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### 1AC – Inherency

#### Contention One: Inherency

#### Obama has rejected Keystone XL --- this will cause damage to both U.S. jobs and our energy supply

**Loris** January 18, **2012** ( Nicolas, Policy Analyst at The Heritage Foundation's Roe Institute for Economic Policy Studies, ‘Obama’s “Forced” Keystone Decision Rejects Jobs, Energy, and Logic’, The Foundry, p. http://blog.heritage.org/2012/01/18/obama’s-forced-keystone-decision-rejects-jobs-energy-and-logic/)

President Obama’s politically intoned decision to reject TransCanada’s permit application to construct a 1,700-mile pipeline from Alberta, Canada, to Texas refineries sent a clear message that special interest demands are of more importance than more energy and much-needed job creation.

Building the pipeline would bring over 700,000 barrels of oil per day and directly create 20,000 truly shovel-ready jobs. The Canadian Energy Research Institute estimates that current pipeline operations and the addition of the Keystone XL pipeline would create 179,000 American jobs by 2035.

Since TransCanada and Nebraska politicians have agreed to reroute the pipeline, the focus should now be on completing the reroute design and beginning construction. Congress should recognize the findings in the State Department’s “Final Environmental Impact Statement” and authorize the application submitted by TransCanada in September 2008.

Given the need for jobs and more oil on the global market to offset high prices, the permit application had been moving along positively with bipartisan support without much attention until environmental activists made blocking the Keystone XL pipeline their issue to rally around for 2011. Although President Obama and the Department of State (DOS) said they’d make a decision at the end of 2011, they ultimately catered to a narrow set of special interests, punting the decision until after the 2012 elections.

The payroll tax holiday legislation signed at the end of 2011 moved that decision date up to February 21. Today, however, the President rejected the permit, claiming, “This announcement is not a judgment on the merits of the pipeline, but the arbitrary nature of a deadline that prevented the State Department from gathering the information necessary to approve the project and protect the American people.” President Obama initially delayed the decision because he claimed that additional environmental review from the DOS was necessary.

This is a stunning (though not unexpected) decision. At a time when unemployment remains unacceptably high, Iran is threatening the Strait of Hormuz, and Canada is looking to take this oil elsewhere, it is difficult to understand how the President could say no to thousands of jobs and an increase in energy supply from our ally.

Environmentalists and opponents of the pipeline are blaming Republicans for forcing the President to make a decision that he was not ready to make (purportedly because additional environmental review was necessary), but this accusation is laughable. DOS has already conducted a thorough, three-year environmental review with multiple comment periods.

### 1AC – China

#### Contention Two: China

#### Canada isn’t waiting for the US --- will shift to China.

**Madhani** 1/09/**2012** (Aamer-national correspondent at Chicago Tribune, Canada seeks alternative route for Keystone XL pipeline, USA Today p. http://content.usatoday.com/communities/theoval/post/2012/01/obama-canada-alternative-route-keystone-xl/1#.T-MBgbWcATZ)

While President Obama wants to delay a decision on the controversial Keystone XL pipeline until after the 2012 election, Canada's Prime Minister Stephen Harper is stepping up efforts to explore an alternative pipeline that would allow Canada to ship their tar sands oil to China. On Tuesday, an independent federal panel in Canada will begin its review of a proposed western pipeline that would carry the oil from Alberta to the coast of British Columbia. From British Columbia, the oil would be shipped on tankers to oil-hungry China. "I think it's essential, based on what's occurred with Keystone XL, that this country does diversify its energy-export markets," Harper said in a radio interview on Thursday, the Wall Street Journal reports.

#### The alternative to Keystone is oil tankers to China --- increases the risk of oil spills and environmental damage.

**Faulkner**, 5/7/**2012** (Chris – founder, president and CEO of Breitling Oil and Gas, Bringing the Keystone Pipeline Debate Back into Focus, Oil Online, p. http://www.oilonline.com/blog/main.asp?Tid=45&id=252&cat )

You say neither, I say nyther: killing Keystone won’t be a win for the environment

Another hotly contested element of the Keystone Pipeline is the potential environmental impact. It amazes me that so much coverage of the environmental concerns fails to mention that the US Department of State Bureau of Oceans and International Environmental and Scientific Affairs has stated that the project will be safer than any other domestic pipeline under current regulations. (There’s already a network of more than 100,000 miles of crude trunk and gathering pipeline in the US; the Keystone pipeline will add about 1,700 miles more.) What many in the media also fail to consider is that the alternatives to the pipeline—tankers and trains—are far more destructive from an emissions standpoint and just as dangerous in relation to potential spills. And let’s not forget this simple fact: whether or not we allow this pipeline, Canada will be increasing production from its tar sands and shipping that oil by whatever method is available. Those hoping to stop the continued exploitation of the Canadian tar sands by blocking the pipeline will only succeed in keeping that oil from reaching US refineries, with the likely result of China taking advantage of our nation’s short-sightedness. And how will Canada’s oil reach China? Overseas tankers, of course, creating a greater risk of oil spills as well as additional emissions. Once again, the environment loses, as do American workers and consumers.

#### China-Canada oil tankers will kill the ocean environment --- including plankton and sea lions

**Byers**, 5/17/**2012** (Michael – professor at the University of British Columbia, and Canada Research Chair in Global Politics and International Law, Canada’s oil-sands bonanza could mean disaster for Alaska’s coastline, The Seattle Times, p. http://seattletimes.nwsource.com/html/opinion/2018232475\_guest18byers.html)

Twenty-three years after the Exxon Valdez spilled more than half a million barrels of oil into Prince William Sound, another threat looms over Alaska's remote and beautiful coastline — in the form of heavy oil exports from Canada to China. Since the Earth is a sphere, the shortest shipping route from Western Canada to China passes through the Aleutian Islands at a narrow strait called Unimak Pass. Two pipeline companies want to dilute tar-like bitumen from the Alberta oil sands with natural gas condensate so that it can be pumped west to the coast of British Columbia. The first plan — a new pipeline called "Northern Gateway" — would carry 525,000 barrels per day to a terminal just south of the Alaska Panhandle, where it would be loaded onto supertankers that would sail westward toward Unimak Pass. The second plan involves tripling the capacity of an existing pipeline to Vancouver so it can carry 850,000 barrels per day, and adding compressor stations so it can handle the diluted but still heavy bitumen. The oil from this "Trans Mountain Pipeline" would also be shipped through Unimak Pass. Unimak Pass is just 10 miles wide. Five thousand ships already use it each year, most of them large container and bulk-cargo vessels. The tidal mixing of cold nutrient-rich waters in and around Unimak Pass supports massive amounts of plankton, the basis of a rich food chain. The area is part of the Alaska Maritime National Wildlife Refuge, which is home to 40 million seabirds. It's also home to a wealth of marine mammals, including endangered Steller sea lions, northern fur seals, sea otters and numerous species of whales. This ecosystem has considerable economical value. The Bering Sea just north of Unimak Pass supports the largest commercial fishery in the United States, worth $1 billion annually. Severe weather and sea conditions are common in Unimak Pass, along with powerful tidal flows. In December 2004, the Selendang Ayu, a 738-foot-long Malaysian cargo ship, had just cleared the pass when it lost power in a storm. The vessel was blown aground and broke apart, spilling 335,000 gallons of fuel oil. Almost none of the oil was recovered due to the remote location, bad weather and the near-complete absence of oil-spill-cleanup equipment and personnel in the Aleutians. Complicating matters, the U.S. State Department has long accepted that Unimak Pass is an "international strait" that foreign vessels can enter without permission or regulatory restriction. As a result, there are no shipping lanes, or notification or pilotage requirements. There are a few steps the federal government could take. It could station a large rescue tug and several oil-spill-cleanup vessels at nearby Dutch Harbor. It could ask the International Maritime Organization to designate Unimak Pass as a "particularly sensitive sea area," which would enable the U.S. to require advance notification of passage and adherence to vessel traffic separation rules. It could seek to persuade shipping companies to voluntarily route oil tankers well south of the Aleutians, though this would increase both distance and cost. In the end, however, none of these steps is likely to prevent hundreds of oil tankers from transiting Unimak Pass each year. For the root of the problem is not the tankers, but Canada's disregard for the environmental impacts of developing and selling its oil sands to China — impacts that include the near-inevitability of another Exxon Valdez-type spill in U.S. waters, this time in Unimak Pass.

#### Plankton losses trigger ecosystem collapse that risks extinction

**Alois and Cheng 7** (Paul and Victoria, The Arlington Institute, “Keystone Species Extinction Overview”, July, http://www.arlingtoninstitute.org/wbp/species-extinction/443)

The most recent paradigm in ecological sciences posits that environmental change happens in a rapid, non-linear fashion. This paper will examine certain species of organisms that have the potential, once their numbers are low enough, to trigger a **sudden collapse** in the cycles that provide human beings with food. 1. Aquatic Systems 1.1. Plankton Plankton is a blanket term for many species of microorganisms that drift in open water and make up the base of the aquatic food chain. There are two types of plankton, phytoplankton and zooplankton. Phytoplankton make their own food through the process of photosynthesis, while zooplankton feed on phytoplankton. Zooplankton are in turn eaten by larger animals. In this way these tiny organisms sustain all life in the oceans. According to the NASA, phytoplankton populations in the northern oceans have declined by as much as 30% since 1980.[[4]](http://www.arlingtoninstitute.org/wbp/species-extinction/443#_ftn4) While the cause of this decline remains uncertain, there are several theories. [Continues] The preservation of the **fundamental cornerstones** of the ecosystem must become a foremost goal in human advancement, and it is clear that their destruction must be stopped. Plankton supporting abundant sea life are dying, fish that is a staple part of the diet of many people around the world are being fished to extinction, bees pollinating crops are threatened by many factors, and topsoil sustaining agriculture is disappearing. To solve these problems, people must also address bigger problems caused by human activity such as climate change, the destruction of habitats, and the depletion of resources due to careless use. If any of these species examined should be reduced to a low enough level, **consequences for our own survival** would be profound. The loss of these actors is happening rapidly, and it is crucial that this be stopped and reversed as soon as possible.

#### Sea lions are a keystone species --- loss causes ocean biodiversity collapse

**Carnegie Mellon 2003**(Biodiversity, p. <http://telstar.ote.cmu.edu/environ/m3/s5/02biodiversity.shtml>)

There are certain species whose role in maintaining the balance of an ecosystem is so significant that they are known as the "keystone species." A keystone is the stone at the summit of an arch that supports all the other stones and keeps the entire arch from collapsing. Therefore, the keystone species in an ecosystem is a species that supports many other species in that ecosystem. The removal of the keystone species would result in quick and noticeable change or degradation of an ecosystem. The sea otter has been referred to as a keystone species in western Alaskan coastal ecosystems by the US Department of the Interior and the US Geological Survey. Because of a decline in the population of Steller sea lions and harbor seals in Alaskan waters, killer whales have been feeding on sea otters. The sea otter is considered keystone because it feeds on sea urchins, who in turn feed on kelp. Without the sea otter, sea urchin populations would rise, leading to probable destruction of the kelp forests, disrupting large portions of that coastal community. Without the otters to keep the sea urchin population in check, the habitat of the entire community would be altered significantly.

#### Extinction --- precautionary principle is a side constraint

**Craig**, Winter **2003** (Robin – associate professor of law at the Indiana University School of Law, 34 McGeorge L. Rev. 155, p. lexis)

Biodiversity and ecosystem function arguments for conserving marine ecosystems also exist, just as they do for terrestrial ecosystems, but these arguments have thus far rarely been raised in political debates. For example, besides significant tourism values - the most economically valuable ecosystem service coral reefs provide, worldwide - coral reefs protect against storms and dampen other environmental fluctuations, services worth more than ten times the reefs’ value for food production. Waste treatment is another significant, non-extractive ecosystem function that intact coral reef ecosystems provide. More generally, “ocean ecosystems play a major role in the global geochemical cycling of all the elements that represent the basic building blocks **of living organisms**, carbon, nitrogen, oxygen, phosphorus, and sulfur, as well as other less abundant but necessary elements.” In a very real and direct sense, therefore, human degradation of marine ecosystems **impairs the planet’s ability to support life**. Maintaining biodiversity is often critical to maintaining the functions of marine ecosystems. Current evidence shows that, in general, an ecosystem’s ability to keep functioning in the face of disturbance is **strongly dependent on its biodiversity**, “indicating that more diverse ecosystems are more stable.” Coral reef ecosystems are particularly dependent on their biodiversity. Most ecologists agree that the complexity of interactions and degree of interrelatedness among component species is higher on coral reefs than in any other marine environment. This implies that the ecosystem functioning that produces the most highly valued components is also complex and that many otherwise insignificant species have strong effects on sustaining the rest of the reef system. Thus, maintaining and restoring the biodiversity of marine ecosystems is critical to maintaining and restoring the ecosystem services that they provide. Non-use biodiversity values for marine ecosystems have been calculated in the wake of marine disasters, like the Exxon Valdez oil spill in Alaska. Similar calculations could derive preservation values for marine wilderness. However, economic value, or economic value equivalents, should not be “the sole or even primary justification for conservation of ocean ecosystems. Ethical arguments also have considerable force and merit.” At the forefront of such arguments should be a recognition of **how little we know about the sea** - and about the actual effect of human activities on marine ecosystems. The United States has traditionally failed to protect marine ecosystems because it was difficult to detect anthropogenic harm to the oceans, but we now know that such harm is occurring - even though we are not completely sure about causation or **about how to fix every problem**. Ecosystems like the NWHI coral reef ecosystem should inspire lawmakers and policymakers to admit that most of the time we really do not know what we are doing to the sea and hence should be preserving marine wilderness whenever we can - especially when the United States has within its territory relatively pristine marine ecosystems that may be unique in the world. We may not know much about the sea, but we do know this much: **if we kill the ocean we kill ourselves**, and we will take most of the biosphere with us. The Black Sea is almost dead, its once-complex and productive ecosystem almost entirely replaced by a monoculture of comb jellies, “starving out fish and dolphins, emptying fishermen’s nets, and converting the web of life into brainless, wraith-like blobs of jelly.” More importantly, the Black Sea is not necessarily unique. The Black Sea is a microcosm of what is happening to the ocean systems at large. The stresses piled up: overfishing, oil spills, industrial discharges, nutrient pollution, wetlands destruction, the introduction of an alien species. The sea weakened, slowly at first, then collapsed with shocking suddenness. The lessons of this tragedy should not be lost to the rest of us, because much of what happened here is being repeated all over the world. The ecological stresses imposed on the Black Sea were not unique to communism. Nor, sadly, was the failure of governments to respond to the emerging crisis. Oxygen-starved “dead zones” appear with increasing frequency off the coasts of major cities and major rivers, forcing marine animals to flee and killing all that cannot. Ethics as well as enlightened self-interest thus suggest that the United States should protect fully-functioning marine ecosystems wherever possible - even if a few fishers go out of business as a result.

