and Metepenagiag First Nation.36

A peaceful, concerted anti-shale gas movement surfaced to challenge the New Brunswick government's commitment to develop its petroleum industry.38
With the perceived prospect that the hydraulic fracturing process contaminates drinking water and the air, an aggressive, violent extremist anti-fracking movement was formed within New Brunswick, including within the aboriginal communities.

As reported by Macdonald Stainsby in the "Counterpunch", on 2013-10-23.

"When land defenders from their community learned of the multiple places around the continent that have seen everything from polluted aquifers to tap water that could be lit on fire as an outcome of fracking--concerned families took action to defend their water."

As SWN conducted its operations, its equipment was destroyed, its employees threatened and harassed, its work impeded by road blocks, and security staff assaulted.

Given the severity of the protesters' criminal actions, the RCMP exercised its authority on 2013-10-17, to ensure the health and safety of the workers and the general public. The RCMP's enforcement actions resulted with: six RCMP vehicles burned; weapons, ammunition and improvised explosive devices seized; and the arrest of 40 individuals, including the Chief and council members of the Elsipogtog First Nation.

Mr. Stainsby further commented:

"On October 17th in the Canadian province of New Brunswick, an indigenous Mi'kmaq community named Elsipogtog came under RCMP militant attack... The RCMP swooped in a community that has never ceded their land via treaty to either Canada or the British Crown, with multiple dozen armed officers coordinating an attack on an encampment of shocked and terrorized Mi'Kmaq people and their supporters,48 and a call for support was issued which prompted the arrival of aboriginal and non-aboriginal supporters from across Canada, and North American-wide protests in support of the New Brunswick aboriginals.

**Opposition to the Canadian Petroleum Pipeline Industry**

(See Appendix E: Activists plot how to block new pipelines in B.C. and Appendix F: Safety and Security, Canadian Petroleum Industry; and, Proposed Petroleum Pipelines.)

The anti-petroleum pipeline movement claims:

- The proposed new pipelines are part of the tar sands rush - the push to more than double production from Alberta's tar sands by 2020.
- Stopping the expansion of the Canadian petroleum network is crucial to shifting Canada's energy sector away from dependence on fossil fuels and toward economic alternatives that protect communities and slow global warming.

---
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According to Lorrie Goldstein, of the Toronto Sun when he discussed; "environmental radicals":

"...Their real agenda is to undermine the development of Canada's oil sands – an insignificant contributor to global greenhouse gas emissions – along with any pipelines needed to move oil to ports in B.C., the Maritimes, and the Gulf Coast..."**41**

Initially, petroleum industry opposition, ranging from peaceful protests to criminality, focused exclusively on the Oil Sands, and its growing significance to the North American energy sector. These protests, while gaining international attention, had limited impact on the continued development of these megaprojects.

Anti-petroleum activists, militant and violent extremists have shifted their focus from the Oil Sands to the proposed multiple pipeline projects that, if approved, will transport the landlocked petroleum products from Alberta, and Saskatchewan, to the Pacific Coast, the Gulf of Mexico Coast, and to Eastern Canada, and eventually, to global markets.

Some pipeline opponents view the expansion of the Canadian pipeline network that will support the Oil Sands as a major contributor to global climate change. They argue the pipeline would increase carbon emissions by accelerating the pace of oil sands development, which releases more greenhouse gas emissions than the production and refining of more conventional types of crude. Others are focused on local concerns over the impact on land and water in the event of a spill.

Quoting from the Deep Green Resistance New York website:

"...But even this is not enough to slake the thirst for profits of these oil companies and their friends in the Harper government, who intend to double tar sands production by 2020 and triple it by 2030. There is, however, one major obstacle standing in the way of this short-sighted project: in order to produce all this oil — the objective is five million barrels per day — there must be a means of transporting it. And to transport it means to build pipelines: no pipelines, no expansion."**42**
SUMMATION

Within the anti-petroleum environmental movement, the law enforcement and security intelligence communities have detected a small, but violent-prone faction that has the intent and demonstrated capability to engage in criminal activity to attempt to shut down the Canadian petroleum industry.

Results of criminal investigations to date indicate the most likely targets of this criminal intervention include: petroleum extraction and processing facilities, pipelines, equipment and offices, private residences of petroleum officials, and hotels used by the field workers, financial institutions and the railway industry, and as witnessed at the National Energy Board hearings in Toronto and Montreal, the regulatory process. Currently, New Brunswick, and British Columbia face the most significant anti-petroleum criminal threat. However, as the petroleum industry expands its operations across Canada, criminal activity associated to the anti-petroleum movement will increase nationally.

The nature and extent of the criminality will depend on the location of the petroleum project, the associated perceived environmental threat, other contentious issues affecting the communities, the criminal intentions and capabilities of the participants, and their willingness to challenge the petroleum industry.

Regardless of the source or nature, criminal actions targeting the Canadian petroleum industry, intended to cause harm or not, represent a credible threat to the health and safety of the workers, the general public, the activists, the natural environment and the facility’s operations.

If violent environmental extremists engage in unlawful activity, it jeopardizes the health and safety of its participants, the general public and the natural environment.

Law enforcement, and other first responders, face the challenge of additional burden on their resources, and of ensuring the safety of their members, of company employees, of the general public, including those engaged in “peaceful assembly”.

RECOMMENDATIONS

CIIT encourages recipients of this document to report information concerning suspicious or criminal activity to local law enforcement organizations. To report information regarding suspicious activity, criminal extremism, or other activities which could pose a threat to Canada’s national security call:

National Security Information Network at 1-800-420-5805
Canadian Security Intelligence Service (CSIS) at (613)-993-9620

Non-emergency suspicious incidents can also be reported to CIIT analysts in the following cities:

Calgary: N. FLATTERS – 403-899-2685 – noel.flatters@rcmp-grc.gc.ca
Montreal: B. WEGRZYCK – 514-939-8400 #2782 – barbara.wegrzycka@rcmp-grc.gc.ca
Toronto: B. MCBAIN – 416-790-2617 – brittany.mc Bain@rcmp-grc.gc.ca
Vancouver: S. MANOLIAS – 778-290-4228 – sofia.manolas@rcmp-grc.gc.ca
Non-emergency suspicious incidents can also be reported to RCMP contacts in the following cities:

Charlottetown: Cpl. A. TRIANTAFILLOU – 902-566-7118 – alexis.triantafillou@rcmp-gcc.gc.ca
Fredericton: Cpl. L. ROBICHAUD – 506-452-3101 – lse.robichaud@rcmp-gcc.gc.ca
Halifax: Cpl. R. CHURCHILL – 902-720-5158 – robin.churchill@rcmp-gcc.gc.ca
Regina: Cpl. P. MCGUGAN – 306-780-8083 – pam.mcgugan@rcmp-gcc.gc.ca
St. John’s: Cpl. B. BEAUMASTER – 709-772-2577 – blaine.beaumaster@rcmp-gcc.gc.ca
Winnipeg: Sgt. R. KARPISH – 204-984-1963 – rod.karpish@rcmp-gcc.gc.ca

Prepared by: Critical Infrastructure Intelligence Team
Federal Policing Criminal Operations
Email: SIR-SIS@RCMP-GCC.GC.CA
Appendix A: Canadians Broadly Support Resource Development – But There Are Still Some Issues

A recent Canada-wide public opinion poll co-sponsored by the Canada West Foundation tested the public’s attitude toward natural resource development and found that Canadians support development but do not trust government and industry to do it right.

Oil sands development and paths to market are a hot button issue, so let’s start there. More than 80% of Canadians support continued oil sands development – a resounding endorsement. However, the supporters are relatively evenly divided between those who say that oil sands development should carry on as-is, and those who support a slower pace. Further, only 55% feel that the oil sands industry provides significant benefits for the whole country. Opposition to oil sands development is strongest in Quebec at 30%, and is just 12% or less in the West, Ontario and Atlantic Canada.

Not surprisingly, almost 80% of Canadians believe that we should process more of our natural resources (including oil) prior to export.

