

Part 1 of Two Part Series on Energy: Ethical Oil

## **Top Reasons to Back Oil Sands:**

**North American Security, Oil Sands' Environmental Progress, Saudi Lawfare against "Ethical Oil" Ad Campaign, and Saudi Funding of Extremist Schools, Not Saudi Mistreatment of Women**

**Weekly CEO/Business Leader Poll By COMPAS in *Canadian Business*  
For Publication Week of October 3rd, 2011**



**COMPAS Inc.  
Public Opinion and Customer Research  
Week of October 3rd, 2011**

## 1.0 Introduction

The CEOs and business leaders on the COMPAS business panel were asked for their attitudes to the oil sands in the wake of the “Ethical Oil” campaign that Saudi lawfare appears to have succeeded in stopping. According to members of the panel, the best reasons to back the oil sands development are:

- The security of North America,
- Environmental progress among oil sands projects,
- Saudi lawfare to get the “ethical oil” advertising off air, and
- Saudi funding of extremist schools, but not
- Saudi mistreatment of women.

These are the key findings from this past week’s Internet survey of CEOs and business leaders on the COMPAS panel. The weekly business survey is undertaken for *Canadian Business* magazine.



## 2.0 Detailed Findings

*Table 2.1: First a book and then a TV advertising campaign argued that Canada's oil sands provide ethical oil, unlike oil from Saudi Arabia. On a 7 point agreement scale where 1 means disagree strongly and 7, agree strongly, how much do you agree with each of the following reasons to encourage Canadian oil sands development. RANDOMIZE*

	MEAN	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	DNK
Doing so provides a secure supply to the U.S., the arsenal for defending democracy against Mid-East extremism.	5.0	32	18	18	10	4	5	11	3
The oil sands deserve our support because its players are successfully reducing the full range of environment risks resulting from oil extraction.	5.0	28	22	13	9	9	8	8	5
The Saudi regime's hiring of Canadian lawyers to stop the "ethical oil" advertising campaign against Saudi mistreatment of women shows that the Saudis reject democracy and cannot be trusted.	4.9	28	18	15	10	5	13	6	5
Reducing the import of Saudi oil reduces the ability of the Saudis to fund extremist schools around the work that promote terrorist-type thinking.	4.8	29	18	9	11	4	10	11	8



	MEAN	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	DNK
Reducing the import of Saudi oil sends a message to the Saudis to stop abusing its female population.	3.7	14	10	10	9	18	18	17	5

The following verbatim comments provide a nuanced sense of respondent opinion:

The most important reason to support development of Canadian oil sands: they are a tremendously valuable resource opportunity which can benefit all Canadians. It would be irresponsible to waste the resource and the wealth they can produce, and the services and goods that wealth can provide - schools, hospitals, social service support systems all cost money which has to come from somewhere!

Ontario's Feed In Tariff (FIT) program is a huge boondoggle that will cost the province far more jobs than it will ever create. China is likely to be the hub for solar power manufacturing. As they are able to drive down the cost of solar panels, it might make sense to revisit, but at \$0.80 per kwh for the next 20 years, it is ludicrous to make consumers subsidize perhaps 20,000 jobs. The Oil Sands are here to stay and without them, the Canadian economy would be in as much trouble as the U.S. right now.

### **3.0 Methodology**

The COMPAS web-survey of CEOs and leaders of small, medium, and large corporations was conducted September 24 – 27, 2011. Respondents constitute an essentially hand-picked panel with a higher numerical representation of small and medium-sized firms.

Because of the small population of CEOs and business leaders from which the sample was drawn, the study can be considered more accurate than



*Energy Part 2: Ethical Oil, Weekly CEO/Business Leader Poll by COMPAS in  
Canadian Business for Publication, Week of October 3rd, 2011*

---

comparably sized general public studies. In studies of the general public, surveys of n=80 are deemed accurate to within approximate 10.9 percentage points 19 times out of 20. The principal and investigator on this study is Conrad Winn, Ph.D.