#### Shift to Chinese-Canadian oil routes will enflame China bashing --- collapsing US/China relations and collapsing Chinese climate negotiations

**Tu**, 2/10/**2012** (Kevin Jianjun – senior associate in the Carnegie Energy and Climate Program, China should be cautious about the Canadian Oil Sands, Phoenix News Group, p. <http://carnegieendowment.org/2012/02/10/china-should-be-cautious-about-canadian-oil-sands>)

First, Canadian oil sands exports to China could further strain the already turbulent Sino-U.S. relationship. In 2012, a presidential election year, the Obama administration rejected TransCanada’s application to build the Keystone XL pipeline. The move stemmed from strong Democratic and environmentalist opposition to the deal—Obama would have risked losing the pro-environment electorate if he approved the plan. Yet, the Democratic Party has been unable to reach a consensus on this contentious issue, and the U.S. State Department has agreed to allow TransCanada to reapply for a Keystone XL permit once an alternative route that avoids particularly environmentally sensitive sites is selected. By comparison, almost all congressional Republicans strongly support the Keystone XL pipeline. Arguing that turning down the pipeline will harm U.S. energy security, kill U.S. jobs, and unnecessarily benefit China, they have vigorously attacked Obama’s decision. Any renewed support for the Northern Gateway pipeline by Chinese national oil companies would shift the focus of the Keystone XL debate within the United States from the environment to national security—a prevailing fear, especially among congressional Republicans, is that without Keystone, China will beat the United States to Canada’s rich oil reserves. A desire to shift the debate to national security in the United States may even be driving the Canadian government’s public support of the Northern Gateway pipeline. Second, large-scale Chinese imports of output from Canadian oil sands would come with a high price tag for China’s future international climate negotiations. According to the revised national Energy Balance Table, China surpassed the United States to become the world’s largest carbon emitter as early as 2006. In 2009, emissions from Chinese coal combustion alone exceeded total U.S. carbon dioxide emissions. According to the International Energy Agency, China is expected to account for 42 percent of global incremental carbon emissions by 2035. Nevertheless, under the 2011 Durban Platform for Enhanced Action, China has already said it will join a legally binding international climate treaty that will be agreed upon by 2015 and will come into force by 2020. As a result, during future international climate negotiations, China is expected to face increasingly higher pressure from the international community to retard its spiking carbon emissions. According to the Canadian Industrial Energy End-Use Data and Analysis Center, carbon-emission intensities of upstream oil sands production are generally one to four times higher than conventional oil extraction. Although recent “well-to-wheels” studies have found that the life-cycle emissions of oil-sands-based products are only 5 to 15 percent higher than those of conventional oil products, such analyses likely overlook the substantial carbon-emissions potential that is embedded in the large amount of carbon-intensive oil sands byproducts, such as petroleum coke. According to Environment Canada, oil sands development and the transportation sector are the primary drivers underlying the growth of Canada’s greenhouse gas emissions. In order to allow room for the emissions that would result from oil sands development, and to save $14 billion in penalties for not achieving its Kyoto targets, the Canadian government withdrew from the Kyoto Protocol right after the Durban climate conference, without adequate consideration of the criticism it would receive from the international community. Large-scale Chinese imports of Canadian oil sands output would correspond to de facto support of Canada’s environmentally irresponsible climate policy. Not surprisingly, Chinese imports from Canada’s oil sands would not only be criticized by the international environmental community but would also make the work of China’s climate negotiation delegation much more difficult in the future. Finally, strong opposition to the Northern Gateway pipeline from environmental organizations and Canada’s indigenous community is another important issue that China should not ignore. As early as 2005, PetroChina, the listed arm of China’s largest national oil company, signed a cooperation agreement with Enbridge to support the Northern Gateway pipeline. However, after Stephen Harper came into power in 2006, Sino-Canadian relations soon deteriorated. Citing a lack of support from the Canadian federal government, PetroChina withdrew from the pipeline project in 2007 but forgot to mention the other serious impediment to the deal—strong opposition from both environmental organizations and indigenous communities along the pipeline route. Although the Canadian government now seems to be supportive of the pipeline, it will still be unable to address environmental concerns and the indigenous community’s opposition to pipeline construction in the near future. Consequently, Enbridge’s application for the pipeline is expected to be a prolonged process, which will inevitably increase the financial risks of the project. To enhance China’s energy security, Chinese national oil companies have significantly expanded their overseas presence in recent years. But, due to the monopoly status they have long enjoyed domestically, these companies often evaluate overseas projects primarily on the basis of energy security and corporate bottom line. However, many other factors are at play, and such practices have made securing a return on some Chinese overseas investments problematic at most. Importing output from Canadian oil sands is likewise complicated. Chinese leaders should prohibit national oil companies’ involvement in the Northern Gateway pipeline, at least during a U.S. presidential election year, or they risk stirring up a national security debate in the United States and inflaming Sino-U.S. relations. After the conclusion of the Chinese political power transition by the end of 2012, the new Chinese leadership should not only fundamentally reform China’s energy-oversight mechanism, which has so far failed to adequately regulate Chinese national oil companies, but also significantly improve intergovernmental coordination. This would lead Chinese national oil companies to, in addition to focusing on national energy security and their corporate bottom line, take other important factors such as Sino-U.S. relations, environmental governance, and the host country’s internal politics into consideration when they make future overseas investment decisions.

#### Chinese cooperation is a pre-requisite for solving global warming.

**Bush** III, 10/11/**2011** (Richard – director of the Center for Northeast Asian Policy Studies, The United States and China: A G-2 in the Making, p. http://www.brookings.edu/research/articles/2011/10/11-china-us-g2-bush)

Now there are a couple of “germs of reality” in the Brzezinski-Bergsten G-2 idea. In the sixth month of his presidency, President Barack Obama laid out a grand vision for bilateral relations between the two countries. On the occasion of the first Strategic and Economic Dialogue, he said, “The relationship between the U.S. and China will shape the 21st century, which makes it as important as any bilateral relationship in the world.... If we advance [our mutual] interests through cooperation, our people will benefit and the world will be better off—because our ability to partner with each other is a prerequisite for progress on many of the most pressing global challenges.” President Obama and President Hu Jintao have repeatedly stated their “commitment to building a positive, cooperative, and comprehensive U.S.-China relationship for the 21st century, which serves the interests of the American and Chinese peoples and of the global community.” Moreover, there are some “pressing global challenges” that stem from the policies of the two countries. Global macroeconomic imbalances are the result, primarily of the bilateral economic imbalance between the United States and China and the related domestic policies. China saves too much and the United States consumes too much. That asymmetry leads to a large bilateral trade imbalance and the necessity for China to recycle its export earnings, usually by purchasing American debt. This bilateral imbalance affects the stability of the global economy, and the only way to reduce this instability is for China to consume more and the United States to save more. **The problem of climate change is similar**. China and the United States are the two largest emitters of greenhouse gases. Unless they are willing to tackle the problem, **global warming will continue to endanger the planet**.

#### Unchecked global warming causes extinction.

Tickell 8 (Oliver, Climate Researcher, The Guardian, “On a Planet 4C Hotter, All We Can Prepare for is Extinction”, 8-11, http://www.guardian.co.uk/commentisfree/2008/aug/11/climatechange)

We need to get prepared for four degrees of global warming, Bob Watson told the Guardian last week. At first sight this looks like wise counsel from the climate science adviser to Defra. But the idea that we could adapt to a 4C rise is absurd and dangerous. Global warming on this scale would be a catastrophe that would mean, in the immortal words that Chief Seattle probably never spoke, "the end of living and the beginning of survival" for humankind. Or perhaps the beginning of our extinction. The collapse of the polar ice caps would become inevitable, bringing long-term sea level rises of 70-80 metres. All the world's coastal plains would be lost, complete with ports, cities, transport and industrial infrastructure, and much of the world's most productive farmland. The world's geography would be transformed much as it was at the end of the last ice age, when sea levels rose by about 120 metres to create the Channel, the North Sea and Cardigan Bay out of dry land. Weather would become extreme and unpredictable, with more frequent and severe droughts, floods and hurricanes. The Earth's carrying capacity would be hugely reduced. Billions would undoubtedly die. Watson's call was supported by the government's former chief scientific adviser, Sir David King, who warned that "if we get to a four-degree rise it is quite possible that we would begin to see a runaway increase". This is a remarkable understatement. The climate system is already experiencing significant feedbacks, notably the summer melting of the Arctic sea ice. The more the ice melts, the more sunshine is absorbed by the sea, and the more the Arctic warms. And as the Arctic warms, the release of billions of tonnes of methane – a greenhouse gas 70 times stronger than carbon dioxide over 20 years – captured under melting permafrost is already under way. To see how far this process could go, look 55.5m years to the Palaeocene-Eocene Thermal Maximum, when a global temperature increase of 6C coincided with the release of about 5,000 gigatonnes of carbon into the atmosphere, both as CO2 and as methane from bogs and seabed sediments. Lush subtropical forests grew in polar regions, and sea levels rose to 100m higher than today. It appears that an initial warming pulse triggered other warming processes. Many scientists warn that this historical event may be analogous to the present: the warming caused by human emissions could propel us towards a similar hothouse Earth.

#### Relations stop global nuclear war

Conable and Lampton, 93 (Barber B., President Emeritus – World Bank and David, President – National Committee, “China: The Coming Power”, Foreign Affairs, December / January, Lexis)

Regionally American interests are both numerous and important. The two most protracted, economically distracting and politically explosive American military commitments in the post-World War II era were Korea and Vietnam. In both cases China figured prominently. The lesson is that regional stability requires workable U.S.-China relations. Competition between Beijing and Washington takes the form of exploiting indigenous regional conflicts by both powers, resulting in local problems that expand to suck both countries into a self-defeating vortex. The most serious threats to American security and economic interests in Asia include armed conflict with nuclear potential between the two Koreas and between India and Pakistan; a deterioration of relations between Beijing and Taipei that could lead to economic or military conflict; a re-ignition of the Cambodian conflict; and a botched transition to Beijing's sovereignty in Hong Kong in 1997. None of these problems can be handled effectively without substantial Sino-American cooperation. Constructive relations with Beijing will not assure P.R.C. cooperation in all cases; needlessly bad relations will nearly ensure conflict. The Republic of Korea's formal diplomatic recognition of Beijing last August, at the expense of Taipei, is just one indication of the increasing importance the region attaches to building positive ties to the P.R.C.

### 1AC – Oil Dependency

#### Contention Three: Oil Dependency

#### The need for oil is inevitable --- Keystone is key to adjust for U.S. dependency

**Washington Post**, 11/12/**2011** (Washington’s unwelcome delay in the Keystone XL pipeline project, p. http://www.washingtonpost.com/opinions/washingtons-unwelcome-delay-in-the-keystone-xl-pipeline-project/2011/11/11/gIQAQDl5FN\_story.html)

Despite the passion among environmentalists against Keystone XL, Mr. Oliver’s travels illustrate the critical point: Canada’s oil will come out of the ground, and someone somewhere will refine it and burn it. Even under optimistic assumptions about greening the world economy, the United States and every other nation will demand immense amounts of oil for decades. The resulting upward pressure on oil prices provides a massive incentive to develop previously unattractive oil deposits, such as those in Alberta’s tar sands. Nixing a pipeline that would bring more of that oil to U.S. refineries wouldn’t cut that demand, it wouldn’t shut down Canadian production, and it wouldn’t make any difference to global carbon emissions. Environmentalists and Nebraska officials also object to the pipeline’s proposed location, warning of spills in the state’s ecologically sensitive Sand Hills region. The State Department insists that objections from Nebraska, including those made during a special session of the state legislature, persuaded federal officials to examine routes that avoid the Sand Hills, even though a government report already considered the economic and environmental impacts of many alternatives. Conveniently for the White House, that reexamination pushes the final decision on Keystone XL past the 2012 elections. Environmentalists can continue to exert political pressure, and Nebraskans can try to move the risks elsewhere, but neither can eliminate the threat of spills. Rejecting the pipeline and forcing the Canadians to send more of their oil west for shipping could increase the risk, in fact, since the oil would travel by pipeline, train, truck or barge, then onto tankers and across an ocean. The United States must reduce its dependence on fossil fuels, from any source, and it should encourage nations such as China to lower the carbon intensity of their economies, too. Even if that happens, though, the world will continue to use oil, with all the dirty realities that entails. **Rejecting Keystone XL would not change that fact**. But it would help China lock up more of the world’s oil production, cost infrastructure jobs in the United States and offend a reliable ally. More delay after three years of review is insult enough.

#### Keystone is critical to wean the U.S. off of its oil dependency --- there will be no production diversion.

**USA Today**, 10/26/**2011** (Editorial: Say yes to building the Keystone oil pipeline, p. <http://www.usatoday.com/news/opinion/editorials/story/2011-10-26/Keystone-oil-pipeline-build/50941230/1>)

In a different world, we might be siding with the protesters. In that world, Canada wouldn't mine its tar sands, the U.S. wouldn't import tar sands oil, refineries here wouldn't process it and U.S. consumers wouldn't use it. Instead, everyone would drive electric cars and trucks powered by sun and wind and other renewable energy. **But that's not the world where Americans still live and will for some time to come**. The nation burns 19 million barrels of petroleum a day, much of it to fuel the quarter-billion cars, trucks, buses and other vehicles on the nation's roads. To satisfy that demand, the U.S. imports about half its oil, which puts the nation at the mercy of the mercurial world oil market. Imports from Mexico and Venezuela, two of the USA's biggest suppliers, are declining, and that's projected to make the nation even more reliant on producers in the unstable Middle East and Africa. The Keystone pipeline would provide about a half-million more barrels a day from one of this nation's closest and most reliable allies. The right answer on the Keystone pipeline is yes. The decision isn't just one of necessity. Criticism of the 1,700-mile pipeline is overblown. For example, opponents assert that its route across the Ogallala Aquifer in Nebraska is risky because a spill could do catastrophic damage to that water supply. But critics ignore the fact that 2,000 miles of oil pipeline already cross the aquifer there. A Nebraska hydrogeologist who has studied the subsurface water formation for 40 years says even if there were a spill, the impact would be modest and containable. For a 35-mile stretch where the water table is close to the surface, the pipeline builder has offered to surround the line with concrete. Critics further charge that companies plan to use the pipeline to export petroleum through the Gulf of Mexico, not distribute it within the USA. That would be a powerful criticism if it were true, because it would undercut the argument that the pipeline will help meet U.S. oil needs. TransCanada, which is building the line, says the charge is false, and Valero Energy, which would be a user of the line, says it has **no intention of using the Canadian oil for export**. Those assurances are welcome; even so, it would be wise for the State Department to make them a condition for approval. As for the climate change argument, the protesters act as though a rejection of Keystone would lock the tar sands in the ground and limit greenhouse gas emissions. Hardly. Canada has signaled it would re-route the pipeline to the West Coast and sell oil to China, which has already invested heavily in the tar sands. For all the need to wean the United States from its dependence on imported fossil fuels, it's important to be realistic about meeting the nation's energy needs in the meantime. Saying no to the Keystone pipeline is an empty gesture that would undermine U.S. energy security.