Regarding market access, 62% feel that President Obama should approve the Keystone XL project. The Energy East project (which would send oil from Alberta to eastern Canada) and Northern Gateway (which would send oil to Asia via the BC coast) were supported by 50% or more of respondents, with Kinder Morgan’s expansion (which would send oil from Alberta to Asia via the BC coast) coming in at 48% support. In addition, almost two-thirds of those polled believe that pipelines are the safest way to transport oil and gas.

The message is clear. Canadians overwhelmingly support continued oil sands development, although many believe that the rate of growth needs to be moderated. Canadians strongly support pipelines as the safest transport option and support building pipelines to reach all three major markets tested: eastern Canada, Asia (via pipeline and tanker, of course) and the US. The poll also revealed some issues that need to be addressed by both governments and industry through more than talking points and advertising campaigns. When asked whether the industry does a good job of balancing economic growth and environmental protection, just 37% responded positively for oil and gas compared to 69% for agriculture and 58% for forestry.

Barely one-third agree that the oil and gas industry does a good job of respecting the views of local communities affected by resource development. The federal and provincial governments received marginally better results for the same questions, but did not exceed 45% support in either category. Federal and provincial environmental regulatory bodies also got failing grades.

The bottom line is that Canadians feel that resource development in general provides economic benefits and does so across Canada. Not surprisingly, this perception is conditional on the geographic distribution of the resource. Agriculture is most strongly perceived as benefitting the entire nation, followed by forestry, mining, oil and gas in general, oil sands, and shale gas. Unfortunately, we don’t trust the oil and gas industry or government to find the balance between economic benefits, the interests of local communities and the environment.
Social licence is primarily about individual citizens and communities supporting resource development industries and projects. This support is dependent upon protecting the environment, being fair with all, and achieving positive outcomes. Despite the efforts of groups that oppose development, a large majority of Canadians generally support resource development. At the same time, the efforts of industry and government to garner the trust of Canadians to do that development right are also not proving to be very effective.

This survey shows clearly that Canadians generally view resource development in a positive light, but they also have serious concerns that need to be addressed.

The full survey results can be found at www.cwf.ca. The poll of 2,000 Canadians was undertaken by CROP and was commissioned by the Atlantic Provinces Economic Council, the Canada West Foundation, The Federal Idea and the Mowat Centre.
Appendix B: Environmentalists’ deep pockets dwarf Canada’s campaign to win approval for Keystone pipeline


Canada’s campaign to win approval in the United States for the Keystone XL pipeline may seem pricey, aggressive, and perhaps out of character — but it’s a drop in the bucket compared with the resources and tactics of those rallying against it.

Environmental organizations such as the Environmental Defense Fund, the Natural Resources Defense Council and the Sierra Club are raising US$300-million to US$400 million a year in the U.S. alone from foundations and wealthy individuals to bankroll their fight for climate change action, said David Keith, who teaches physics and public policy at Harvard University. Defeating Keystone XL is high on their agenda. I think industry is a bit naive about what they are up against “This is hardball. This is serious,” the Canadian environmental scientist said this week on the sidelines of a conference in Calgary, where he spoke about the strategies of non-governmental organizations (NGOs) in the U.S. “I think industry is a bit naive about what they are up against. It’s not like they are up against dope-smoking, nonsense people. Some of the people I know in that movement are people who could easily get $1-million a year jobs in industry. And they are people who successfully created billion-dollar industries.”

Prof. Keith, who is also president of a Calgary startup that develops technologies to capture carbon dioxide from ambient air, said the U.S. NGO movement has changed its game plan in the past decade. When its goal of cutting a deal with the U.S. Congress on climate change failed because of Republican opposition, it became grassroots-based. New groups such as 350.org successfully mobilized young people eager to pressure “elites” to think about climate change and do something about it. The movement aimed its firepower at fossil-fuel projects such as Keystone XL, power plants and coal exports in the hope of delaying and stopping them, while “irritating” industry into being “more willing to cut a larger deal.”

Prof. Keith said. In fact, there is speculation Canada is quietly negotiating with the White House to toughen up its pending greenhouse gas emission regulations for the oil and gas industry — which would put Canada at a disadvantage over other oil-producing countries — in exchange for approval of the Alberta-Texas pipeline.

A decision on whether the much-delayed project is in the public interest is now expected around March. The environmental movement is also looking to build public support by delivering victories — they “want to see some scalps,” Prof. Keith said. “If Keystone is killed, [while] that actually doesn’t do much to change the climate because that is just one oil platform, that scalp might help the movement [achieve] something substantial, which is to change the energy system.” Indeed, another goal is to accelerate the shift to renewable energy by making fossil fuels as expensive as possible, he said. While energy consumers may not like that, this benefits some of the movement’s funders, such as Tom Steyer, the hedge-fund billionaire and green energy philanthropist, who is paying for TV and social media campaigns against Keystone XL.
Appendix C: U.S. foundations against the oil sands
http://opinion.financialpost.com/2010/10/14/u-s-foundations-against-the-oil-sands/

There has never been a major oil spill in Vancouver harbour, but this coming Sunday protestors who say a spill is inevitable will take kayaks and canoes out into the water to stare down oil tankers. Chances are there won't be a tanker in sight, but there will be a party boat, organizers say.

If the campaign against oil tankers were to succeed in Vancouver, overseas exports of Canadian oil would be blocked and Canada would be stuck with only one major customer for Alberta oil: the United States. That's the trade-off.

Like most protests, the one against oil tankers has all the look and feel of a Canadian grassroots movement. The campaign against Alberta's oil sands also seems to rise out of the people, but the interesting thing is that there are very few roots under that grass. Money comes in from a small core of U.S. charitable groups. One of those groups — the U.S. Tides Foundation of California (Tides U.S.) and its Canadian counterpart have paid millions to at least 38 campaign organizations. (See list below.)

All the money, at least US$5-million, comes from a single, foreign charity. The Tides U.S. campaign against Alberta oil is a campaign against one of Canada's most important industries. It's fair for Canadians to inquire about who's funding this campaign and why. The trouble is, nobody knows.

But Tides U.S. is not alone. U.S. tax returns and public records show that Tides U.S. and charities based in California and New York have granted US$15-million since 2003 specifically for campaigns against Alberta oil and against oil tanker traffic and pipelines through British Columbia. The purposes for these grants are clearly outlined in the filings. For example, Tides U.S. received US$700,000 in 2009 from the Oak Foundation of San Francisco "to raise the visibility of the tar sands issue and slow the expansion of tar sands production by stopping new infrastructure development."

The Oak Foundation, created by a duty-free-shop founder, paid Greenpeace Canada an undisclosed sum of money "to leverage the growing interest of ranchers and landowners in limiting unbridled oil and gas exploration and production in southern Alberta." Greenpeace was also funded "to conduct specialized opinion research and media work" and to identify messaging for maximum information value among Albertans. World Wildlife Fund Canada was paid an unreported amount by the Oak Foundation for "an e-campaign to mobilize Canadians and send a politically compelling message."

In short, environmental organizations are doing what they are paid to do. What hasn't been known is who's paying the piper — and why. One thing is sure: when 38 organizations are all funded by a common, foreign source, their multi-million dollar campaign — with paid, full-time staff, expensive billboards and state-of-the-art web-sites — is anything but a grassroots operation.

The Tides Foundation is an American charity that has given away US US$1.5-billion since 1976. For many years, the chairman of the U.S. Tides Foundation, and the vice-chairman of Tides Canada, has been Joel Solomon. Mr. Solomon, an interesting figure in his own right, also
backed the election campaign of Vancouver’s Mayor Gregor Robertson to the tune of about US$350,000. But that’s another story.

U.S. tax returns show that Tides and Tides Canada have paid US$4.3-million for a “Tar Sands Campaign.” The top recipients were the Sierra Club (US$909,652), Corporate Ethics International (US$750,000), the Natural Resources Defense Council (US$520,000), and Forest Ethics (US$401,364).

Many of the grants for the “Tar Sands Campaign” are far larger than grants for other important causes. For example, a rape intervention project in Sub-Saharan Africa got US$9,000 and a project to support people with HIV in Indonesia got US$9,998. In comparison, Greenpeace got US$186,000 and the World Wildlife Fund got US$160,000 to campaign against Alberta oil.

Unlike many charitable foundations, Tides U.S. doesn’t have a large endowment. “In practice, Tides behaves less like a philanthropy than a money-laundering enterprise, taking money from other foundations and spending it as the donor requires,” writes the U.S. Center for Consumer Freedom. “Called ‘donor-advised’ giving, this pass-through funding vehicle provides public-relations insulation for the money’s original donors.”

Since 2000, Tides Canada has been paid at least US$56-million by American charitable foundations. In 2007 and 2008, Tides Canada received US$34-million and ranked 14th in the world in terms of funding from U.S. foundations. Obviously, something about Tides Canada is very important to its American funders.

Tides, and the U.S. foundations that fund it, have incredibly deep pockets. A large part of Tides’ funding comes from the Gordon & Betty Moore Foundation, the William & Flora Hewlett Foundation, the David & Lucile Packard Foundation, the Pew Charitable Trusts and the Rockefeller Brothers Fund. These are The Big Five. They give away about US$1.2-billion every year. If these foundations decide to undermine a foreign industry, they probably can.

These Big Five have poured at least US$190-million into Canada’s environmental movement over the last decade, but their American logos are nowhere to be seen. Instead, we see a pageant of Canadian icons: dogwood, herds of caribou, wild salmon, First Nations and loons. U.S. tax returns show that the David Suzuki Foundation has been paid at least US$10-million from American foundations. This hasn’t exactly been out in the open.

The Moore Foundation is the creation of Gordon Moore, a co-founder of Intel Corp. According to Forbes, he was once the ninth-wealthiest American. Based in San Francisco, the Moore Foundation has paid B.C. organizations nearly US$50-million and says as plain as day that grantees are expected to influence British Columbia’s resource management decisions, specifically with regards to oil and gas.

Since 2006, the Moore Foundation has paid US$14-million to support the Pacific North Coast Integrated Management Area Initiative (PNCIMA). This is a federal agency assigned the task of helping to plan all coastal development and influence decisions about natural resources from the northern tip of Vancouver Island to the southern border of Alaska, a strategic part of the Canadian coast. Ottawa created the PNCIMA, but its role is unclear. If PNCIMA — funded by the anti-tanker Moore Foundation — were to recommend banning oil tankers, Alberta oil can’t go to Asia.
Hands down, the biggest beneficiaries of Tides Canada's distributions have been First Nations along the B.C. coast. Some of these same First Nations have vehemently promised to stop the Enbridge Northern Gateway Pipeline to send oil from Alberta to Kitimat, on the B.C. coast. U.S. tax returns for 2008 show that Tides Canada paid two coastal First Nations US$27.3-million in a single grant. This mega-grant was "to fund conservation planning projects and conservation initiatives" and was earmarked for the Nuxalk and the Lax Kw'alaams. Tides Canada's objective was to pay for "Mobilizing First Nations Against Climate Change in B.C." and for "support of Coastal First Nations to hire a co-ordinator to engage with government, industry, environmental groups, media and the public regarding the proposed Enbridge Gateway tar sands pipeline."

Rethink Alberta, the newest campaign to try to influence Alberta development, is led by Corporate Ethics International. Its aim is to tell tourists and tour operators to boycott Alberta. In addition to funding from Tides U.S., Corporate Ethics received US$950,000 from The Rockefeller Brothers Fund "to stem demand for tar sands derived fuels in the United States." Never mind oil from Nigeria or the Middle East. Rockefeller Brothers has honed in on Alberta. Michael Marx, the executive director of Corporate Ethics International, won't answer any questions about CEI's sources of funding or how that's spent. "CEI's policy is to maintain the confidentiality of its funders," Marx replied by email.

The Hewlett and Packard foundations in California were created by the founders of tech giant Hewlett-Packard. With assets of almost US$7-billion, Hewlett alone is one of the largest charitable foundations in the world. Since 2000, the separate Hewlett and Packard foundations have contributed US$71-million to conservation initiatives, including an effort to "reform" resource-based industries, and to fund First Nations in Canada. That included US$29-million towards the Great Bear Rainforest, US$22-million to reduce the development of fossil fuels in northern Canada, and US$14-million to support First Nations.

My research into the filings of U.S. charities active in funding activists against Canadian and Alberta energy development shows that the anti-oil sands movement is the product of American charities with unknown or certainly unclear motives. At least US$15-million has been paid by the Hewlett and other foundations since 2003, most of it in recent years, including US$3.7-million in U.S. grants paid to the Pembina Foundation, which funds the Pembina Institute of Calgary, a tar sands critic. The flow of money though the Tides group, in turn, is going to Greenpeace Canada and others.

The kayaks bobbing into Vancouver Harbour on Sunday are likely riding a sea of money from U.S. sources. If all this money isn't enough to get Alberta to "rethink," there's plenty more where it came from, which means the Alberta oil industry is up against a billion-dollar gorilla. There's nothing wrong with foreign funding for charitable purposes but charities should do charity and foreign funding should be out in the open.
### WHO'S FUNDING THE WAR ON THE OIL SANDS

**ORGANIZATIONS PAID BY THE U.S. TIDES FOUNDATION/TIDES CANADA TO CAMPAIGN AGAINST ALBERTA'S OIL SANDS IN U.S., SINCE 2007**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Tar sands</th>
<th>General</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Corporate Ethics International</td>
<td>$750,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$750,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural Resources Defence Council</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
<td>$320,000</td>
<td>$520,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sierra Club / Sierra Club Foundation (U.S.)</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
<td>$231,004</td>
<td>$431,004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forest Ethics</td>
<td>$286,000</td>
<td>$115,364</td>
<td>$401,364</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sierra Club of B.C. Foundation</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$341,198</td>
<td>$341,198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Defense Canada Inc.</td>
<td>$310,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$310,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boréal Songbird Initiative</td>
<td>$265,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$265,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rainforest Action Network</td>
<td>$225,000</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td>$245,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western Organization of Resources Councillis Education Project</td>
<td>$175,000</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>$225,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ducks Unlimited Canada</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern Alberta Land Trust Society</td>
<td>$185,030</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$185,030</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greenpeace Canada</td>
<td>$186,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$186,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friends of the Earth</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$160,000</td>
<td>$160,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>World Wildlife Fund (WWF) Canada</td>
<td>$160,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$160,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insight Productions Inc.</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$145,000</td>
<td>$145,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sierra Club of Canada</td>
<td>$117,450</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td>$137,450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Toronto (The Governing Council)</td>
<td>$133,763</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$133,763</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Driftwood Foundation</td>
<td>$27,000</td>
<td>$93,917</td>
<td>$120,917</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Earthworks</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
<td>$115,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indigenous Environmental Network</td>
<td>$115,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$115,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fresh Energy</td>
<td>$110,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$110,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dogwood Initiative</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$102,983</td>
<td>$102,983</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plains Justice</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tides Center Global Community Monitor</td>
<td>$75,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$75,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Law &amp; Policy Center</td>
<td>$60,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$60,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oil Change International</td>
<td>$30,000</td>
<td>$30,000</td>
<td>$60,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equiterre</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nine other organizations</td>
<td>$225,184</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$225,184</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL:** $4,345,776 $1,644,466 $5,990,242

**SOURCE:** AVIAN KRANS, U.S. CHARITABLE TAX RETURNS

---
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Appendix D: New U.S. funding for the war on Canadian oil
Financial Post: 2013-12-03
http://opinion.financialpost.com/2013/11/29/vivian-krause-new-u-s-funding-for-the-war-on-canadian-oil/

Tides USA letters reveal $3.2-million in payments over last few months to activists groups and environmental organizations in Canada, U.S. and Europe. The objective: Create opposition to Canadian oil developments. Keystone opponent 350.org has the look and feel of an amateur, grassroots operation, but in reality, it is a multi-million dollar campaign run by staff earning six-digit salaries. For more than a decade, there has been a complex international effort to stymie the oil industry in Canada.