#### Failure to shift from an oil-dependent transportation sector results in extinction --- economic collapse escalates to nuclear war

**Bearden**, 6/12/**2000** (Thomas – Association of Distinguished American Scientists and LTC, U.S. Army (Retired), Why The Energy Crisis Needlessly Exists and How to Solve It, p. [www.cheniere.org/techpapers/Unnecessary%20Energy%20Crisis.doc](http://www.cheniere.org/techpapers/Unnecessary%20Energy%20Crisis.doc))

History bears out that **desperate nations take desperate actions**. Prior to the final economic collapse, the stress on nations will have increased the intensity and numberof their conflicts, to the point where the arsenals of weapons of mass destruction (WMD) now possessed by some 25 nations, are almost certain to be released. As an example, suppose a starving North Korea [7] launches nuclear weapons upon Japan and South Korea, including U.S. forces there, in a spasmodic suicidal response. Or suppose a desperate China--whose long-range nuclear missiles (some) can reach the United States--attacks Taiwan. In addition to immediate responses, the mutual treaties involved in such scenarios will quickly draw other nations into the conflict, escalating it significantly. Strategic nuclear studies have shown for decades that, under such extreme stress conditions, once a few nukes are launched, adversaries and potential adversaries are then **compelled to launch on perception** of preparations by one's adversary. The real legacy of the MAD concept is this side of the MAD coin that is almost never discussed. Without effective defense, the only chance a nation has to survive at all is to launch immediate full-bore pre-emptive strikes and try to take out its perceived foes as rapidly and massively as possible. As the studies showed, rapid escalation to full WMD exchange occurs. Today, a great percent of the WMD arsenals that will be unleashed, are already on site within the United States itself [8]. The resulting great Armageddon will **destroy civilization** as we know it, and perhaps most of the biosphere, at least for many decades. My personal estimate is that, beginning about 2007, on our present energy course we will have reached an 80% probability of this "final destruction of civilization itself" scenario occurring at any time, with the probability slowly increasing as time passes. One may argue about the timing, slide the dates a year or two, etc., but the basic premise and general time frame holds. We face not only a world economic crisis, but also a world destruction crisis. So unless we dramatically and quickly solve the energy crisis — rapidly replacing a substantial part of the "electrical power derived from oil" by "electrical power freely derived from the vacuum" — we are going to incur the final "Great Armageddon" the nations of the world have been fearing for so long. I personally regard this as the greatest strategic threat of all times — to the United States, the Western World, all the rest of the nations of the world, and civilization itself { } { }. What Is Required to Solve the Problem To avoid the impending collapse of the world economy and/or the destruction of civilization and the biosphere, we must quickly replace much of the "electrical energy from oil" heart of the crisis at great speed, and simultaneously replace a significant part of the "transportation using oil products" factor also.

#### Oil dependency hamstrings the U.S. military and foreign policy goals --- that escalates to great power conflict

**Crawford** 2010/**2011** (Colin – J.D. Wake Forest University School of Law, Green Warfare: An American Grand Strategy for the 21st Century, Wake Forest Journal of Business and Intellectual Property Law, p. Lexis)

[\*248] In addition to the potential for economic growth, even the most ardent climate change skeptics will concede that the United States' dependence on fossil fuels has implications for national security and foreign policy. Security analysts have made the case for framing this debate in terms of "natural security," as the scarcity of natural resources will inevitably affect the United States' foreign policy calculus for years to come. n24 Despite the fact that the U.S. imports most of its oil from Canada and Latin America n25 - not the Middle East - many emerging markets are just beginning their love affair with the sticky, black hydrocarbon. n26 The corresponding increase in demand from emerging economies will continue to drive up energy prices, necessitating importation of oil from countries with less friendly dispositions toward the United States. n27 It is important to note how energy policy intersects with virtually all other aspects of governance. Not only will increased prices constrain U.S. fiscal policy and make it more expensive to project American power around the globe, they create pressures that will heavily influence American foreign policy in the coming decades, whether through resource wars or climate-induced humanitarian crises. n28 International trade and maritime policy in particular will be [\*249] greatly affected. Because "90 percent of global commerce and two thirds of all petroleum supplies travel by sea," and global energy demand will continue its inexorable rise, the Indian Ocean - already heavily used by "nuclearized" powers such as Pakistan, India, China, and Israel - will dramatically increase in strategic importance to the world's great powers. n29 The proximity of nuclear states in the Asia-Pacific region, along with increased pressures commensurate with rising energy demand, are already heightening military tensions among the major players in the region, including China and Russia in particular. n30 Geopolitical constraints will become increasingly difficult to manage as fuel prices continue to rise, and intervention will be needed to combat piracy and protect merchant shipping. n31 Make no mistake, the United States' continued dependence on fossil fuels poses significant problems for the national interest. The strategic implications are clear as U.S. foreign policy throughout entire regions is framed in the context of energy. n32

#### Collapse of leadership causes global nuclear war

**Kagan 2011** (Robert, Senior Associate – Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, “The Price of Power”, The Weekly Standard, 1-24, http://www.weeklystandard.com/articles/price-power\_533695.html?nopager=1)

Today the international situation is also one of high risk.  • The terrorists who would like to kill Americans on U.S. soil constantly search for safe havens from which to plan and carry out their attacks. American military actions in Afghanistan, Pakistan, Iraq, Yemen, and elsewhere make it harder for them to strike and are a large part of the reason why for almost a decade there has been no repetition of September 11. To the degree that we limit our ability to deny them safe haven, we increase the chances they will succeed. • American forces deployed in East Asia and the Western Pacific have for decades prevented the outbreak of major war, provided stability, and kept open international trading routes, making possible an unprecedented era of growth and prosperity for Asians and Americans alike. Now the United States faces a new challenge and potential threat from a rising China which seeks eventually to push the U.S. military’s area of operations back to Hawaii and exercise hegemony over the world’s most rapidly growing economies. Meanwhile, a nuclear-armed North Korea threatens war with South Korea and fires ballistic missiles over Japan that will someday be capable of reaching the west coast of the United States. Democratic nations in the region, worried that the United States may be losing influence, turn to Washington for reassurance that the U.S. security guarantee remains firm. If the United States cannot provide that assurance because it is cutting back its military capabilities, they will have to choose between accepting Chinese dominance and striking out on their own, possibly by building nuclear weapons. • In the Middle East, Iran seeks to build its own nuclear arsenal, supports armed radical Islamic groups in Lebanon and Palestine, and has linked up with anti-American dictatorships in the Western Hemisphere. The prospects of new instability in the region grow every day as a decrepit regime in Egypt clings to power, crushes all moderate opposition, and drives the Muslim Brotherhood into the streets. A nuclear-armed Pakistan seems to be ever on the brink of collapse into anarchy and radicalism. Turkey, once an ally, now seems bent on an increasingly anti-American Islamist course. The prospect of war between Hezbollah and Israel grows, and with it the possibility of war between Israel and Syria and possibly Iran. There, too, nations in the region increasingly look to Washington for reassurance, and if they decide the United States cannot be relied upon they will have to decide whether to succumb to Iranian influence or build their own nuclear weapons to resist it. In the 1990s, after the Soviet Union had collapsed and the biggest problem in the world seemed to be ethnic conflict in the Balkans, it was at least plausible to talk about cutting back on American military capabilities. In the present, increasingly dangerous international environment, in which terrorism and great power rivalry vie as the greatest threat to American security and interests, cutting military capacities is simply reckless. Would we increase the risk of strategic failure in an already risky world, despite the near irrelevance of the defense budget to American fiscal health, just so we could tell American voters that their military had suffered its “fair share” of the pain? The nature of the risk becomes plain when one considers the nature of the cuts that would have to be made to have even a marginal effect on the U.S. fiscal crisis. Many are under the illusion, for instance, that if the United States simply withdrew from Iraq and Afghanistan and didn’t intervene anywhere else for a while, this would have a significant impact on future deficits. But, in fact, projections of future massive deficits already assume the winding down of these interventions.Withdrawal from the two wars would scarcely make a dent in the fiscal crisis. Nor can meaningful reductions be achieved by cutting back on waste at the Pentagon—which Secretary of Defense Gates has already begun to do and which has also been factored into deficit projections. If the United States withdrew from Iran and Afghanistan tomorrow, cut all the waste Gates can find, and even eliminated a few weapons programs—all this together would still not produce a 10 percent decrease in overall defense spending.  In fact, the only way to get significant savings from the defense budget—and by “significant,” we are still talking about a tiny fraction of the cuts needed to bring down future deficits—is to cut force structure: fewer troops on the ground; fewer airplanes in the skies; fewer ships in the water; fewer soldiers, pilots, and sailors to feed and clothe and provide benefits for. To cut the size of the force, however, requires reducing or eliminating the missions those forces have been performing. Of course, there are any number of think tank experts who insist U.S. forces can be cut by a quarter or third or even by half and still perform those missions. But this is snake oil. Over the past two decades, the force has already been cut by a third. Yet no administration has reduced the missions that the larger force structures of the past were designed to meet. To fulfill existing security commitments, to remain the “world’s power balancer of choice,” as Leslie Gelb puts it, to act as “the only regional balancer against China in Asia, Russia in eastern Europe, and Iran in the Middle East” requires at least the current force structure, and almost certainly more than current force levels. Those who recommend doing the same with less are only proposing a policy of insufficiency, where the United States makes commitments it cannot meet except at high risk of failure. The only way to find substantial savings in the defense budget, therefore, is to change American strategy fundamentally. The Simpson-Bowles commission suggests as much, by calling for a reexamination of America’s “21st century role,” although it doesn’t begin to define what that new role might be.  Others have. For decades “realist” analysts have called for a strategy of “offshore balancing.” Instead of the United States providing security in East Asia and the Persian Gulf, it would withdraw its forces from Japan, South Korea, and the Middle East and let the nations in those regions balance one another. If the balance broke down and war erupted, the United States would then intervene militarily until balance was restored. In the Middle East and Persian Gulf, for instance, Christopher Layne has long proposed “passing the mantle of regional stabilizer” to a consortium of “Russia, China, Iran, and India.” In East Asia offshore balancing would mean letting China, Japan, South Korea, Australia, and others manage their own problems, without U.S. involvement—again, until the balance broke down and war erupted, at which point the United States would provide assistance to restore the balance and then, if necessary, intervene with its own forces to restore peace and stability.  Before examining whether this would be a wise strategy, it is important to understand that this really is the only genuine alternative to the one the United States has pursued for the past 65 years. To their credit, Layne and others who support the concept of offshore balancing have eschewed halfway measures and airy assurances that we can do more with less, which are likely recipes for disaster. They recognize that either the United States is actively involved in providing security and stability in regions beyond the Western Hemisphere, which means maintaining a robust presence in those regions, or it is not. Layne and others are frank in calling for an end to the global security strategy developed in the aftermath of World War II, perpetuated through the Cold War, and continued by four successive post-Cold War administrations. At the same time, it is not surprising that none of those administrations embraced offshore balancing as a strategy. The idea of relying on Russia, China, and Iran to jointly “stabilize” the Middle East and Persian Gulf will not strike many as an attractive proposition. Nor is U.S. withdrawal from East Asia and the Pacific likely to have a stabilizing effect on that region. The prospects of a war on the Korean Peninsula would increase. Japan and other nations in the region would face the choice of succumbing to Chinese hegemony or taking unilateral steps for self-defense, which in Japan’s case would mean the rapid creation of a formidable nuclear arsenal. Layne and other offshore balancing enthusiasts, like John Mearsheimer, point to two notable occasions when the United States allegedly practiced this strategy. One was the Iran-Iraq war, where the United States supported Iraq for years against Iran in the hope that the two would balance and weaken each other. The other was American policy in the 1920s and 1930s, when the United States allowed the great European powers to balance one another, occasionally providing economic aid, or military aid, as in the Lend-Lease program of assistance to Great Britain once war broke out. Whether this was really American strategy in that era is open for debate—most would argue the United States in this era was trying to stay out of war not as part of a considered strategic judgment but as an end in itself. Even if the United States had been pursuing offshore balancing in the first decades of the 20th century, however, would we really call that strategy a success? The United States wound up intervening with millions of troops, first in Europe, and then in Asia and Europe simultaneously, in the two most dreadful wars in human history.  It was with the memory of those two wars in mind, and in the belief that American strategy in those interwar years had been mistaken, that American statesmen during and after World War II determined on the new global strategy that the United States has pursued ever since. Under Franklin Roosevelt, and then under the leadership of Harry Truman and Dean Acheson, American leaders determined that the safest course was to build “situations of strength” (Acheson’s phrase) in strategic locations around the world, to build a “preponderance of power,” and to create an international system with American power at its center. They left substantial numbers of troops in East Asia and in Europe and built a globe-girdling system of naval and air bases to enable the rapid projection of force to strategically important parts of the world. They did not do this on a lark or out of a yearning for global dominion. They simply rejected the offshore balancing strategy, and they did so because they believed it had led to great, destructive wars in the past and would likely do so again. They believed their new global strategy was more likely to deter major war and therefore be less destructive and less expensive in the long run. Subsequent administrations, from both parties and with often differing perspectives on the proper course in many areas of foreign policy, have all agreed on this core strategic approach.  From the beginning this strategy was assailed as too ambitious and too expensive. At the dawn of the Cold War, Walter Lippmann railed against Truman’s containment strategy as suffering from an unsustainable gap between ends and means that would bankrupt the United States and exhaust its power. Decades later, in the waning years of the Cold War, Paul Kennedy warned of “imperial overstretch,” arguing that American decline was inevitable “if the trends in national indebtedness, low productivity increases, [etc.]” were allowed to continue at the same time as “massive American commitments of men, money and materials are made in different parts of the globe.” Today, we are once again being told that this global strategy needs to give way to a more restrained and modest approach, even though the indebtedness crisis that we face in coming years is not caused by the present, largely successful global strategy. Of course it is precisely the success of that strategy that is taken for granted. The enormous benefits that this strategy has provided, including the financial benefits, somehow never appear on the ledger. They should. We might begin by asking about the global security order that the United States has sustained since Word War II—the prevention of major war, the support of an open trading system, and promotion of the liberal principles of free markets and free government. How much is that order worth? What would be the cost of its collapse or transformation into another type of order? Whatever the nature of the current economic difficulties, the past six decades have seen a greater increase in global prosperity than any time in human history. Hundreds of millions have been lifted out of poverty. Once-backward nations have become economic dynamos. And the American economy, though suffering ups and downs throughout this period, has on the whole benefited immensely from this international order. One price of this success has been maintaining a sufficient military capacity to provide the essential security underpinnings of this order. But has the price not been worth it? In the first half of the 20th century, the United States found itself engaged in two world wars. In the second half, this global American strategy helped produce a peaceful end to the great-power struggle of the Cold War and then 20 more years of great-power peace. Looked at coldly, simply in terms of dollars and cents, the benefits of that strategy far outweigh the costs.  The danger, as always, is that we don’t even realize the benefits our strategic choices have provided. Many assume that the world has simply become more peaceful, that great-power conflict has become impossible, that nations have learned that military force has little utility, that economic power is what counts. This belief in progress and the perfectibility of humankind and the institutions of international order is always alluring to Americans and Europeans and other children of the Enlightenment. It was the prevalent belief in the decade before World War I, in the first years after World War II, and in those heady days after the Cold War when people spoke of the “end of history.” It is always tempting to believe that the international order the United States built and sustained with its power can exist in the absence of that power, or at least with much less of it. This is the hidden assumption of those who call for a change in American strategy: that the United States can stop playing its role and yet all the benefits that came from that role will keep pouring in. This is a great if recurring illusion, the idea that you can pull a leg out from under a table and the table will not fall over.

### 1AC – Plan

#### The United States federal government should invest in infrastructure development of the Keystone XL pipeline.

### 1AC – Solvency

#### Contention Four: Solvency

#### Approving Keystone XL construction is infrastructure investment --- key to progress.

**Perryman Group**, June **2010** (The Impact of Developing the Keystone XL Pipeline Project on Business Activity in the US: An Analysis Including State-by-State Construction Effects and an Assessment of the Potential Benefits of a More Stable Source of Domestic Supply, p. 9-11)

The project is subject to regulatory approvals in both Canada and the US. TransCanada filed its section 52 application with the National Energy Board and received approval on March 11, 2010 to construct and operate the Canadian portion of the Keystone Gulf Coast Expansion Project (Keystone XL). It has also filed an application for a Presidential Permit with the US Department of State, authorizing the crossing of the international border. The Department of State is conducting an environmental review of the project under the National Environmental Policy Act. The project will also require approvals from the Bureau of Land Management and the US Army Corps of Engineers, as well as some state, local, and regional authorities. 2 In the US, construction of the new pipeline is expected to begin in 2011 after receiving all the pertinent permits. Construction of the pipeline between Cushing, Oklahoma and the Gulf Coast is scheduled for completion in the fourth quarter of 2011; construction of the pipeline from Montana to Steele City, Nebraska is scheduled for completion in the first quarter of 2013. 3 The US portion of the existing Keystone Pipeline includes the states of North Dakota, South Dakota, Nebraska, Kansas, Oklahoma, Missouri, and Illinois. The proposed Keystone XL Pipeline is a 1,661 mile, 36-inch crude oil pipeline that would enter the United States in Montana and proceed through South Dakota and Nebraska. It would incorporate the 298-mile portion of the Keystone Pipeline in Nebraska, Kansas, and Oklahoma to serve markets at Cushing, Oklahoma before continuing south through Oklahoma and Texas to a delivery point near existing terminals in Nederland, Texas to serve the Port Arthur, Texas marketplace. This investment in infrastructure will benefit many communities and landowners along the way, and care must of course be taken concerning the environmental impact of construction. These local economies on the route will benefit from increases in tax revenues and business activity associated with temporary construction work in the area. Moreover, local property taxes will be paid on a continuing basis for the 100-year life of the project. 4 Of even greater significance is the ongoing benefit to the US economy of a more stable source of consistent energy supply over an extended time horizon. This issue is explored in the following section.

#### Keystone will be funded through tax breaks

**Paulman**, 2/8/**2012** (Ken, Analysis: $1B in subsidies for Keystone XL refiners, Midwest Energy News, p. http://www.midwestenergynews.com/2012/02/08/analysis-finds-1-billion-in-subsidies-for-keystone-xl-efining/)

While the Keystone XL pipeline may not receive direct payments from the U.S. government, an analysis by two environmental groups finds that taxpayers could be on the hook for more than $1 billion in tax breaks for the refiners that will process the oil. The report by Oil Change International and Earth Track looks at capacity upgrades made to three Gulf Coast refineries that will process the crude shipped via Keystone XL. Under Title 179C of the U.S. tax code, oil refineries can deduct depreciation from such investments at an accelerated rate. The tax break, the groups say, is unique to the refining industry and an amendment last year extend the rule specifically to equipment used to process crude from the oil sands. All told, the analysis [PDF] finds taxpayers will spend $1 billion to $1.8 billion subsidizing these upgrades. The report’s authors characterize their estimate as “conservative.”

## Inherency

### Inherency – TransCanada Applied for Keystone Permit

#### TransCanada reapplied for Keystone Permit

**Belogolova** 5/4/ 20**12** ( Olga, Political correspondant, National Journal Daily, TransCanada Reapplies for Keystone Permit, EBSCOHost)

TransCanada announced on Friday that it has submitted a new application for a permit for the northern portion of the controversial Keystone XL pipeline that would bring Canadian tar-sands oil from Alberta to Steele City, Neb., reigniting the divisive political debate over the project.

"Our application for a Presidential Permit builds on more than three years of environmental review already conducted for Keystone XL," TransCanada CEO Russ Girling said in a statement, noting that 10,000 pages of review documents have already been completed for the project. "It was the most comprehensive process ever for a cross-border pipeline and that work should allow our cross-border permit to be processed expeditiously and a decision made once a new route in Nebraska is determined."

The Obama administration earlier this year denied a permit for TransCanada to build the full pipeline running from Canada down to the Gulf Coast, but President Obama did give the nod to the southern portion of the project, which will run from Cushing, Okla., to Port Arthur, Texas, to help ease a bottleneck in the nation's pipeline system.

### Inherency – AT: Southern Segment

#### An early start of Southern portion of keystone will not speed up construction; Obama fails to produce fossil fuels.

**Markay,** March 22, 20**12** ( Lachlan, investigative reporter for Heritage's Center for Media and Public Policy, “Obama’s Rush to Approve Keystone Segment Won’t Speed Construction”, p. http://blog.heritage.org/2012/03/22/obamas-rush-to-approve-keystone-segment-wont-speed-construction/)

The president’s enthusiastic backing of the portion of the pipeline running from Oklahoma to the Gulf Coast won’t actually speed pipeline construction, according to TransCanada, the company building it.

President Barack Obama’s promise to expedite review of the southern leg of TransCanada Corp. (TRP)’s Keystone XL pipeline won’t speed up the timeline for the project, which already is slated to start construction as soon as June…

TransCanada’s president of energy and oil pipelines, Alex Pourbaix, said in an interview March 6 that construction on the Cushing phase of Keystone could begin as soon as June. The company doesn’t expect the new review process to change that schedule, Cunha said yesterday.

The Cushing phase would have continued apace without presidential action, but Obama looked to take credit for some portion of the project, which Americans support by a 2-1 margin, according to Gallup.

The tactic is similar to the president’s repeated claims that fossil fuel production has increased under his administration. While technically true, he neglects to mention that the majority of that increase has occurred on private lands, over which he has no authority. On federal land, fossil fuel production is at a nine-year low.

## Economy

### Economy Low – Generic

#### Entry-level wages fall to $11.68 as a Result of the Recession, Household wealth dropping

**Cooper**, **6/18**/2012 (Michael, National Correspondent for the New York Times, Lost in Recession, Toll on Underemployed and Underpaid, New York Times, p. www.newyorktimes.com)

These are anxious days for American workers. Many, like Ms. Woods, are underemployed. Others find pay that is simply not keeping up with their expenses: adjusted for inflation, the median hourly wage was **lower in 2011 than it was a decade earlier**, according to data from a forthcoming book by the Economic Policy Institute, “The State of Working America, 12th Edition.” Good benefits are harder to come by, and people are staying longer in jobs that they want to leave, afraid that they will not be able to find something better. Only 2.1 million people quit their jobs in March, down from the 2.9 million people who quit in December 2007, the first month of the recession.

And household wealth is dropping. The Federal Reserve reported last week that the economic crisis left the median American family in 2010 with no more wealth than in the early 1990s, wiping away two decades of gains. With stocks too risky for many small investors and savings accounts paying little interest, building up a nest egg is a challenge even for those who can afford to sock away some of their money.

Things are much worse for people without college degrees, though. The real entry-level hourly wage for men who recently graduated from high school fell to **$11.68 last year, from $15.64 in 1979**, according to data from the Economic Policy Institute. And the percentage of those jobs that offer health insurance has plummeted to **22.8 percent, from 63.3 percent in 1979**.

Though inflation has stayed relatively low in recent years, it has remained high for some of the most important things: college, health care and even, recently, food. The price of food in the home **rose by 4.8 percent last year**, one of the biggest jumps in the last two decades.

#### US Economy is Falling Behind, Standard and Poor’s Downgrade Correct

**Bergsten**, 8/12/**2011** (C. Fred, Peterson Institute for International Economics, U.S. Economy: Beyond a Quick Fix, Vital Speeches of the Day, EBSCOhost)

As already noted, however, this means that we have become heavily dependent on external developments for our own prosperity and stability. Unfortunately, we have failed to recognize that dependence and have behaved in ways that exacerbate our vulnerability. We have run large trade deficits for thirty years. As a result, we have become by far the world's largest debtor country. Our gross foreign debt totals about $**23 trillion and our net foreign debt, even after taking account of our very large** (mainly privately held) **assets abroad, is about $2 1/2 trillion.** The ongoing debate about our national debt and deficits must therefore proceed with a wary eye on the fact that much of it is owed to investors in other countries, some of the largest of which are institutions owned by governments (e.g., China, Russia and several Middle Eastern oil exporters) that may not always be our best friends.

We have let down our guard in a number of ways. Our primary and secondary education system is no longer qualifying our people to succeed in a highly competitive global economy. We do not save enough as a nation to finance adequate levels of investment and we therefore borrow about $500 billion annually from the rest of the world. **Our infrastructure is falling behind world-class standards and, in many cases, is literally crumbling**. Our governmental support for technological innovation, which has been critically important for some of the most important advances of the past half century, is lagging. Our tax system encourages footloose multinational firms, based both here and abroad, to invest in countries other than the United States and rewards consumption (including of energy and pollutants) instead of saving. We have let the exchange rate of dollar, by far the single most important determinant of our international competitiveness in the short run, remain substantially overvalued for prolonged periods. The latest debt deal fails miserably to resolve our budget deficits and once again reveals our proclivity, in the absence of a real crisis, to kick the can down the road; Standard and Poor's was correct to downgrade our long-term credit rating.

#### The US Economy is sluggish and unemployment is rising

**Bergsten**, 8/12/**2011** (C. Fred, Peterson Institute for International Economics, U.S. Economy: Beyond a Quick Fix, Vital Speeches of the Day, EBSCOhost)

What does all this mean for the United States? The United States faces a genuine dilemma fashioning an effective response to its current economic woes. On the one hand, **growth is sluggish and unemployment is unacceptably high**. This would traditionally call for larger doses of expansionary fiscal and monetary policy.

On the other hand, US budget deficits and national have risen rapidly and are on clearly unsustainable paths. Prior to the new debt deal just passed by Congress, which may or may not change things very much, our annual deficits were on track to **exceed $1 trillion annually for next decade.** The debt of the federal government has doubled over the past four years and, at about **80 percent of GDP**, is fast approaching the danger thresholds. The usual prescription is fiscal tightening.

It is not surprising that we face such an acute policy dilemma after experiencing the deepest economic crisis since the Great Depression, especially one that was triggered a profound financial crisis. Careful studies of past financial crises show that the deleveraging required to restore normalcy takes **seven to ten years**; that public debt/GDP ratios tend to double over such a period, as revenues lag badly due to subdued growth (or worse) and additional spending is required to escape the downturn; and that growth can be expected to slow by a percentage point or more (i.e., one third or more of a previous 2-3 percent norm) when debt ratios approach 100 percent. Those typical patterns **describe** quite well **what the United States** **is now going through** but they do not of course obviate the need to make every possible effort to improve the situation.

There are two standard ways to resolve the dilemma. One relates to the policy mix: tighten the budget to limit the debt buildup but maintain easy monetary policy to spur growth. The other addresses the timing of corrective actions: adopt corrective fiscal measures now, to restore market confidence, but implement them over time to avoid weakening the economy even further. (Some of the most promising budget measures, such as an energy or gasoline tax and increasing the retirement age for Social Security and Medicare, should be phased in gradually in any event to cushion their impact on those Americans most directly affected.) Both strategies will be part of any definitive restoration of robust US growth.

### Economy Low – EU Crisis

#### US Economy Not Looking Good with EU Crisis

**Foroohar**, 6/18/**2012** (Rana, Assistant Managing Editor for Time Magazine, Your Global Economic Mess Is Now Being Served, Time, p. EBSCOhost.)

The most rational actors in all of this may be the Americans, who have done a respectable job of getting their personal debt loads down since the financial crisis and have slowly begun spending again, which is one reason the U.S. economy is in better shape than Europe's. But that consumer recovery is still delicate, to say the least. And job growth is anemic, which restrains wage growth, so incomes are flat. According to the Economic Cycle Research Institute, income growth over the past three months has been lower than it was at the start of the past 10 recessions. That's what this "recovery" looks like. The result is that the U.S. economy is "as sensitive to external shocks as I can remember it ever being," says Jim O'Neill, Goldman Sachs' chief economist.

There will likely be plenty more shocks in the long, hot summer ahead. The next three months will bring a resolution, one way or another, to the euro-zone crisis. Soon, the Greeks will either vote to continue with austerity measures or else break from Europe, reissue the drachma and begin the first chapter of a new, volatile post-euro era. If that happens, the value of the euro and any new currency would surely plummet, and social unrest would soar.

As Lady Gaga might sing in her best French, Faites vos jeux. Place your bets. The 2% economy is looking like the best-case scenario for the U.S. this year. If Europe fails to step up to its crisis, the consequences will be much, much worse. "If the euro falls apart, the U.S. would go into a double dip, and it wouldn't be a small one," warns Rogoff, sharing the consensus view. As everyone knows, the only thing worse than a bad romance is a nasty divorce.

### Economy – Studies

#### REMI and Energy & Water Economics Announce Study Examining the Economic Effects of the Proposed Expansion of Keystone Pipeline

**Wade**, 3/13/**2012** (William, President of Energy & Water Economics, The Economic Impact of the Keystone XL Pipeline: REMI and Energy & Water Economics Announce Study Examining the Economic Effects of the Proposed Expansion of Keystone Pipeline, Business Wire, p. [www.businesswire.com](http://www.businesswire.com))

[Regional Economic Models, Inc.](http://cts.businesswire.com/ct/CT?id=smartlink&url=http%3A%2F%2Fwww.remi.com%2Findex.php%3Fpage%3Dpresentations%26hl%3Den_US&esheet=50201118&lan=en-US&anchor=Regional+Economic+Models%2C+Inc.&index=1&md5=45b2cb3ecb47ef9dd21104e5d8880358) (REMI), the foremost provider of dynamic economic models for policy analysis, and [Energy & Water Economics](http://cts.businesswire.com/ct/CT?id=smartlink&url=http%3A%2F%2Fwww.energyandwatereconomics.com%2F&esheet=50201118&lan=en-US&anchor=Energy+%26+Water+Economics&index=2&md5=fcfb8bc59ae416c1a7be4bf2c1373d37), today announced a study evaluating the economic impact of the Keystone XL pipeline. “The pipeline will increase competition between Canadian and Middle East crude producers for position in Gulf Coast and Midwest refineries, but will not affect refined product prices”

Scott Nystrom, associate economist at REMI, and Dr. William W. Wade, resource economist and president of Energy & Water Economics, used the REMI model to resolve the differences in findings of the Keystone XL studies conducted by TransCanada’s economic consultant, The Perryman Group, and Cornell University’s Global Labor Institute (GLI). “The REMI model forecasts that the XL expansion of the Keystone pipeline would create about 16,000 jobs over a two-year period,” said Nystrom. “After that two years, about 800 jobs would be sustainable moving forward.” The study’s findings suggest that previous evaluations forecasted the economic impacts either too high or too low. It corrects model inputs and forecasts the job creation from the pipeline’s construction, operation, and maintenance.

“The benefits of the Keystone XL pipeline would be concentrated largely in the pipeline states themselves,” said Wade. “**These areas could see an** increase in gross domestic **product by as much as $3.1 billion as well as an increase in business sales by as much as $6 billion.**

### Economy – Growth

#### Keystone XL Pipeline generates billions in economic gain

**Perryman**, **2010** (M. Ray, Founder and President of The Perryman Group, The Impact of Developing the Keystone XL Pipeline Project On Business Activity in the US, The Perryman Group, p. [www.perrymangroup.com](http://www.perrymangroup.com))

The Perryman Group utilized the US Multi- Regional Impact Assessment System to determine the total impact of the construction and development phases on the US economy. These **effects over the life of the project were found to include $20.931 billion in total spending, $9.605 billion in output, and 118,935 person- years of employment.** All monetary values are given in constant (2009) dollars.