It's called the Tar Sands Campaign and the main sources of funding for this campaign are the Rockefeller Brothers Fund, the William and Flora Hewlett Foundation, the Oak Foundation, the Sea Change Foundation, the Tides Foundation and other charitable foundations, most of which are based in California. By my calculations, these foundations have provided at least $75-million for campaigns and land use planning initiatives that thwart the development and export of Canadian oil. Until now, little information has been available about the specific activities that have been funded. Not anymore. Earlier this month, an unprecedented amount of detail came to light in a series of covering letters for 70 payments sent by the San Francisco-based Tides Foundation ("Tides USA") to 45 organizations in the U.S., Canada and Europe. These payments total $3.2-million. I came across these covering letters using Google.

All of the letters that I've seen are signed by Gary D. Schwarz, the interim CEO of Tides USA. Most of these letters were sent between June and October of 2013. Mr. Schwarz's covering letters stipulate a list of conditions including, for example, that the recipient organization agrees "not to use any portion of the granted funds to carry on propaganda nor to attempt to influence specific legislation either by direct or grassroots lobbying." And yet these letters suggest to me that this is precisely what Tides is funding.

The numbering and timing of these payments indicates that they have been made systematically. For example, between August 2 and September 29, Tides made 27 consecutively numbered payments for a total of $1.9-million. In all cases, the donor is listed as "an existing fund." Generally, the existing fund is not identified. The recipients are clearly identified. From the Great Bear Rainforest Initiative and the First Nations at Fort Chipewyan to the groups pushing for the EU Fuel Quality Directive in Europe, virtually every organization that campaigns against the Alberta oil industry is funded by Tides USA, these letters reveal. Among the initiatives that Tides USA funds are LeadNow, Idle No More, the Indigenous Tar Sands campaign, the Tanker Free Coast campaign, Pipe Up, the Tar Sands Reality Check, the Canadian Youth Climate Coalition, PowerShift and Save the Salish Sea. The gist of these initiatives is to foment opposition to pipeline and export infrastructure that is essential for getting Canadian energy to global markets. Seven payments mention building relationships with First Nations, "indigenous solidarity," resistance and opposition along pipeline routes. For example, through the Tides Canada Foundation Exchange Fund, Tides USA paid $35,000 for re-granting to West Coast Environmental Law "to provide legal strategies and communication support to First Nations to constrain tar sands development."
Through the Tides Canada Foundation Exchange Fund, Tides USA also paid $15,000 to the Sierra Club of BC for a project called, "Our Coast, Our Call: Mobilizing and Strengthening Opposition to Tanker Expansion on the British Columbia Coast."

Even before the recommendations of the Joint Panel Review of the Northern Gateway pipeline are in, Tides USA has paid First Nations in British Columbia to respond to the panel and to media. On August 9, 2013, Tides USA paid $67,500 to the Great Bear Initiative Society "for work with Coastal First Nations on the Central and North Coasts to prepare for the federal consultations; respond to media; and raise awareness of the costs of an oil spill and respond to Joint Review Panel (JRP) recommendations." Tides USA paid $25,000 to the same group "to enforce the oil tanker ban for the Great Bear Rainforest through communications outreach, to maintain opposition to oil tankers, and to increase public support against the Northern Gateway pipeline." Both of the letters regarding these payments were sent to the attention of Mr. Art Sterritt. Tides funds the Dogwood Initiative "to cultivate widespread public opposition to tar sands oil tankers and pipeline proposals in British Columbia." Note that Dogwood isn't paid to oppose all tankers, only "tar sands oil tankers" — in other words, only tankers exporting Canadian oil.

On August 9, 2013, Pembina was paid $225,000 "to advance policy improvements, the narrative that oilsands expansion is problematic, land use decisions that slow expansion, and improved climate policy." Tides USA also funded Pembina "to provide regular briefings to the Tar Sands Group and broaden the base of key influencers." Earlier in the year Tides USA paid Pembina $55,000 "for furthering awareness of the negative impacts of the tar sands economy." Indeed, with the recent release of its recent report, "Booms, Busts and Bitumen," Pembina did just that. Environmental Defence Canada was paid $212,500 by Tides USA "for outreach and education on the Line 9 and Energy East pipelines; ongoing promotion of Tar Sands Reality Check; leading government relations work in Ottawa; promotion of the Fuel Quality Directive (FQD); and supporting the work of allies."

EquiBerre was paid $75,000 by Tides USA "to educate the public on Line 9 and Energy East, participate in the regulatory process for Line 9, and assist in promoting Tar Sands Reality Check in Quebec and raising awareness of the economic challenges with tar sands development." Greenpeace Canada was paid $90,000 "for events that show opposition to pipelines and tar sands expansion, for ongoing participation in the AB pipeline review, and for continued work to expose the nefarious work of industry and government in order to expand the tar sands" and a further $100,000 for similar purposes.

Some payments mention a specific pipeline company: TransCanada pipelines (Keystone XL and Line 9) are mentioned in regards to 15 payments, Enbridge in 11 and Kinder Morgan in six. Some payments mention specific pipelines, including Line 9, the Clipper/Line 67 expansion, Energy East, as well as pipelines in the MacKenzie valley and New England. For example, the National Wildlife Federation, based in Washington D.C., was paid $50,000 "to organize opposition to the Enbridge Line 67 expansion and the Keystone XL pipeline."

Living Oceans Society was paid $30,000 "to build opposition to the KM pipeline; conduct research on risks to human health from an oil spill, risks to wildlife, and the "blue economy;" implement comprehensive rollout strategies for the research results including ethnic audiences; and renew opposition parties' commitment to tanker ban." Living Oceans was also paid $6,000 for a project titled, "Exposing the threats to human health posed by a Kinder Morgan spill."

National Security Critical Information

This document is the property of the Royal Canadian Mounted Police (RCMP), National Security Program. It is marked sensitive to your department/agency in confidence and for internal use only, and it is not to be redisseminated, copied, forwarded, or further disseminated, in whole or in part without the consent of the originator. It is to be used in accordance with the proper security safeguards as outlined by the Government of Canada for classified information. If your department/agency has applicable guidelines, please use as guidelines. This document is a classified part of the government's national security information. For any questions concerning the information or the caveat, please contact the OKC National Security Critical Support Branch, RCMP.
Tides also funds the beginning of a new campaign against InSitu mining, according to one letter to the Keepers of the Athabasca Watershed Society. The EU Fuel Quality Directive is mentioned in the covering letters regarding five payments that I've seen. For example, on September 13, 2013 a numbered company in Fort Chipewyan was paid $55,000 "to build the case for rejecting the Shell and Teck Frontier mines; participate in regulatory processes and use legal tools to increase regulations; work with groups in Europe to support the Fuel Quality Directive (FQD); and build public opposition to tar sands and pipelines."

Tides USA paid the same amount to the same numbered company in 2012, tax returns show. For a project titled, "Stop Shell and Keep Tar Sands Out of Europe," Tides USA paid $12,000 to the U.K. Tar Sands Network, based in Oxford. Tides USA also funds Friends of the Earth in Europe and the European Federation for Transport & Environment, both based in Belgium. In the U.S., Tides paid $1.5-million to 21 organizations including funds organizing landowners, for the Nebraska Farmers Union and for "using creative action" in small towns and rural communities along the proposed Keystone XL pipeline route. The Sierra Club was paid $155,000 "for organizing and mobilizing opposition to the Keystone XL pipeline and other tar sands projects and for coordination with Canadian colleagues."

The New York-based Natural Resources Defense Council was paid $150,000 for policy analysis and advice and for "co-ordinating allies" in Canada and Europe. It was also paid to co-ordinate the Tar Sands Free Northeast Coalition, particularly at the municipal level.

Forest Ethics was paid $155,000 "... to persuade a minimum of either Coke or Pepsi to confirm publicly that they have committed to eliminate fuel that comes from tar sands refineries" – in other words, Canadian oil.

Details of the 27 consecutively numbered payments (#1875 – #1903) made by Tides USA between August 2 and September 29, are reported below.

- #1875: $75,000 for Bill McKibben's organization, 350.org “for mobilizing the public in opposition to the Keystone XL pipeline and expansion of tar sands,” August 2, 2013.
- #1876: $80,000 paid to ProgressNow “for Bold Nebraska’s efforts towards organizing landowners in Nebraska who oppose the Keystone XL pipeline; and for support of the Nebraska Farmers Union and Nebraska Easement Action Team,” August 16, 2013.
- #1877: $50,000 paid to the Earth Island Institute “for Energy Action Coalition’s efforts towards mobilizing students and youth in opposition to the Keystone XL pipeline and the expansion of the tar sands,” August 9, 2013.
- #1878: $75,000 paid to Forest Ethics “to conduct education and outreach on the Kinder Morgan and Enbridge Northern Gateway Campaign; participate in the development of Tar Sands Free West Coast; and persuade a minimum of either Coke or Pepsi to confirm publicly that they have committed to eliminate fuel that comes from tar sands refineries,” August 9, 2013. For the same purpose, Forest Ethics was also paid $50,000 on August 16, 2013 and $30,000 on October 25, 2013.
- #1879: $25,000 paid to Friends of the Earth “for monitoring and exposing State Department handling of the Keystone XL pipeline review process,” August 9, 2013.
- #1880: $25,000 paid to the Polaris Institute “for Indigenous Environmental Network’s organizing indigenous opposition to the expansion of Enbridge Alberta Clipper/Line 67

- #1881: $50,000 paid to the National Wildlife Federation, "to organize opposition to the Enbridge Line 97 expansion and the Keystone XL pipeline," August 9, 2013.

- #1882: $150,000 paid to the Natural Resources Defense Council (c/o Frances Beinecke) for "policy analysis and advice, for education of policy makers, for organizing opposition to the Keystone XL pipeline and tar sands expansion generally, for coordinating with Canadian and European allies, and for development of the Tar Sands Free Northeast Coalition including organizing municipalities." August 9, 2013.

- #1883: $60,000 paid to Oil Change International for "oil industry analysis and for information on the climate impacts of tar sands projects," August 16, 2013.

- #1884: $35,000 paid to Public Citizen Foundation "towards monitoring and exposing the practices of TransCanada on the Keystone XL South (Gulf Coast) pipeline project; and for organizing landowners along the pipeline route of Keystone XL and SeaWay," August 9, 2013.

- #1885: $165,000 paid to The Sierra Club, based in San Francisco "for organizing and mobilizing opposition to the Keystone XL pipeline and other tar sands projects and for coordination with Canadian colleagues." August 16, 2013.

- #1886: $25,000 paid to the Backbone campaign (c/o Mr. Bill Moyer) for a project called "The Other 99%'s training and organizing direct actions in opposition to the Keystone XL pipeline." September 27, 2013.

- #1887: $55,000 paid to a numbered company, 850450 Alberta Ltd., in Fort Chipewyan "to build the case for rejecting the Shell and Teck Frontier mines; participate in regulatory processes and use legal tools to increase regulations; work with groups in Europe to support the Fuel Quality Directive (FQD); and build public opposition to tar sands pipelines," September 13, 2013.

- #1888: $75,000 paid to The Dogwood Initiative "to increase the number of no tankers supporters; develop volunteer teams in each area; and deepen the engagement of existing supporters," August 9, 2013. Dogwood was also paid $25,000 on July 18, 2013 "to cultivate widespread public opposition to tar sands oil tankers and pipeline proposals in British Columbia" and a total of $81,700 in four grants "to help British Columbians exercise local control to create healthy and prosperous communities."

- #1889: $212,500 paid to Environmental Defense "outreach and education on the Line 9 and Energy East pipelines; ongoing promotion of Tar Sands Reality Check; leading government relations work in Ottawa; promotion of the Fuel Quality Directive (FQD); and supporting the work of allies," August 9, 2013. Through Tides Canada Foundation Exchange Fund, Environmental Defense was also paid $15,000 "to co-sponsor a series of concerts aimed at engaging and educating a wider audience about the risks of tar sands expansion," July 12, 2013.

- #1890: $60,000 paid to The European Federation for Transport & Environment, based in Belgium, "for organizing, providing technical advice to policy makers, and educating the public of key countries in support of the EU Fuel Quality Directive implementing regulations, as outlined in your proposal," August 2, 2013.

- #1892: $70,000 paid to Friends of the Earth Europe ASBL, based in Belgium, "towards organizing and educating policy makers and the public in key countries in support of the EU Fuel Quality Directive implementing regulations, as outlined in your proposal," August 9, 2013.

- #1893: $67,500 paid to the Great Bear Initiative Society, "for work with Coastal First Nations on the Central and North coasts to prepare for the federal consultations;"
respond to media; raise awareness of the costs of an oil spill and respond to Joint Review Panel (JRP) recommendations," August 9, 2013. The Great Bear Initiative Society was paid $25,000 "to enforce the oil tanker ban for the Great Bear Rainforest through communications outreach, to maintain opposition to oil tankers, and to increase public support against the Northern Gateway Pipeline," July 12, 2013. Both payments were sent by Tides to the attention of Mr. Art Sterritt.

- #1894: $100,000 paid to Greenpeace Canada "for your continued outreach and education on pipelines, tar sands mines and pipeline safety regulations, as outlined in your proposal," August 9, 2013. Greenpeace Canada was also paid $90,000 "for events that show opposition to pipelines and tar sands expansion, for ongoing participation in the AB pipeline review, and for continued work to expose the nefarious work of industry and government in order to expand the tar sands," April 12, 2013.

- #1895: $50,000 paid to Keepers of the Athabasca Watershed Society for "development and implementation of an InSitu campaign; continued work on pipelines; and participation in other Alberta events and campaigns," August 9, 2013.

- #1896: $30,000 paid to Living Oceans Society "to build opposition to the KM pipeline; conduct research on risks to human health from an oil spill, risk to wildlife, and the "blue economy," implement comprehensive roll out strategies for the research results including ethnic audiences; and renew opposition parties' commitment to tanker ban," August 9, 2013. Living Oceans was also paid $6,000 for a project titled, "Exposing the Threats to Human Health Posed by a Kinder Morgan Spill," October 4, 2013.

- #1897: $35,000 paid to the The Northwest Bioregional Research Society for "ongoing coordination of the Enbridge campaign in the north, support for materials and events, and for hosting regular provincial calls," August 16, 2013.

- #1898: $225,000 paid to the Pembina Institute "to advance policy improvements, the narrative that oilsands expansion is problematic, land use decisions that slow expansion, and improved climate policy," August 9, 2013. That grant also specified, "This grant is also to provide regular briefings to the Tar Sands Group and broaden the base of key influencers, as outlined in your proposal." The Pembina Institute was also paid $55,000 "for further raising awareness of the negative impacts of the tar sands on the economy, for participating in conversation with Province of Alberta about water, land and air regulatory reform, technical support to tar sands campaign partner, and for participation in the Shell JRP's and preparation for the Tech Frontier JRP," April 12, 2013.

- #1899: $30,000 paid to the Sierra Club of BC for "continued work to stop the Enbridge and Kinder Morgan pipelines including working with First Nations, PowerShift and others," August 23, 2013. Through the Tides Canada Foundation Exchange Fund, the Sierra Club of BC was also paid $15,000 for a project titled, "Our Coast, Our Call: mobilizing and strengthening opposition to tanker expansion on the BC coast," October 4, 2013.

- #1900: $30,000 paid to the Prairie Chapter of the Sierra Club of Canada for the "Climate and Energy Campaigner's work on new mines, pipeline safety, regulations, protection of water and support for the Athabasca Chipewyan First Nation (ACFN), August 30, 2013.