The construction and development of the Keystone XL pipeline thus provides a significant economic stimulus, including substantial job creation, to the plains states through which the pipeline will pass at a time when the economies in those states are somewhat stagnant due to the recent national economic recession.

The proposed Keystone XL Project would generate tens of billions of dollars in economic activity in communities in the plains states through which the Keystone XL pipeline passes during its construction and development phases and across the US once the pipeline is in operation. In fact, The Perryman Group found that **building the pipeline would lead to gains in business activity of $20.931 billion in spending, $9.605 billion in output, and 118,935 person-years of employment.**

#### The Keystone Pipeline to Generate $9.6 billion and 118, 935 Jobs

**Perryman, 2010** (M. Ray, Founder and President of The Perryman Group, The Impact of Developing the Keystone XL Pipeline Project On Business Activity in the US, The Perryman Group, p. www.perrymangroup.com)

The Perryman Group measured the total impact of the construction and development of the proposed Keystone XL pipeline on the US economy. These effects over the life of the project were found to include **$20.931 billion** in total spending, **$9.605 billion** in output, and **118,935 person-years of employment**. These effects are significant in the states along the route, though spillover gains to other areas, particularly with regard to manufacturing, are quite notable.

### Economy – Jobs

#### Investment expected to create over 444,000 new jobs and generate $521 billion- most qualified author

**Durbin**, August **2011**(Marty, American Petroleum Institue, 5 para, KEYSTONE XL WILL PIPE ENERGY AND ECONOMIC SECURITY TO THE U.S., <http://www.pipelineandgasjournal.com/keystone-xl-will-pipe-energy-and-economic-security-us>)

Investing in Canadian oil is an economic win-win for both Canada and the United States. According to a 2011 study by the Canadian Energy Research Institute (CERI), new oil sands investments are expected to create 444,000 new U.S. jobs and generate $521 billion in U.S. government revenues by 2035. The Keystone XL Pipeline construction alone could create 20,000 U.S. jobs. And for every two jobs supported in Canada, one will be supported in the U.S.

These are well-paying jobs for hardworking Americans, ranging from manufacturing steel for the pipeline and developing advanced leak-monitoring-and-detection systems to electrical work, construction and welding. In fact, nearly 1,000 companies from 47 states are in one way or another involved in developing Canada’s oil sands. The Caterpillar® 797, for example, is one of the world’s largest trucks, with the capacity to haul up to 400 tons per load. Its engine is made in Indiana, its cab fabricated and its engine installed in Illinois, its frame component cast in Louisiana and its Giant Michelin® tires made in South Carolina. As of 2009, 200 of these trucks had been purchased for use in Canada’s oil sands, giving an economic boost to these four U.S. states.

The economic benefits to the United States are clear, and that is why local leaders in Illinois and Nebraska, along with labor unions, strongly support the project. As House Energy and Commerce Chairman Fred Upton (R-MI) stated, “With high gas prices, high unemployment, and clear threats to national security, a project such as Keystone XL should be a top priority for any administration.”

Meanwhile, the Alberta government estimates that the mining and oil and natural gas sectors employ about 136,000 Albertans—a number that is sure to grow as the United States looks to Canada for greater supplies of secure, affordable oil. Their government has also noted that every dollar invested in oil sands creates about $9 worth of economic activity—with one-third of that economic value generated outside Alberta in Canada, the U.S. and around the world.

#### Jobs produced would be a start

Hamilton 12/18/2011 (James- UC San Diego Professor, Costs and benefits of the Keystone XL pipeline, Econbrowser p. http://www.econbrowser.com/archives/2011/12/costs\_and\_benef.html)

The construction work force would consist of approximately 5,000 to 6,000 workers, including Keystone employees, contractor employees, and construction and environmental inspection staff. That would generate from $349 million to $419 in total wages. An estimated $6.58 to $6.65 billion would be spent on materials and supplies, easements, engineering, permitting, and other costs. One should also emphasize that these are temporary jobs, as any construction work by definition must be. Once the infrastructure is constructed, the work of those who were employed in building it is finished. On the other hand, presumably the objective of any stimulus program is precisely to provide temporary employment opportunities. A recent report from Cornell University Global Labor Group came up with much more modest estimates of the short-term employment boost from the spending other than the direct construction would be 33,000 to 44,000 person-years. In terms of "permanent" employment effects, I did not see either the State Department or the Cornell report mention TransCanada's claim that the pipeline would generate a present value of $5.2 billion in property tax revenue over its lifetime. Even if the only jobs you counted were government workers, that should be enough loose change to buy you something.

#### Without the plan, the U.S. will lose jobs to China.

**Madhani** 1/09/20**12** (Aamer-national correspondent at Chicago Tribune, Canada seeks alternative route for Keystone XL pipeline, USA Today p. http://content.usatoday.com/communities/theoval/post/2012/01/obama-canada-alternative-route-keystone-xl/1#.T-MBgbWcATZ)

Proponents of the project say that Keystone XL would create thousands of jobs in the USA and would lessen U.S. dependence on Middle East oil. "President Obama says we can't wait for action on jobs," House Speaker John Boehner's office noted in an e-mail to reporters today. "Well, Canada isn't waiting. One way or another, a new energy pipeline will be built. The question the president and Democrats in Washington need to answer is: would Democrats rather American workers get these Keystone jobs? Or China?"

#### Keystone pipeline creates jobs and lowers the cost of gas

**Bradley**, 10/20/**2011** (Robert-president of the Institute for Energy Research in Houston, The Keystone XL Energy Project is Much More Than a Pipe Dream, Cato Institute, p. http://www.cato.org/publications/commentary/keystone-xl-energy-project-is-much-more-pipe-dream)

All told, this megaproject will stretch 1,661 miles from Alberta to Texas's Gulf Coast region. Immediately upon completion, the pipeline will have the capacity to carry 700,000 barrels per day (bpd) and ultimately the ability to transport 900,000 bpd. The Cornell study, which environmentalists have trumpeted, is born of desperation. Facing a likely go-ahead decision from the U.S. Government, the study is a last ditch attempt to drum up opposition to a no-brainer, market-approved project. In fact, the Keystone XL pipeline will give our country a more stable and cheaper source of fuel and create thousands of quality American jobs. And taxpayers (think Solyndra) will not risk a dime. The United States currently consumes 25% of the world's energy, but produces less than 5 percent. Heavily dependent on foreign oil, America imports 11 million barrels each day. This need for foreign oil isn't going to change anytime soon. The 2010 Annual Energy Outlook projects that over 40 percent of U.S. liquid fuel consumption will be supplied by imports through 2035. Global demand for oil will only rise too — 39% between 2005 and 2030. A new influx of up to 700,000 bpd from Canada will dramatically increase U.S supplies and in turn drive gas prices down. A study from Energy Policy Research Foundation found a greater supply of Canadian oil could save Gulf Coast refiners almost $500 million annually in transport costs, which, in turn, would mean lower prices for consumers at the pump. According to the Canadian Energy Research Institute, by 2019 employment directly related to Keystone XL could grow from 80,000 jobs to 179,000. If the flow of Canadian oil through the United States remains unchanged, however, total employment from the Keystone line will peak at 94,000 in 2019. The respected Perryman Group found that across the entire economy, an increase in stable oil supplies would create 250,348 permanent jobs from gains in U.S. economic activity. Personal income gains from these jobs would amount to $6.5 billion, stimulating $2.3 billion of retail sales.

#### Keystone pipelines creates jobs --- including construction and manufacturing jobs

**Ayers**, 11/3/**2011** (Mark – president of Buildings and Trade Construction, For the 99% of Americans, Keystone = Jobs, Huffington Post, p. http://www.huffingtonpost.com/mark-h-ayers/for-the-99-of-americans-k\_b\_1073705.html)

For America's skilled craft construction professionals, any discussion of the Keystone XL project begins and ends with one word: JOBS. Today, roughly **14% of the American construction workforce is unemployed** -- which is significantly higher than the overall national unemployment rate of 9%. Throughout America's Heartland, the Keystone Pipeline represents the prospect for 20,000 immediate jobs, and as many as 500,000 indirect jobs via a strong economic multiplier effect. **By constructing a safe, reliable method for transporting crude oil through the American Midwest, this initiative not only fulfills sound U.S. energy policy goals, but will spur employment opportunities for American workers** in the construction industry, as well as many other industries. The Keystone XL pipeline has now been awaiting regulatory approval for more than two and one half years since the initial application was filed in September 2008. The U.S. Department of State has held more than twenty public comment meetings and hearings along the proposed route of the pipeline, and TransCanada has held more than ninety open houses and public meetings while providing hundreds of hours of testimony and submitting thousands of pages of project information. All of these efforts have been designed to ensure that any environmental impact along the route is minimized as much as practically possible. Having done its due diligence, the State Department has concluded that the Keystone XL project represents the best course of action. Further, in its Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS), the State Department recognized that the development of the Canadian oil sands would not impact greenhouse gas production. And even though the State Department was not obligated to have analyzed any environmental impacts outside of the United States, the SDEIS provides a clear life-cycle analysis of greenhouse gas production that would be connected to the development of the Canadian oil sands, as well as the environmental impact to wildlife, forests, threatened and endangered species, and water resources**. In each instance, all key issues raised by the SDEIS have been adequately addressed.** **" A leak of the Keystone XL pipeline would not affect the majority of the Ogallala Aquifer...those who think that a leaking pipeline will destroy the Aquifer in Nebraska need to understand that it would be localized to an area of 10's or 100's of feet around the pipeline. When people say the whole Ogallala Aquifer is at risk, they're wrong."** Additionally, the State Department SDEIS also noted the important role **the Keystone XL project** would play in providing for domestic energy security now and into the future. Specifically, the project **would serve** a critical short and long term market **opportunity to fill a crude oil gap** created by a decline in supply from transitional heavy suppliers, such as Mexico and Venezuela that would otherwise have to be recouped by an accelerated dependence on an increasingly unstable and unpredictable Middle East. There can be no question that the Keystone XL pipeline project serves America's national security interests. **The privately-financed Keystone XL pipeline project is projected to create tens of thousands of U.S. jobs in construction and manufacturing, and without one single dollar of government assistance.** There is also an economic multiplier effect associated with this project, as the economic impact spreads to other industries where demand and expenditures for goods and services within and around the vicinity of the pipeline's construction are expected to increase significantly. In the end, this projected rise in the demand for local goods and services will result in more tax revenue for the surrounding local governments. In fact, it has been estimated that the pipeline's corridor states would realize an additional $5.2 billion in tax revenue during the course of construction.

#### Keystone Creates Jobs

**Sherter**, 1/19/**2012** (Alain-Award Winning Business Journalist for CBS, Keystone Pipeline: How Many Jobs Really at Stake? CBS News, p. http://www.cbsnews.com/8301-505123\_162-57361212/keystone-pipeline-how-many-jobs-really-at-stake/)

Yet exactly how much work **Keystone**, a proposed 1,700-mile pipeline that **would** transport oil from Alberta, Canada, to the Texas Gulf Coast, would generate remains in dispute. Transcanada ([TRP](http://markets.cbsnews.com/cbsnews./quote?Symbol=321%3A1598967)), the energy giant bidding to build the pipeline, projects the undertaking would [create 20,000 jobs](http://www.cbc.ca/news/business/story/2012/01/10/transcanada-keystone-jobs.html) in the U.S., including 13,000 positions in construction and 7,000 in manufacturing. That figure, based on a report by a consulting firm [hired by Transcanada](http://www.transcanada.com/docs/Key_Projects/TransCanada_US_Report_06-10-10.pdf) to assess the project's economic impact, has been widely cited by Keystone backers on Capitol Hill. Other estimates advanced by supporters of the pipeline have been even more optimistic, with the [U.S. Chamber of Commerce claiming](http://www.uschamber.com/issues/letters/2011/key-vote-alert-letter-support-hr-1938-north-american-made-energy-security-act) **it could create 250,000 permanent U.S. jobs.**

#### Keystone will create jobs and prevent future job loss

**Faulkner**, 5/7/**2012** (Chris – founder, president and CEO of Breitling Oil and Gas, Bringing the Keystone Pipeline Debate Back into Focus, Oil Online, p. http://www.oilonline.com/blog/main.asp?Tid=45&id=252&cat )

You say tomato, I say tomahtoh: jobs will be created as well as saved

Let’s agree to disagree on the jobs estimates—TransCanada has put the number at 20,000, some US politicians have inflated it to 200,000, and the US State Department has issued its verdict of 5,000 to 6,000. One thing is for sure: construction and maintenance of the pipeline will create jobs, both direct and indirect. But let’s look at the flip side of the jobs-created coin. What about the workers whose livelihoods are endangered if the pipeline project is never completed? Thousands of jobs are at stake in the Gulf Coast area refineries that were built for heavy oil. These refineries now process oil from Mexico and Venezuela, but heavy oil production in both countries is falling. And some of Venezuela's oil is being diverted elsewhere for political reasons.

**Loris**, 12/19/**2011** (Nicolas – policy analyst in the Roe Institute for Economic Policy Studies at the Heritage Foundation, Unnecessary Keystone XL Pipeline Delay Obstructs Energy, Jobs, The Cutting Edge, p. <http://www.thecuttingedgenews.com/index.php?article=53424&pageid=16&pagename=Opinion>)

The construction of the Keystone XL pipeline would deliver an additional 700,000 to 830,000 barrels of oil per day to the U.S. from Canada, the U.S.’s largest supplier of oil. Not only is the delay preventing additional imports from Canada, it is also preventing the creation of thousands of private-sector jobs. Building the pipeline would directly create 20,000 truly shovel-ready jobs; the Canadian Energy Research Institute estimates that current pipeline operations and the addition of the Keystone XL pipeline would create 179,000 American jobs by 2035.

### Jobs Key to Economy

#### Investment to infrastructure is the most effective way to raise both the output and employment

US Department of Treasury 12(A NEW ECONOMIC ANALYSIS OF INFRASTRUCTURE INVESTMENTA REPORT PREPARED BY THE DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURYWITH THE COUNCIL OF ECONOMIC ADVISERS, United States Department of Treasury, p 12, <http://www.treasury.gov/resource-center/economic-policy/Documents/20120323InfrastructureReport.pdf>)

**Even as the economy has begun to recover, construction employment remains well below pre-recession levels**. In December 2011, total payroll jobs in the construction industry remained 25 percent below the level of December 2007, dropping 1.9 million from 7.5 million to 5.6 million employees (seasonally-adjusted), which constitutes one-third of the total jobs lost over this period. In February 2012, the unemployment rate for construction workers was 17.1 percent, and over the past twelve months, the unemployment rate for construction workers has averaged 15.6 percent.