- #1903: $46,500 paid to West Coast Environmental Law Research Foundation (WCELRF) "for ongoing work to support First Nations in their opposition to pipelines in British Columbia," August 16, 2013. Through the Tides Canada Foundation Exchange
Fund, WCELRF was paid also paid $35,000 "to provide legal strategies and communication support to First Nations to constrain tar sands development," July 12, 2013.
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At night, around campfires under a New Brunswick sky, Ambrose Williams thought about imminent battles back home.

...Last November, the young Vancouver man and nine others travelled more than 5,000 kilometres east to the town of Rexton. Their mission was to reinforce the Mi'kmaw of the Esgenoopetitj First Nation who had clashed the month before with the RCMP. The confrontation happened on October 17, 2013, when heavily armed police dismantled a highway blockade by Natives opposing a gas-exploration project.

"I saw it as a staging ground," Williams told the Georgia Straight about his journey during a December 27 interview—the day he returned—near Vancouver's downtown waterfront. According to the 25-year-old former president of the Aboriginal Life in Vancouver Enhancement Society, it was “good training to see how police tactics are used against aboriginal people and protesters”.

That knowledge may become valuable later.

Williams's Gitxsan and Dene ancestors are from northern B.C., where lies the path of the Northern Gateway oil pipeline proposed by Enbridge Inc. This is also where planned gas pipelines to the west coast will pass. These will cross pristine forests and waters as well as traditional Native territories.

"It was a good starting point because I saw Enbridge coming...like, four or five years ago," Williams said about his involvement in New Brunswick. "I was talking about it with people, and people wore, 'Oh, yeah, that's not going to go through; that's not going to go through.' But now they've got the green light....It's only a matter of time."

About a week before he returned to Vancouver, a federal joint review panel endorsed for cabinet approval the 1,177-kilometre pipeline that will carry diluted bitumen from Alberta's oilsands to the port in Kitimat, B.C., for shipment to foreign markets.

Williams echoed the vow by Native and nonaboriginal activists that Northern Gateway "will not be built”.

He expects "protection" and "decolonization" camps rising, blockades going up, and occupations. He cited as an example the 1990 crisis in Oka, Quebec, where Mohawks, some of whom were armed, came face to face with police and the military.

"We'll hit them on all fronts and just keep on hammering," Williams pledged.

He stressed that he neither encourages nor condones sabotage and other acts of destruction. But the soft-spoken Williams also said that "anything like that is acceptable if the cause is just."
And stopping the pipeline is a just cause."

"Everyone has their line, and once they cross it, then they're accountable for themselves and the actions that they've caused," Williams added. "We can't go around telling people what to do, what to say. But everyone needs to realize they will come up to this line at some point, and they have to be willing to cross it or not."

Acts of sabotage in the name of the environment are rare in B.C., according to Zoe Blunt (her activist name: legal name Tracie Park), a veteran of antilogging protests. Not only rare, but most people are also reluctant to talk about them, the Victoria-based activist noted.

"It's difficult for anyone who is speaking out publicly in favour of sabotage, or even in, like, a neutral way...because they're facing not only condemnation and denunciation from the corporations, the police, [and] the government but also the mainstream environmental groups," Blunt told the Straight in a phone interview.

But she maintained that actions like tree-spiking and monkey wrenching—the destruction of property and machinery—helped stop the clear-cut logging of ancient forests in Clayoquot Sound on Vancouver Island and in the Elaho Valley near Squamish during the 1990s and 2000s.

Although acts of civil disobedience during the Clayoquot Sound conflict are celebrated, Blunt said, there's hardly ever a mention that 20,000 trees are believed to have been spiked to ward off chainsaws.

That's one reason why she's working on her first book—a slim one, she said—with the tentative title *The Pros and Cons of Tree-Spiking: The Secret History of Eco-Sabotage in British Columbia.*

"Radicals assert that our society is founded on violence and coercion, much of it invisible," Blunt writes in a draft she forwarded to the Straight. "Social critics note the accepted order of things is for the strong to abuse the weak. But when those lower on the hierarchy push back, the reaction is fear and horror."

Her research material includes writings by former Vancouverite Paul Watson, world-renowned founder of the Sea Shepherd Conservation Society, a direct-action group operating on the high seas to protect whales and other marine wildlife.

In one 1990 manuscript titled "In Defense of Tree-Spiking", Watson recalled organizing a "small cadre of concerned eco-activists" in 1982 when the Grouse Mountain Ski Resort announced that it was selling timber rights on a part of the mountain overlooking Vancouver.

Armed with hammers and metal spikes, they spiked 2,000 trees. They also posted warnings in the area. Watson and his companions then drove across the bridge to Vancouver and delivered news releases about their action, which generated front-page stories. They followed up with TV interviews. Wearing masks, they all identified themselves as Wally Cedarleaf.
"Within a day, the sawmills stated flatly that they would not buy logs from the spiked lot," Watson wrote. "The deal was off. Grouse Mountain Resort people were furious. We were denounced as terrorists and criminals by those we thought were our allies—the North Vancouver City Council, Greenpeace, and assorted other eco-bureaucrats.

"We didn't give a damn—the trees were saved," Watson continued. "Grouse Mountain would remain intact. The tactic worked."

In the same document, Watson commented on civil disobedience, a symbolic and peaceful violation of the law, like sit-ins.

According to Watson, civil disobedience is "costly to its participants both financially and physically".

The "establishment loves" civil disobedience, he stated. "The authorities are trained to deal with it. There are no surprises."

Oil and gas pipelines are part of the energy-and-utilities sector, one of 10 sectors identified by the federal government in its 2009 National Strategy for Critical Infrastructure.

It defines critical infrastructure as "processes, systems, facilities, technologies, networks, assets and services essential to the health, safety, security or economic well-being of Canadians and the effective functioning of government".

The strategy sets out a collaborative approach by the national government, provinces, territories, and private infrastructure owners and operators to protect these assets against "natural, intentional and accidental hazards".

Critical infrastructure is also mentioned in a major security document released in 2012 and updated in 2013 by the federal government titled Building Resilience Against Terrorism: Canada's Counter-Terrorism Strategy.

The government identifies "domestic, issue-based extremism" as one of three sources of terrorism threats in the country.

Noting that "domestic issue-based groups remain a reality in Canada", the document states that these revolve around issues that include "environmentalism".

"As part of this Strategy," the paper notes, "the Government works closely with the owners and operators of critical infrastructure to identify risks and to understand what in practice can and should be done to reduce security vulnerabilities."

It also states that under new legislation related to terrorism, the definition of "harm to Canadian interests" includes "interference with critical infrastructure".

The document further notes that the RCMP "operates a Critical Infrastructure Intelligence Team examining physical and cyber threats to critical infrastructure". This effort includes a "Suspicious Incident Reporting system to gather information from private industry and local law enforcement about suspicious incidents".
In 2000, Wiebo Ludwig, a Dutch immigrant and leader of a Christian community in Alberta, was convicted on five charges related to bombings and vandalism of oil and gas wells in that province; he received a 28-month sentence.

Ludwig was also suspected by the RCMP of bombing six gas pipelines in B.C. in 2008 and 2009. He died in 2012.

The RCMP, Enbridge, and the Canadian Association of Petroleum Producers refused Straight requests for interviews. The Canadian Energy Pipeline Association did not respond to an interview request by the Straight before deadline.

Joe Alaimoona is the general manager of All Peace Protection, an Alberta-based security-guard company with clients in the oil industry. A Samoan from New Zealand, he is also the company’s First Nations economic-development officer, working to provide security jobs to aboriginal people in B.C. and Alberta.

According to Alaimoona, remote sites are a big challenge.

"It’s very easy for people to hide in there and start stealing and tampering with equipment," Alaimoona told the Straight in a phone interview.

Safety for oil-and-gas employees and contractors working in isolated areas is also a concern, he added.

Services offered by Alaimoona’s company include pipeline security. He said that increased oil-and-gas activity will mean more employment for security guards, especially for pipeline patrols.

From East Vancouver, Gord Hill followed events in New Brunswick as the Mi'kmaq battled the police and employed various tactics against SWN Resources Canada, the company exploring for shale gas that will be extracted by means of hydraulic fracturing, a controversial method also known as fracking.

The Kwakwaka’wakw man noted that in court filings for an injunction against protesters, SWN stated that several company vehicles had been damaged and more than 1,000 geophones sabotaged. Geophones are devices for mapping gas deposits.

The Mi'kmaq also set fire to RCMP cruisers during the October 17 clash. A few days later, the RCMP abandoned its detachment in the Elsipogtog First Nation community following an arson attempt. The Canadian flag at the Mountie outpost was replaced with a Native warrior flag.

"With the Mi'kmaq struggle, you saw a lot of sabotage occur," Hill told the Straight in a coffeehouse interview.

Turning to Enbridge’s Northern Gateway in B.C., Hill said he expects legal challenges and a massive mobilization of public opinion against the project.

"But then beyond that...what I think is really important is...a grassroots Native movement," he said. "It’s the only one that really has the capability of engaging in more radical tactics or the willingness to engage in more radical tactics. Something like what happened in New Brunswick with the antifracking struggle from the Mi'kmaq. I mean, that’s an example for Native communities to look at as to how grassroots Native people can resist these kinds of projects."
He sees one grassroots movement emerging with the Unist'ot'en clan of the Wet'suwet'en First Nation in northern B.C.

The Unist'ot'en have set up camp in the way of the planned Pacific Trails gas pipeline. The project was granted an environmental-assessment certificate by the B.C. government in 2008. It is expected to be operational in 2015.

In a 2012 interview in Vancouver, Unist'ot'en spokesperson Freda Huson told the Straight that Pacific Trails will clear the route for Enbridge's Northern Gateway oil pipeline and other gas pipelines.

When asked how her people will deal with a potential violent confrontation, Huson replied: "We'll do what we need to do."

Hill has visited the Unist'ot'en camp in the path of Pacific Trails. "It's going to be the first pipeline that's going to be really challenged," Hill said. "That's going to be a critical part of the Enbridge struggle."

While growing up, Ambrose Williams spent many summers with his Gitxsan and Dene relatives in northern B.C., where they live next to the Unist'ot'en clan of the Wet'suwet'en Nation. When Williams returned to Vancouver on a bus from Calgary in the early morning of December 27, he didn't bother with a rest. He went straight to meetings with people opposing oil and gas developments.

One of these was Shannon Hecker, a UBC anthropology student. They got acquainted through social media when Williams was in New Brunswick and Hecker was organizing rallies in Vancouver in solidarity with the Mi'kmaq.

Williams and Hecker met personally for the first time on that day he came home, and he invited her to join the interview with the Straight.

According to Hecker, resistance to oil and gas pipelines in B.C. and antifracking protests in New Brunswick are "all related...a case of people standing up to defend Mother Nature from desecration as a result of unsustainable resource extraction. The pipelines is just like another sort of front on that same war."

As to how far people should go, Hecker said: "That depends on your willingness to commit. I don't want to tell anyone what they should or shouldn't do. But we all need to be aware that this is a war."
Appendix F: Safety and Security, Canadian Petroleum Industry; and, Proposed Petroleum Pipelines

Canadian Petroleum Pipelines

Most of Canada's oil is land locked, most notably within Western Canada, and is moved to market primarily by the use of transmission pipelines.

Canada's transmission pipeline network is an extensive (over 425,000 km of pipelines) and complex series of interconnected pipes that can be found running through urban and rural areas - delivering oil and natural gas domestically and to the U.S. Petroleum products produced in Western Canada are often transported via pipelines that run from Canada into the U.S. and then back to Canada.

According to numerous independent studies, including the U.S. Standing Senate Committee on Energy, the Environment and Natural Resources: diluted bitumen (the type of Oil Sand oil to be transported by the: TransCanada's XL Keystone Pipeline, Enbridge's Northern Gateway and Line 9, and the Kinder Morgan Trans Mountain Pipeline) is a dense and viscous form of petroleum that will flow in oil pipelines only when it is diluted with lighter oils. Diluted bitumen has been imported into the U.S. from western Canada for more than 30 years through the Canadian and U.S. pipeline network.

The Standing Senate Committee on Energy, the Environment and Natural Resources released its report titled: "Moving Energy Safely: A Study of the Safe Transport of Hydrocarbons by Pipelines, Tankers and Railcars in Canada."


The Committee's goal was to examine the current state of emergency and spill prevention, preparedness and response frameworks under federal authority and to make recommendations to improve public safety and the protection of the environment.

The Committee reported that: For the most part, oil and natural gas are moved safely in Canada. Transmission pipelines moved liquid product 99.9996 per cent of the time without spills in Canada and railcars have an average of 99.9 per cent for dangerous goods. This type of ratio was not available for tankers but major tanker spills are rare; the last one that occurred in Canada was more than 30 years ago. Transportation systems operate within a highly regulated environment. There are extensive regulatory frameworks, management systems, standards and practices all serving to promote safety. However, no activity is without risk. Hydrocarbon spills do occur and sometimes major disasters happen.

Effects of Diluted Bitumen on Crude Oil Transmission Pipelines: The U.S. National Research Council was commissioned by the U.S. Transportation Safety Administration to produce a report on the: "Effects of Diluted Bitumen on Crude Oil Transmission Pipelines". The report was authored by the: Transportation Research Board; Board on Energy and Environmental Systems; Board on Chemical Sciences and Technology; National Research Council. The objective of the report was to determine: whether shipments of diluted bitumen have a greater likelihood of release from pipelines than shipments of other crude oils. The oil sands region of Canada is the source of diluted bitumen shipped by pipeline to the United States.
Findings of the report:

The committee that produced the report did not find any pipeline failures unique to the transportation of diluted bitumen or evidence of physical or chemical properties of diluted bitumen shipments that are outside the range of those of other crude oil shipments.

"...shipments of diluted bitumen do not contain higher concentrations of water, sediment, dissolved gases, or other agents that cause or exacerbate internal corrosion, including microbiologically influenced corrosion, and the organic acids in diluted bitumen are not corrosive to steel at pipeline operating temperatures. In addition, the committee found no properties in diluted bitumen that could make transmission pipelines more vulnerable to erosion, external corrosion and cracking, or damage from mechanical forces."

In its environmental impact statement (EIS) for the proposed Keystone XL pipeline, the U.S. State Department examined Alberta's crude oil pipelines, which carry massive amounts of diluted bitumen. The study found that corrosion is indeed the main case of pipeline spills, accounting for 37.7 percent. But the report found that percentage not significantly greater than in the United States, where it's 34.4 percent. "Therefore no evidence is found that Alberta's pipeline contents are more corrosive than average crude oil."

Enbridge Line 9 – Ontario

The reversal of Line 9A, from Sarnia, Ont., to North Westover, Ont., represents the first phase of Enbridge's Eastern Canadian Refinery Access Initiative. The proposed Line 9 reversal project will use the existing pipeline, which has been operated by Enbridge since 1976. No new pipe will be added to complete the reversal and capacity expansion. Except for some temporary workspace, all work will take place within existing Enbridge properties and rights-of-way.

Line 9 will carry mainly light crude oil. However, shippers will be permitted to ship crude oil blends or types that meet quality specifications set by Enbridge, and filed with the National Energy Board. This includes heavy crudes such as diluted bitumen.

The reversal of Enbridge's Line 9 will permit the transportation of oil derived from the Oil Sands to the Ontario and Quebec-based refineries.

Opponents of the Line 9 reversal believe the crude Enbridge wants to transport is more corrosive, will stress the aging infrastructure and increase the chance of a leak. Over the last two weeks of June 2013, 14,000 protesters, including some linked to the Toronto G20 protesters, broke into and occupied an Enbridge pumping station in Hamilton region. This unlawful occupation resulted in Enbridge having to abandon its site for the health, safety and security of its staff for a short duration.

Hamilton Police Services enforced an injunction and arrested the occupiers.