**Building** more roads, bridges, and rail tracks would especially **help those workers that were disproportionately affected by the economic crisis – construction and manufacturing workers**. Accelerated infrastructure investment would provide an opportunity for construction workers to productively apply their skills and experience. Moreover, hiring currently unemployed construction workers would impose lower training costs on firms than would be incurred by hiring workers during normal times because these workers already have much of the requisite skills and experience**. Analysis by the Congressional Budget Office found that additional investment in infrastructure is among the most effective policy options for raising output and employment.**25 Given this situation, the President’s proposal to front-load our six-year surface transportation legislation with an additional $50 billion investment makes sound economic sense

#### Empirically proven that construction jobs triggers economy growth and stops econ collapse- Bronx

Ortega, Kappstatter 99(Ralph – business writer of Star- Leger, NY Daily News, and member of NAHJ, Bob – reporter of Bronx Times Reporter, FERRER CITES GROWTH IN CONSTRUCTION, JOBS, <http://www.lexisnexis.com/lnacui2api/results/docview/docview.do?docLinkInd=true&risb=21_T14988533708&format=GNBFI&sort=BOOLEAN&startDocNo=1&resultsUrlKey=29_T14988533712&cisb=22_T14988533711&treeMax=true&treeWidth=0&csi=151550&docNo=2>)

**The comeback story of the Bronx continues, thanks t**o booming business, **rising construction and job development, Borough President Fernando Ferrer said** yesterday in his annual State of the Borough address.

Ferrer boasted of his successes, announced new initiatives, and also used the opportunity to fire a few volleys at his old foe, Mayor Giuliani.

With a bow to the Democratic administration in Washington, Ferrer yielded to a surprise guest speaker before launching into the meat of his speech. Appearing live via satellite, Vice President Gore delivered a wealth of praise for the borough and its achievements, adding: "Thanks to Fernando Ferrer, we know the state of the Bronx is strong."

Ferrer returned the compliment by saying: "Pretty soon we'll be addressing you as Mr. President."

Looking at the rosy side of the state of the borough, **Ferrer pointed to dramatic gains in general building construction**. He reported there were 550 applications for proposed buildings in 1998, up from 148 the year before.

He also noted:

**Institutional construction "skyrocketing" from $ 2.8 million to $ 158 million last year.**

**A net gain of 8,000 jobs in the private sector over the last five years.**

**An infusion of regional and national retailers, resulting in 1,500 new jobs and hundreds of construction jobs.**

### US Key to the World Economy

#### The US Economy is key to the world economy.

Kevin Hall, 2010 (staff writer). April 30, 2010. “U.S. economy grew briskly in first quarter, government says.” P. http://www.miamiherald.com/2010/04/30/1606734/us-economy-grew-briskly-in-first.html

If sustained, the upturn in U.S. consumption would be good news for the whole world, since the United States remains the key global economic engine. "What was particularly encouraging about today's GDP numbers is that U.S. consumption appears to be on a strong recovery path," said Frederic Neumann, co-head of Asian Economic Research for the global Hong Kong bank HSBC. Friday's GDP numbers were in line with a revised forecast from the International Monetary Fund, which predicted earlier in April that the world's economy would grow at a rate above 4 percent this year, significantly better than its initial 1.9 percent forecast.

#### US economic declines undermine the world economy.

David Kampf, 2009 (former communications director for PEPFAR. May 7, 2009, p. http://www.worldpoliticsreview.com/article.aspx?id=3717)

The worldwide economic turmoil underlines the importance of the United States -- for better or worse -- to the global market. As the U.S. goes, so goes the world. When the American bubble burst, the speed with which the contagion spread beyond its borders is an illustration.

#### The US is key to the global economy.

David McCormick, 2008 (former under secretary for International Affairs in the U. S. Treasury Department, May 12, 2008, Newsweek. P. Lexis/Nexis)

Our friends around the world should gain confidence from the fact that U.S. policymakers and their international counterparts are taking aggressive, targeted actions to stabilize the financial markets, to reduce their impact on the economy and the individuals negatively affected by the turmoil and to protect against the same mistakes' being repeated. There are already some early indicators that these actions are beginning to have the desired effect, as markets appear to be gaining confidence and the availability of credit has improved modestly. Flexibility and resilience in the face of such unexpected financial-market turmoil and economic hardship are among America's greatest strengths. Our objective is to help individuals and markets recover as quickly as possible, while avoiding actions that cause new problems that would hurt our economy in the long run**. This storm, too, shall pass, and the United States will emerge, as it always has, as a driver of growth and innovation for the global economy.**

### Econ Impacts – Nuclear War

#### Economic decline causes nuclear war.

**Mead**, Summer **1992** (Walter Russell Mead – avid fan of the show The Price is Right and the movie Saving Private Ryan, New Perspectives Quarterly, p. 30)

What if the global economy stagnates-or even shrinks? In the case, we will face a new period of international conflict: South against North, rich against poor, Russia, China, India-these countries with their billions of people and their nuclear weapons will pose a much greater danger to world order than Germany and Japan did in the '30s.

#### Extinction --- global instability

**Auslin 9** (Michael, Resident Scholar – American Enterprise Institute, and Desmond Lachman – Resident Fellow – American Enterprise Institute, “The Global Economy Unravels”, Forbes, 3-6, http://www.aei.org/article/100187)

What do these trends mean in the short and medium term? The Great Depression showed how social and global chaos followed hard on economic collapse. The mere fact that parliaments across the globe, from America to Japan, are unable to make responsible, economically sound recovery plans suggests that they do not know what to do and are simply hoping for the least disruption. Equally worrisome is the adoption of more statist economic programs around the globe, and the concurrent decline of trust in free-market systems. The threat of instability is a pressing concern. China, until last year the world's fastest growing economy, just reported that 20 million migrant laborers lost their jobs. Even in the flush times of recent years, China faced upward of 70,000 labor uprisings a year. A sustained downturn poses grave and possibly immediate threats to Chinese internal stability. The regime in Beijing may be faced with a choice of repressing its own people or diverting their energies outward, leading to conflict with China's neighbors. Russia, an oil state completely dependent on energy sales, has had to put down riots in its Far East as well as in downtown Moscow. Vladimir Putin's rule has been predicated on squeezing civil liberties while providing economic largesse. If that devil's bargain falls apart, then wide-scale repression inside Russia, along with a continuing threatening posture toward Russia's neighbors, is likely. Even apparently stable societies face increasing risk and the threat of internal or possibly external conflict. As Japan's exports have plummeted by nearly 50%, one-third of the country's prefectures have passed emergency economic stabilization plans. Hundreds of thousands of temporary employees hired during the first part of this decade are being laid off. Spain's unemployment rate is expected to climb to nearly 20% by the end of 2010; Spanish unions are already protesting the lack of jobs, and the specter of violence, as occurred in the 1980s, is haunting the country. Meanwhile, in Greece, workers have already taken to the streets. Europe as a whole will face dangerously increasing tensions between native citizens and immigrants, largely from poorer Muslim nations, who have increased the labor pool in the past several decades. Spain has absorbed five million immigrants since 1999, while nearly 9% of Germany's residents have foreign citizenship, including almost 2 million Turks. The xenophobic labor strikes in the U.K. do not bode well for the rest of Europe. A prolonged global downturn, let alone a collapse, would dramatically raise tensions inside these countries. Couple that with possible protectionist legislation in the United States, unresolved ethnic and territorial disputes in all regions of the globe and a loss of confidence that world leaders actually know what they are doing. The result may be a series of small explosions that coalesce into a big bang.

#### The impact is extinction

**Torgerson 99** (Douglas, Professor and Chair of the Department of Political Studies – Trent University, Ontario, The Promise of Green Politics: Environmentalism and the Public Sphere, p. 145-146)

By adopting an uncompromising posture, green radicalism serves to high-light the danger that green reforms might well be absorbed and rendered ineffective by the established order. Against reforims, green radicals emphasize the need to thoroughly transform prevailing institutions and ways of viewing the human/nature relationship. In the absence of coherent and plausible programs for radical transformation, however, desperate scenarios of crisis and catastrophe become inviting: “The very best thing for the planet,” one radical green has thus declared, “might be a massive worldwide economic depression”: “Amid the terrible hardships this would create for countless people, at least the machinery would stop for a while, and the Earth could take a breather.”5 Needless to say, this repugnant hope ignores the obvious range of potential consequences arising from such a scenario. Social insecurity and human misery could intensify human conflicts and promote neglect of environmental concerns as people desperately sought to protect themselves, there could also be increased terrorism, even warfare of a **type** and **scale** that would prove enormously destructive to **life on earth**.

## China Advantage

### Ext – Lack of Keystone Leads to China Shift

#### Canada isn’t waiting for the US --- will shift to China

**Madhani** 1/09/20**12** (Aamer-national correspondent at Chicago Tribune, Canada seeks alternative route for Keystone XL pipeline, USA Today p. http://content.usatoday.com/communities/theoval/post/2012/01/obama-canada-alternative-route-keystone-xl/1#.T-MBgbWcATZ)

While President Obama wants to delay a decision on the controversial Keystone XL pipeline until after the 2012 election, Canada's Prime Minister Stephen Harper is stepping up efforts to explore an alternative pipeline that would allow Canada to ship their tar sands oil to China. On Tuesday, an independent federal panel in Canada will begin its review of a proposed western pipeline that would carry the oil from Alberta to the coast of British Columbia. From British Columbia, the oil would be shipped on tankers to oil-hungry China. "I think it's essential, based on what's occurred with Keystone XL, that this country does diversify its energy-export markets," Harper said in a radio interview on Thursday, the Wall Street Journal reports.

#### Canada will send the oil to China

Broder and Frosch 12/23/2011 (John M.- Reporter at The New York Times, and Dan- Reporter at The New York Times, Politics Stamps Out Oil Sands Pipeline, Yet It Seems Likely to Endure, New York Times p. http://www.nytimes.com/2011/12/24/us/provision-may-halt-keystone-pipeline-but-oil-is-still-likely-to-flow.html?\_r=1)

It is only after 2020, when production of Canadian crude is expected to double from today’s 1.5 million barrels a day, that the pipeline crunch becomes severe. Canadian companies are already planning to expand current pipelines and build new ones to carry oil to the coast of British Columbia for export to Asia. Notably, however, one such proposed project, Enbridge’s Northern Gateway pipeline from Alberta to Kitimat, British Columbia, has been stopped for at least a year by the Canadian government because of strong opposition on environmental grounds from local landowners and indigenous populations. Nonetheless, Stephen Harper, the Canadian prime minister, said in a television interview this week that if the United States blocked the Keystone pipeline, Canada would look to China as a market for its oil. “I am very serious about selling our oil off this continent, selling our energy products off to China,” Mr. Harper said.

#### The Chinese oil pipe is close to being on its way

Malcom 2/10/2012 (Andrew- Former Politics Blogger at LA Times, Will Canadian Oil Be For the Lamps of China? Investor’s Business Daily p. http://news.investors.com/article/600855/201202101833/canadian-keystone-xl-oil-to-china-.htm?p=full)

While our president sleeps on the Keystone XL pipeline, Canada’s prime minister is in Beijing signing a series of trade deals to ship additional petroleum to China. Halftime in America? We need a new quarterback. While Clint Eastwood, in that thinly disguised infomercial for President Obama's re-election campaign, was promising that the world would soon hear the roar of our engines, China's economy will soon be revving up with petroleum that should and could be flowing south in a pipeline the Obama administration won't build. Prime Minister Steven Harper is making good on his warning that Canada would seek other customers for the vast oil riches locked in the oil sands of Alberta. He is leading a five-day delegation to an energy-hungry China eager to be Canada's best customer. He will not wait for an American administration fixated on windmills and Solyndras and automakers that produce overpriced electric cars prone to battery fires. "I am very serious about selling our oil off this continent, selling our energy products off to Asia. I think we have to do that," Harper said in an interview with Canada's CTV National News in the wake of President Obama's decision to kick the Keystone oil can down the road past the November election. On the trip Harper announced a series of multibillion-dollar trade and business agreements to ship additional Canadian petroleum, uranium and other products to China. More than 20 commercial agreements involving more than 50 Chinese and Canadian companies were announced. In addition, a joint economic study to be completed by May could form the basis for a free trade agreement. The elephant in the room, of course, was Canadian oil. State-owned Chinese oil and gas firms have invested more than $10 billion in Alberta's oil sands and British Columbia shale gas just in the past couple of years. They are hoping for a big return on their investment. "Canada has the resources, technological sophistication and geostrategic positioning to complement China's economic growth strategy," Harper told the Chinese. "And China's growth, in turn, complements our determination to diversify our export markets. We expect to see similar success stories in Canadian energy exports to China, once infrastructure is in place. “That infrastructure would be the Northern Gateway oil sands pipeline and a separate one for natural gas that would run westward to Vancouver for export to China. Harper has stated that it is a national priority and Sinopec, a Chinese state-controlled oil company, has a stake in the $5.5 billion plan to build the Northern Gateway Pipeline from Alberta to the Pacific Coast province of British Columbia.

### China Shift Bad – Emissions

#### A shift to China will increase the emissions used

Hamilton 12/18/2011 (James- UC San Diego Professor, Costs and benefits of the Keystone XL pipeline, Econbrowser p. http://www.econbrowser.com/archives/2011/12/costs\_and\_benef.html)

The most important issue for opponents of the pipeline is that getting a usable product out of the Canadian oil sands releases significantly more greenhouse gases than conventional oil resources. Charpentier, Bergerson and MacLean (2009) surveyed a number of different studies of the size of this effect, with each study's estimate represented by a bar on the graph below. Whereas extracting one barrel of crude oil and delivering it to the refinery from conventional sources has been estimated to release 27 to 58 kilograms of CO2 per barrel, getting a barrel from surface-mined oil sands would emit 62 to 164, and estimated releases from in situ production range from 99 to 176. However, this is much less alarming than it sounds, since far more CO2 is emitted when the final gasoline is combusted in the vehicle than in the production of the synthetic crude liquid itself. When one asks how much carbon dioxide is emitted when I drive a vehicle for one kilometer whose original energy source was oil sands rather than conventional crude oil, the differences are relatively modest. In any case, U.S. production of oil from conventional sources has been declining for some time, and it's simply not realistic to use conventional oil as the standard of comparison. Enhanced oil recovery and conversion of natural gas to liquid fuels are also associated with higher greenhouse gas emissions per kilometer driven than conventional petroleum; see for example Brandt and Farrell (2007). And if the end result of the U.S. refusing to buy the Canadian oil would be for them to build a pipeline westward to ship it to the Chinese or shipping the oil by rail or truck, there would be added greenhouse gas emissions associated with the transportation. The extraction of the oil sands is also environmentally more destructive than conventional sources, though it would be an unusual step for the U.S. State Department to be the arbiter of what happens inside Canadian borders. And again perhaps a better standard of comparison is deep-sea or arctic production. It is quite possible that we'll need these, and oil sands, and very significant U.S. conservation, to cope with the challenges over the next decade.

### Ext – Keystone Drilling Inevitable

#### Global Impact would be gradual and if the US doesn’t burn it, someone else will

Broder and Frosch 12/23/2011 (John M.- Reporter at The New York Times, and Dan- Reporter at The New York Times, Politics Stamps Out Oil Sands Pipeline, Yet It Seems Likely to Endure, New York Times p. http://www.nytimes.com/2011/12/24/us/provision-may-halt-keystone-pipeline-but-oil-is-still-likely-to-flow.html?\_r=1)

But experts in oil economics say that the oil is coming out of the ground in any event because of steadily growing global demand and the heavy investment in infrastructure already made in Alberta. Andrew Leach, an associate professor of natural resources at the Alberta School of Business, said that Canada would continue to develop its oil resources, but that it would need additional pipeline capacity in coming years to meet export demands, whether to the United States or Asia. Slowing or stopping a particular project — Keystone or Northern Gateway, for example — could temporarily slow production in the oil sands, but eventually that resource will be tapped, he and others said. Dr. Leach added, however, when asked about Dr. Hansen’s argument, that even at the higher end of production estimates, it would take until the year 3316 to burn all the oil, so the atmospheric effect would be gradual. And it would make no difference to the atmosphere whether it was burned in the United States, China or elsewhere, he noted. The oil industry continues to invest in Canadian oil sands because such projects are expected to produce a steady stream of crude for decades, said Philip Budzik, a research analyst at the Energy Information Administration, a federal research organization. He said that over time, costs and the energy required to extract the oil would come down as technology improved. “In an era of limited accessibility to overseas oil resources and in contrast to conventional oil fields that produce at their peak production level for only three to six years before going into decline,” Mr. Budzik said, “long-lived productive assets such as oil sands provide a company some insurance as to its long-term financial viability.” He said that canceling Keystone would probably slow the rate of increase of oil sands production, but only until new routes to Asia or North America were found.