TransCanada XL Keystone Pipeline Project

The Keystone XL Pipeline is a proposed 1,897 km, 36-inch-diameter crude oil pipeline beginning in Hardisty, Alberta, and extending south to Steele City, Neb. Along with transporting crude oil from Canada, the Keystone XL Pipeline will also support the significant growth of crude oil production in the U.S. by allowing American oil producers more access to the large refining capacity in the Gulf of Mexico and other areas.
markets found in the American Midwest and along the U.S. Gulf Coast.

Keystone would have the capacity to deliver 830,000 barrels of crude a day, including 100,000 barrels reserved for U.S. producers.

The Canadian leg of the pipeline is already constructed, as is a large portion within the U.S. The remaining portion is pending U.S. presidential approval.

The pipeline has become one of the more politically divisive issues in the U.S., pitting environmental and landowner interests against national security and economic interests.

Trans Mountain Pipeline Expansion Project

In operation since 1953, the Trans Mountain pipeline system is the only pipeline system in North America that currently transports both crude oil and refined products to the west coast. TMPL moves product from Edmonton, Alberta, to marketing terminals and refineries in the central British Columbia region, the Greater Vancouver area and the Puget Sound area in Washington state, as well as to other markets such as Calif., the U.S. Gulf Coast and overseas through the Westridge marine terminal located in Burnaby, B.C.

There is a proposal to expand Trans Mountain Pipeline, and if approved, would be operational in 2017, and would produce a twinned pipeline that would increase the nominal capacity of the system to 890,000 barrels per day, from 300,000 barrels per day.

Enbridge Northern Gateway Pipelines Project

Enbridge is planning to build the Northern Gateway Pipelines Project, a twin pipeline 1,170 km in length, running from Bruderheim, Alta., to Kitimat, B.C. The eastbound pipeline would import hydrocarbon natural gas condensate. The westbound pipeline would export bitumen from the Athabasca Oil Sands, diluted with the condensate, to the new marine terminal in Kitmat where it would be transported to Asian markets by oil tankers. The project would also include terminal facilities with integrated marine infrastructure at tidewater to accommodate loading and unloading of oil and condensate tankers, and marine transportation of oil and condensate.

Aside from New Brunswick, the most urgent anti-petroleum threat of violent criminal activity is in Northern British Columbia where there is a coalition of like-minded violent extremists who are planning criminal actions to prevent the construction of the pipeline.

TransCanada Energy East Pipeline Project

Called the Energy East Pipeline, the 4,500-km pipeline will carry 1.1-million barrels of crude oil per day from Alberta, and Saskatchewan, to refineries in Eastern Canada.

Currently, the project has the following major components:

- Converting an existing natural gas pipeline to an oil transportation pipeline
- Constructing new pipelines in Alberta, Saskatchewan, Manitoba, Eastern Ontario, Quebec, and New Brunswick, to link up with the converted pipe
- Constructing the associated facilities, pump stations and tank terminals required to move crude oil from Alberta, to Quebec, and New Brunswick, including marine facilities that enable access to other markets by ship
While the exact route will only be determined after public and regulatory review, the planned starting point is a new tank terminal in Hardisty, Alta. Three new terminals will be built along the pipeline's route: one in Saskatchewan, one in the Québec City area and another in the Saint John, N.B. area. The terminals in the Québec City and Saint John areas will include facilities for marine tanker loading. The project will also deliver oil to existing Quebec, refineries in Montreal, near Québec City and in Saint John. New pipeline will be built in Alberta, Saskatchewan, Manitoba, Eastern Ontario, Quebec, and New Brunswick.

The Energy East Pipeline Project involves three major components: pipeline conversion, the construction of new pipeline and the construction of new pipeline facilities. Energy East will convert an existing natural gas pipeline to oil service between Burstall, Sask., and Cornwall, Ont. New sections of pipe will also need to be constructed in Alberta, Saskatchewan, Manitoba, Eastern Ontario, Quebec, and New Brunswick to link up with the newly converted pipe. Lastly, associated facilities like pump stations, tank terminals and marine facilities will be constructed to move the crude oil to New Brunswick from Alberta.

- If approved, this will be the largest and most controversial of the planned pipeline projects.
- Opposition has already commenced throughout eastern Canada and the State of Maine.

**Petroleum Industry Safety and Security**

The Canadian federal and provincial governments are aware that every land use activity, including resource extraction and energy development, poses some degree of personal and environmental risk. Those risks associated with the oil and natural gas industry are managed through an extensive, perpetually evolving framework of federal, provincial, and local regulations. Each oil and gas producing province has an oil and gas permitting and regulatory program that manages risks associated with various phases of the oil and gas development process.

To date, scientific and environmental findings, and engineering reports indicate the Canadian petroleum industry's operations, when completed in accordance with regulations and industry standards, is rated internationally amongst the most safely run and environmentally sound of all petroleum producing countries.

**Studies to date indicate that:**

According to reports prepared for, or by governments, (Canada, United States, provincial and state, United Kingdom), academia and industry, hydraulic fracturing, when conducted in accordance with regulations and industry standards, is a proven technology used safely in a large proportion of the oil and gas wells drilled throughout North America, without negative safety consequences or significant adverse environmental impacts.

Specifically:

- Natural Resources Canada advised that hydraulic fracturing is a technique that has been used by the oil and gas industry for the past 60 years.
- The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) within its 2004 study, titled: “Evaluation of Impacts to Underground Sources of Drinking Water by Hydraulic
Fraturing of Coalbed Methane Reservoir", reported that: "...EPA reviewed more than 200 peer-reviewed publications, other research, and public comments. The Agency has concluded that the injection of hydraulic fracturing fluids into coalbed methane wells poses minimal threat to underground sources of drinking water."

The U.S. National Research Council was commissioned by the Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration of the U.S. Department of Transportation to study the risk associated to the transportation of diluted bitumen (the type of oil extracted from the Alberta Oil Sands) by pipelines. The study found that diluted bitumen has no greater likelihood of accidental pipeline release than other crude oils. These findings are in line with those of other independent studies.

The Alberta Oil Sands account for ~ five per cent of Canada's greenhouse gas emissions, and ~ 0.1 per cent of the world's total greenhouse gas emissions.

In its 2010 report on the oil sands, the Royal Society of Canada reported that (http://environment.alberta.ca/documents/Oilsands_provincial_action_December17_2010.pdf):

Impacts of oil sands contaminants on downstream residents

There is currently no credible evidence of environmental contaminant exposures from oil sands reaching Fort Chipewyan at levels expected to cause elevated human cancer rates. More monitoring focused on human contaminant exposures is needed to address First Nation and community concerns.

Impacts on population health in Wood Buffalo:

There is population level evidence that residents of the Regional Municipality of Wood Buffalo (RMWB) experience a range of health indicators, consistent with "boom town" impacts and community infrastructure deficits, which are poorer than those of a comparable Alberta region and provincial averages.

Impacts on regional water supply:

Current industrial water use demands do not threaten the viability of the Athabasca River system if the Water Management Framework developed to protect in-stream, ecosystem flow needs is fully implemented and enforced.

Impacts on regional water quality:

Current evidence on water quality impacts on the Athabasca River system suggests that oil sands development activities are not a current threat to aquatic ecosystem viability. However, there are valid concerns about the current Regional Aquatics Monitoring Program (RAMP) that must be addressed.

Tailings pond operation and reclamation:

Technologies for improved tailings management are emerging but the rate of improvement has not prevented a growing inventory of tailings ponds. Reclamation and
management options for wet landscapes derived from tailings ponds have been researched but are not adequately demonstrated.

Impacts on ambient air quality:

The current ambient air quality monitoring data for the region show minimal impacts from oil sands development on regional air quality except for noxious odour emission problems over the past two years. Control of NOx emissions and regional acidification potential remain valid concerns.

Impacts on greenhouse gas emissions (GHG):

Progress has been made by the oil sands industry in reducing its GHG emission per barrel of bitumen produced. Nonetheless, increasing GHG emissions from growing bitumen production creates a major challenge for Canada to meet our international commitments for overall GHG emission reduction that current technology options do not resolve.
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