### China Shift Bad – Oil Spills

#### Keystone failure results in more carbon emissions and worse oil spills.

**McNally**, 11/29/**2011** (Scott – research intern for the White House Council on Environmental Quality, Keystone XL? It’s Not an Environmental Question, Scientific American, p. http://blogs.scientificamerican.com/plugged-in/2011/11/29/guest-post-keystone-xl-its-not-an-environmental-question/)

Canada already produces almost two million barrels of oil per day from oil sands (National Energy Board of Canada – www.neb-one.gc.ca) and they aren’t going to just stop doing it because America says no to this pipeline. If the Keystone XL pipeline is blocked, TransCanada can just build a pipeline to the west coast of British Columbia and use tankers to move the oil to Asia. (By the way, they already have a major pipeline to the west coast – The Kinder Morgan Trans Mountain pipeline, and almost a dozen other major pipelines that come into the United States). You might argue, ‘Environmentalists in Canada will stop that pipeline.’ No they won’t. Pipelines and massive oil sands operations already exist. Keystone XL did not meet significant resistance in Canada, and as long as it is routed correctly, neither will a pipeline to the coast. The oil sands are an incredible source of jobs and revenue for Canada, and they will find a way to route the pipeline that does not meet untenable political resistance. Just like Canada will keep producing, we will keep importing. If we don’t import from Canada, we will import more oil from the Middle East or Africa. The same amount of oil will be produced and consumed globally either way, but in the ‘no Keystone’ case, the oil will just have to travel farther, which could mean more carbon emissions because of transportation. The previously referenced Ensys report also mentions that, “Together, growing Canadian oil sands imports and U.S. demand reduction have the potential to very substantially reduce U.S. dependency on non-Canadian foreign oil, including from the Middle East.” Furthermore, we are lucky to get the oil. Canada already exports to Asia, where the market is actually cheaper to access. That is because to export from Canada to China, the required pipeline will be much shorter than to the U.S. Gulf Coast, and pipelines are very expensive (About $1 million per mile). As it was put in the Ensys Keystone XL Report: “costs for transporting [Canadian oil sands] crudes to major markets in northeast Asia (China, Japan, South Korea, Taiwan) via pipeline and tanker are lower than to transport the same crudes via pipeline to the U.S. Gulf Coast.” There is valid concern over pipelines crossing sensitive areas, including aquifers. The pipeline should be routed so that any potential spill will have the least impact possible, as small spills should be expected to occur occasionally. However, the odds that oil spilled from a pipeline will actually contaminate an aquifer are low, and pipeline spills tend to be much less severe than tanker spills. The bottom line is this: if we don’t build a pipeline over land, the alternative to ship, in tankers, across oceans. The pipeline is the less risky environmental choice. For the record, I believe very strongly that we need to reduce carbon emissions. The quickest, easiest, least expensive, least disruptive way to reduce carbon emissions is to stop using so much energy. Stop driving, turn off your air conditioner. If we are serious about reducing carbon emissions, we have to get serious about using less energy and using it more efficiently. Blocking Keystone XL will **not get us any closer to solving the climate problem**.

### China Shift Bad – Environmental Damage

#### Keystone exploitation is inevitable – only U.S. intervention prevents worse damages.

Wall Street Journal, 12/9/**2011** (An Inevitable Keystone Pipeline, p. http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424052970204319004577084921578161262.html)

If the Prohibition Era taught us anything about business, it's that demand has a way of finding supply. That was true of whiskey. It will likely also be true of Canada's oil sands and the controversial Keystone XL pipeline. Keystone XL, or a similar pipeline and set of worries, isn't just inevitable. It's something we should accept to prevent worse alternatives from coming to pass. The 1,700-mile pipeline, proposed by TransCanada Corp. and blocked for the moment by the White House, is back in the news. Lawmakers in the U.S. Congress are seeking to override the administration and start construction of the pipeline, which would carry oil from the oil sands of Alberta to refineries in Houston. President Barack Obama and Canadian Prime Minister Stephen Harper discussed the matter on Wednesday. Big corporate names have stakes in the Canadian oil sands: ConocoPhillips, Exxon, Shell, Chevron, Marathon, Statoil, Total, Sinopec and BP among many others. Environmentalists say the pipeline is a bad idea: "It locks the U.S. into a high carbon form of energy," says Nathan Lemphers at the Pembina Institute in Calgary. "Until there's a national energy policy, these sorts of pipelines will become the surrogate battleground for the environmental movement." Susan Casey-Lefkowitz of the National Resources Defense Council says the pipeline would promote a dirty and energy-intensive form of oil extraction, pipe that oil through environmentally sensitive areas and aquifers in the U.S., and ultimately keep the U.S. addicted to the wrong sort of fuel, speeding climate change. Theirs is a compelling argument for abstinence: Until Washington stops dithering and charts a clear road to cleaner energy, remove the temptation to burn more oil by preventing access to supply. Last month, the White House delayed a yes-or-no decision on the pipeline—conveniently until after the 2012 presidential election. Markets, however, won't delay. Global demand for energy, driven by growth in developing countries, is expected to rocket 33% over the next 25 years, says the International Energy Agency. By 2035, China is likely to consume almost 70% more energy than the U.S. Fossil fuels such as oil will still account for 75% of energy consumed in 2035, says the IEA. And these numbers assume positive steps toward conservation and the adoption of renewable and other fuels. Where will the new energy come from? Globally, reliance will grow on a relatively small number of producers, mainly in the Middle East and North Africa, and the oil will be shipped along vulnerable supply routes, says the IEA. By 2035, the agency says, OPEC's share of global production will rise to above 50%. If you wonder why China is currently running sea trials for its first aircraft carrier, these vulnerable supply routes and China's own energy insecurity provide an answer. Frustrated with the U.S., Canada is talking with China about piping its oil west instead of south. Enbridge Inc. has proposed a pipeline to a port at Kitimat, British Columbia, where the oil would be loaded on ships bound for Asia. Native communities in the region are resisting the project. Somehow, though, demand will eventually pull the oil to market. "That oil is going to get produced, it's going to get refined somewhere, and it's going to get consumed," says Larry Nichols, executive chairman of Devon Energy. Devon produces about 30,000 barrels a day in the oil sands now and plans to more than quintuple production by 2020. Until cleaner energy sources are cheap, effective and available enough to supplant oil—until pipelines like Keystone are no longer needed—the options for the U.S. are difficult but clear: On supply: The U.S. can continue to rely on dicey regimes in countries such as Saudi Arabia and Venezuela. Or it can buy more oil from its ally Canada and companies it knows, with the added short-term benefit of generating jobs to build new pipelines to U.S. refineries. On the environment: The U.S. can let oil-sands oil go to Asia with all the carbon emissions that entails: pollution from shipping, possible substandard refining, and use of the product in Chinese industries with weak emissions rules. Scientists have already found that mercury and other effluents from China's power plants and factories drift across the Pacific and contaminate North American waterways. Expect more. Or the U.S. can pipe the oil to Houston where regulators scrutinize refiners over emissions, where ever-greater economies of scale help companies create best practices in refining, and where the U.S. can earn money exporting refined products to the rest of the world. The choices seem inevitable. Why wait?

### China Shift Bad – Oil Spills

#### China-Canada shipments will result in oil spills in the Arctic --- the impact is massive environmental destruction.

**Boswell**, 5/18/**2012** (Randy, Canada cruising for a major oil spill crisis in the Arctic, academics warn, p. <http://www.canada.com/news/Canada+cruising+major+spill+crisis+Arctic+academic+warns/6646337/story.html>)

One of Canada's top experts on Arctic issues is warning of the "near-inevitability" of an Exxon Valdez-scale oil spill at a fragile choke point in Alaskan waters if Canada ends up shipping oilsands fuel to China via pipeline terminals on the British Columbia coast. Michael Byers, a UBC professor and Canada Research Chair in Global Politics and International Law, argues that Canada's "disregard for the environmental impacts of developing and selling its oil sands to China" could eventually expose the narrow, already-congested Unimak Pass in the Aleutian Islands — a key maritime gateway between Asia and North America — to an ecological disaster. Byers' warning — published Friday in the Seattle Times under the headline "Canada's oil-sands bonanza could mean disaster for Alaska's coastline" — follows comments at a Congressional hearing last week by the commandant of the U.S. Coast Guard, Adm. Robert Papp, that the strategic importance of the Unimak Pass and nearby Bering Strait have long been overlooked by the U.S. government, and that protection of the two passageways has become an urgent priority for his agency. The likelihood that China and other Asian countries could become major buyers of Canadian bitumen has increased significantly in recent months because of unanticipated obstacles in securing U.S. approvals for the TransCanada's Keystone XL pipeline, intended to run between Alberta's oilsands and American petroleum refineries on the Gulf Coast. "Twenty-three years after the Exxon Valdez spilled more than half a million barrels of oil into Prince William Sound, another threat looms over Alaska's remote and beautiful coastline — in the form of heavy oil exports from Canada to China," Byers states in the U.S. article. He goes on to explain that whether fuel from Alberta's oilsands is transported via the planned Northern Gateway outlet at Kitimat, B.C., or from the Vancouver terminus of the Trans-Mountain Pipeline, the most direct route to China would be through the Unimak Pass — a heavily used shipping lane that connects the North Pacific Ocean and the Bering Sea through sometimes treacherous waters. While other critics have highlighted potential risks posed to by increased tanker traffic along B.C.'s coastline, Byers argues that Alaska could be at greater risk of environmental damage once "hundreds of oil tankers" begin moving annually through the Unimak Pass en route to China from Canada.

### Ext – Sea Lions Impact

#### Sea lions are key to their entire ecosystem

**Los Angeles Times**, 10/12/**2000** (As Go the Sea Lions, So Go the Fishermen, p. <http://articles.latimes.com/2000/oct/12/local/me-35247>)

For it is not only the sea lion whose future is on the line, but the broader ecosystem in which it lives. Other species in the northern Pacific that rely on pollock are also in trouble. Among them are northern fur seals, Pacific harbor seals, spotted and ringed seals, and several bird species, including kittiwakes, murres and puffins. Deprived of sea lions and seals to eat, killer whales have begun preying on sea otters, a phenomenon that was virtually unknown in the past. Now, in the central Aleutians, sea otters are becoming scarce.

### US/China Relations Good – Economy

#### Strong US/Chinese relations are key to global economic growth

**Summers 99** (Lawrence H., Former Treasury Secretary, FDCH, 10-12, Lexis)

There is little doubt that a constructive bilateral relationship between the United States and China will be critical to the shape and prosperity of the 21st century global economy. China will choose its own destiny. But by working with China as it reforms, by expanding our areas of cooperation and by dealing forthrightly with our differences - in all of these ways we can advance fundamental American interests and values. Principled and successful United States engagement with China in the years ahead will involve a wide range of concerns that are not strictly economic: from combating global warming and nuclear proliferation, to  global aviation regulation, to expanding our people-to-people ties. For our part the Treasury Department will be working, at the upcoming JEC and in other fora to strengthen our cooperation on international law enforcement issues such as money laundering, and we will also be continuing to call on China to observe the terms of the Memorandum of Understanding and Statement of Cooperation on prison labor. Beyond these issues, what will be most important for China's economic future will be the approach we adopt toward the closer integration of China with the global trading system. Many see a rising economy with millions of poor people within its borders as a threat to American economic interests. And starting from this perspective, they worry about the implications of such a country becoming more integrated with our own markets. This Administration - and all of those who have supported, on a bipartisan basis, China's closer integration with the world trading system for well over a decade - perceive it rather differently. Of course, it is important to ensure in our relations with China that our commercial interests are protected. But to seek to contain China  economically - to keep it poor and to isolate it from our markets - is to see our long-term core interests precisely backwards. The truth is that an open and prosperous China will best promote our national commercial interests - and it will best promote our broader national economic and security interests: It will open an enormous export market to our producers and our farmers. Even the limited opening that has already occurred has quadrupled our exports to China in the past decade, to the point where an estimated 400,000 American jobs now depend on them. It will support faster growth in productivity and wages in China - and thus faster real living standards and higher demand for our products in the future. And, as I have described, it will provide a catalyst for broad economic and institutional change that could help China in the 21st century become the open, stable and prosperous  observer of global norms that we would all like to see.

#### Economic decline causes nuclear war.

**Mead**, Summer **1992** (Walter Russell Mead – avid fan of the show The Price is Right and the movie Saving Private Ryan, New Perspectives Quarterly, p. 30)

What if the global economy stagnates-or even shrinks? In the case, we will face a new period of international conflict: South against North, rich against poor, Russia, China, India-these countries with their billions of people and their nuclear weapons will pose a much greater danger to world order than Germany and Japan did in the '30s.

### US/China Relations Good – Free Trade

#### US/Chinese relations maintain global free trade

**Bartholomew 4** (Carolyn, Commissioner – US-China Economic Committee, House Armed Services, FDCH, 7-15, Lexis)

The development of the U.S.-China economic relationship has broader implications for the path of globalization writ large. As generally understood, globalization refers to the process of creating a unified global economy through the breaking down of barriers between national economies. It encompasses the increased integration of national goods, financial, and labor markets. In goods markets, globalization takes the form of increased goods and services trade between countries and the internationalization of production through global supply chains. In labor markets, it manifests itself through increased labor migration and movement of production to labor markets that are the most cost-effective in terms of wages and working conditions, whether or not they are the result of artificial conditions. In financial markets, it shows up in the international diversification of investor portfolios and increases in cross-border financial flows. The Commission believes that the U.S.-China economic relationship is of such large dimensions that the future trends of globalization will be influenced to a substantial degree by how the United States manages its economic relations with China. It is reasonable to believe that U.S.-China economic relations will help shape the rules of the road for broader global trade relations. If current failings are remedied and the relationship is developed so as to provide broad-based benefits for both sides, globalization will likely be affected in a positive manner on a worldwide scale. If not, the opposite will likely be true.

#### Nuclear war

**Spicer 96** (Michael, Economist and Member – British Parliament, The Challenge from the East and the Rebirth of the West, p. 121)

The choice facing the West today is much the same as that which faced the Soviet bloc after World War II: between meeting head-on the challenge of world trade with the adjustments and the benefits that it will bring, or of attempting to shut out markets that are growing and where a dynamic new pace is being set for innovative production. The problem about the second approach is not simply that it won't hold: satellite technology alone will ensure that he consumers will begin to demand those goods that the East is able to provide most cheaply. More fundamentally, it will guarantee the emergence of a fragmented world in which natural fears will be fanned and inflamed. A world divided into rigid trade blocs will be a deeply troubled and unstable place in which suspicion and ultimately envy will possibly erupt into a **major** **war**. I do not say that the converse will necessarily be true, that in a free trading world there will be an absence of all strife. Such a proposition would manifestly be absurd. But to trade is to become interdependent, and that is a good step in the direction of world stability. **With nuclear weapons at two a penny, stability will be at a premium in the years ahead.**

### US/China Relations Good – Taiwan

#### Strong US/Chinese relations prevent Chinese invasion of Taiwan

**Swaine 4** (Michael, Senior Associate – Carnegie Endowment for Int’l Peace, Foreign Affairs, Mar/April, Lexis)

Ultimately, the extent to which the United States and Taiwan must rely on deterrence is inversely related to the success of Washington's efforts to reassure China that it is committed to the status quo. As President Bush has recognized, such efforts are likely to be more successful if greater levels of trust can be created through the establishment of a stronger, more cooperative, Sino-American relationship. They are likely to be less successful if the relationship is allowed to deteriorate through insufficient attention to each other's interests. Chinese officials will be less bellicose and more patient if they believe Washington is not colluding with Taipei to favor independence. Insufficient reassurance -- even if it is combined with a strong deterrence posture -- could eventually provoke China into a desperate use of force, in the belief that Washington might use its superior military capabilities to protect Taiwan from a Chinese attack as the island moved toward independence. Efforts to strengthen deterrence, in other words, must be carefully coordinated with a larger strategy of reassurance if stability is to be maintained.

#### Global nuclear war

**Johnson 1** (Chalmers, The Nation, 4-14, Lexis)

China is another matter. No sane figure in the Pentagon wants a war with China, and all serious US militarists know that China's minuscule nuclear capacity is not offensive but a deterrent against the overwhelming US power arrayed against it (twenty archaic Chinese warheads versus more than 7,000 US warheads). Taiwan, whose status constitutes the still incomplete last act of the Chinese civil war, remains the most dangerous place on earth. Much as the 1914 assassination of the Austrian crown prince in Sarajevo led to a war that no one wanted, a misstep in Taiwan by any side could bring the United States and China into a conflict that neither wants. Such a war would bankrupt the United States, deeply divide Japan and probably end in a Chinese victory, given that China is the world's most populous country and would be defending itself against a foreign aggressor. More seriously, it could **easily escalate into a nuclear holocaust**. However, given the nationalistic challenge to China's sovereignty of any Taiwanese attempt to declare its independence formally, forward-deployed US forces on China's borders have virtually no deterrent effect.

### US/China Relations Good – AT: Resilient

#### Disruptions in US-China relations spill over – collapses overall relations

**Gladkyy 3** (Oleksandr Gladkyy, Edmund S. Muskie Fellow in international affairs at SMS, 6-22-2003 World Affairs)

In the previous sections, which were mainly based on government documents, I discussed newly changed official U.S. policies toward Russia and China and the resulting change in U.S.-Russia and U.S.-China relations. Although the documents have demonstrated beneficial changes in the official policies of the states toward one another after 11 September, they do not reflect the whole situation. In reality, it is still too early to state that U.S.-Russia and U.S.-China relations have become entirely cooperative and strategically stable and that the changes are long term. The actions of one nation, if they do not correspond with the interests and expectations of another country, become constraints on the foreign policy of the latter toward the former. Such restraints are obstacles to further improvement of U.S.-Russia and U.S.-China relations and prevent successful relations in one area from spilling over to another. Moreover, current barriers are dangerous because those issues have the most potential to become serious problems, preventing the further improvement of relations and even hindering already established cooperation.

## Oil Dependency

### Ext – Keystone Solves Oil Dependency

#### Keystone solves energy dependence --- the alternative would be Chinese access to Canadian oil.

**Hoeven**, 2/24/**2012** (John – Republican senator from North Dakota and former governor of North Dakota, Why we need the Keystone oil pipeline, CNN, p. <http://www.cnn.com/2012/02/23/opinion/hoeven-keystone-pipeline-defense/index.html>)

The Keystone XL pipeline represents a big step toward true North American energy independence, reducing our reliance on Middle Eastern oil and increasing our access to energy from our own nation and our closest ally, Canada, along with some oil from Mexico -- to 75% of our daily consumption, compared with 70% now. That decades-long goal for our country is finally within reach, but we need to stay focused on the big picture, and we need to act. This $7 billion, 1,700-mile, high-tech transcontinental pipeline is a big-time, private-sector job creator, and it will also hold down the gas prices for consumers and reduce our energy dependence on an unstable part of the world. Finally, it will do so with good environmental stewardship. That's why I, along with 44 of my colleagues from across the nation, introduced new legislation to move the project toward approval and construction after President Barack Obama's rejection of the project last month. The Hoeven-Lugar-Vitter amendment to the highway funding bill, which we are now working to pass, authorizes TransCanada to construct and operate the Keystone XL pipeline from Alberta, Canada, to the Midwest and Gulf Coast, transporting an additional 830,000 barrels of oil per day to U.S. refineries. This includes 100,000 barrels of crude oil a day from the Bakken region of North Dakota and Montana. That's key to my state, because providing pipeline capacity and gathering systems for that much North Dakota crude will take as many as 500 trucks a day off of roads in the oil patch. That's a win-win for producers, state revenues and most importantly, public safety on our Western highways. The Keystone XL project is good for North Dakota, but it is vital for the nation. Some 75% of the pipe for the Keystone XL pipeline will be made here in North America, 50% of it in Arkansas. Some 90% of all other construction materials will come from companies in the United States and Canada. From an environmental perspective, the project has been under review since September 2008, more than three years, and the State Department's environmental review, completed in August 2011, found "no significant impacts on most resources" providing environmental restrictions are met. Further, our new legislation includes all federal and state safeguards and sets no time limit on Nebraska's ability to further review the pipeline's route through the state, the only portion of the route in contention. Additionally, 80% of the new Canadian oil sands development is being developed "in situ," meaning, it has a similar carbon footprint and emissions as conventional oil wells. If the Keystone XL pipeline isn't built, Canadian oil will still be produced -- 700,000 barrels a day of it -- but instead of coming down to our refineries in the United States, instead of creating jobs for American workers, instead of reducing our dependence on a turbulent part of the world, **that oil will be shipped to China**. It will have to be carried there on large oil tankers, creating more carbon emissions, and it will be processed at facilities with weaker environmental safeguards. Finally, it's important to point out that the Keystone XL pipeline is nothing new. Thousands of pipelines crisscross our nation, delivering refined products to fuel our cars, heat our homes and power our industries. In fact, the original Keystone pipeline, which became operational in 2010, runs from Alberta through my state of North Dakota. Contrary to claims by critics, the pipeline itself has never leaked. The leaks happened at fittings and seals at above-ground pumping stations, which were properly and promptly fixed. I have worked toward approval of the Keystone XL pipeline, first as governor of North Dakota and now as a U.S. senator, because I believe it helps our nation on so many levels. It is just the kind of project that will grow our economy and create jobs in the right way -- through private-sector investment. The Keystone XL pipeline will also help to wean us from our dependency on oil from volatile regions of the world and help us move toward a true energy independent future. It will make our nation safer and stronger for the American people.

#### Keystone is critical to lock-up the Canadian market and lessen oil dependence --- failure to act shifts Canadian oil to China

**Nocera**, 2/6/**2012** (Joe – business columnist for the New York Times, Poisoned Politics of Keystone XL, The New York Times, p. <http://www.nytimes.com/2012/02/07/opinion/nocera-the-poisoned-politics-of-keystone-xl.html?_r=1>)

Oliver no longer talks so freely about the environmental critics of the Keystone pipeline; all of Harper’s ministers have been instructed to stop making comments that might be construed as interfering in the American presidential election. But there are other, more diplomatic, ways to send messages. Like going to China with your cabinet members and cutting energy deals with a country that has, as The Globe and Mail in Toronto put it recently, a “thirst for Canadian oil.” Oil, I might add, that may be a little dirtier than the crude that pours forth from the Saudi Arabian desert — that is one of the main reasons environmentalists say they oppose Keystone — but is hardly the environmental disaster many suppose. I realize that President Obama rejected Keystone because, politically, he had no choice. My guess is that, in his centrist heart of hearts, the president wanted to approve it. But to give the go-ahead before the election was to risk losing the support of the environmentalists who make up an important part of his base. I also understand that the Republican decision to force Obama’s hand was a political stunt, allowing them to denounce his decision during the campaign. As Jennifer Steinhauer put it in The Times recently, “Republicans are framing Keystone as an urgent jobs and energy project at a time of high unemployment and creeping gasoline prices.” Surely, though, what the Keystone decision really represents is the way our poisoned politics damages the country. Environmental concerns notwithstanding, America will be using oil — and lots of it — for the foreseeable future. It is the fundamental means by which we transport ourselves, whether by air, car or truck. Where do we get that oil? Mostly from countries that don’t like us, like Venezuela, which has the world’s second-largest oil reserves. And here is Canada, a staunch American ally that has historically sold us virtually all of its crude exports. Over the past two decades, energy companies have invested tens of billions of dollars in the tar sands, so much so that Canada now ranks No. 3 in estimated oil reserves. Along with the natural gas that can now be extracted thanks to hydraulic fracturing — which, of course, all right-thinking environmentalists also oppose — the oil from the Canadian tar sands ought to be viewed as a great gift that has been handed to North America. These two relatively new sources of fossil fuels offer America its first real chance in decades to become, if not energy self-sufficient, at least energy secure, no longer beholden to OPEC. Yet these gifts have been transformed, like everything else, into political footballs. In Canada, the Keystone XL controversy has created a surprising new resolve. “Keystone was a transformative turning point in terms of how Harper sees the bilateral relationship,” says Fen Hampson, a professor of international affairs at Carleton University in Ottawa. Instead of blithely assuming the United States would purchase its oil, Canada is now determined to find diverse buyers so it won’t be held hostage by American politics. Hence, the newfound **willingness to do business with China**. Canada has concluded that it simply can’t expect much from the United States, even on an issue that would seem to be vital to our own interests.

## US/Canada Relations Add-On

### US/Canada Relations 2AC

#### Failure to advance the Keystone pipeline will collapse US/Canada relations ---prevents North American economic integration and collapses Canada’s economy

**Velk**, 2/9/**2012** (Tom – Associate Professor of Economics at McGill University, director of North American Studies, Keeping Canada Close, The National Interest, p. <http://nationalinterest.org/commentary/keeping-canada-close-6472>)

History, geography and economic logic combine to make America and Canada close partners. Today, Canada is being shaken up by the uncertainty of a U.S. election year, and some analysts suggest it should "look east" to Asia or "diversify" its trading portfolio. Canadians should ignore these calls. Canada needs to find the right balance for its national interests. But the danger exists it will shift too suddenly—and there is no better example than the current negotiations with the United States on the Keystone oil pipeline. Obama's Energy Reality On January 17, President Obama’s Council on Jobs and Competitiveness said that the continuing importance of traditional fuels, combined with uncertain supply lines ”require the United States to optimize all of its natural resources and construct pathways (pipelines, transmission and distribution) to deliver electricity and fuel." It continued that "permitting obstacles that could threaten the development of some energy projects" would "negatively impact jobs and weaken our energy infrastructure.” Later that day, acting on “advice” from the State Department, The president delayed—and some fear de facto cancelled—completion of the Keystone oil-pipeline project. If the TransCanada corporation completes the project, the thirty-six-inch conduit would carry 1.3 million barrels a day of unrefined petroleum from Canada’s oil sands of Alberta to refineries and shipping assets in Nederland and Port Arthur, Texas. The United States consumes 15 million barrels of oil per day, of which about 11 million is imported. So Keystone oil would meet almost 9 percent of American needs and provide necessary employment. Despite its January message that Keystone was contrary to U.S. national interests, the August 26, 2011, State Department environmental-impact statement affirmed the project would have “limited adverse environmental impacts.” Since the environmental and economic elements of his rejection don’t add up, suspicion exists that the president acted politically to sooth the ardent, implacable environmentalists in his voting base. Much of the pipeline is already built and in operation. The rejected completion plan would move more oil but expose less terrain to “environmental risk.” Transcanada's interactive map shows that oil now moves from Hardisty, Alberta, by way of Steele City, Nebraska, and Cushing, Oklahoma, with a side trip to Wood River and Patoka, Illinois. Four hundred thirty-five thousand barrels a day move between Alberta and Illinois, and 501,000 barrels a day find their way to Oklahoma. Obama rejected a short-cut, extension and capacity enlargement, Keystone XL, which would ship 1.3 million barrels every day—all via a bigger pipe and a shorter distance, making a more direct connection between Hardisty and Port Arthur. When Canadians Respond Canadian prime minister Stephen Harper said the resulting impact on Canada's national interest was a "wake-up call." Harper now suggests that Canada look across the Pacific to sell its oil and warned his countrymen of "the degree to which we are held hostage to decisions in the United States, and especially decisions that may be made for very bad political reasons." It isn’t the first time Canada’s perceived national interest, dignity and independence has suffered at the hands of an American president. Lester B. Pearson, Canada’s prime minister between April 1963 and April 1968, came into office after promising to reverse the previous government’s failure to place Bomark missiles (which protected U.S. cities) on Canadian soil. He also signed the US/Canada treaty that allowed rational North America-wide integration of automobile production, to great benefit of both nations. But in April 1965, after Pearson gave a speech in Philadelphia recommending a halt to the bombing of North Vietnam, President Lyndon Johnson’s aides phoned the prime minister and summoned him to Camp David. Upon arrival, the 6’4” president seized the 5’ 10” prime minister by the lapels and bellowed, "Don't you come into my living room and piss on my rug." President Nixon called Prime Minister Pierre Trudeau a “pompous egghead.” In the George W. Bush White house, Prime Minister Jean Chrétien was known as "Dino," short for dinosaur. There is a roller-coaster element in the relationship: Prime Minister Brian Mulroney and President Ronald Reagan sang this duet in full: “When Irish eyes are smiling, Sure, 'tis like the morn in Spring.” Together, they created the world’s largest bilateral free-trade relationship. Stopping A Difficult Divorce North American economic health is impaired by bickering and instability among the continent's political elites. A stable U.S. trade relationship is essential to Canada. But nationalist sentiment, antagonistic toward America, has long been a **threat to Canadian economic health and North American economic integration**. And Obama’s progressive Green rejection of the Keystone project may push conservative Steven Harper toward the “diversified economic internationalism” long advocated by the Canadian Left. For example, Prime Minister Trudeau’s Left-leaning Canadian secretary of state for external affairs minister Mitchell Sharp in 1972 advocated “The Third Option.” It was a rejection of existing close relations with the United States in favor of international "diversification." Sharp claimed his plan to actively reduce U.S. and Canadian economic and cultural links would "develop and strengthen the Canadian economy and other aspects of its national life.” Mr. Harper is no Son of Sharp, but Obama’s economic nationalism and Green radicalism has nearly made him so. Exports and imports between the two countries dominate both nation’s trade statistics. Exports and imports are 29 percent and 30 percent, respectively, of Canadian GDP, and 11 percent and 14 percent in the United States. Seventy-five percent of Canada’s exports go “down South,” and 50 percent of its imports come from there. Nineteen percent and 14 percent are the corresponding American numbers. In 2010, despite the recession, Canada’s exports to the United States grew 9 percent, and imports expanded 10 percent. Canada is a significant source of major U.S. total imports: food, 22 percent, metals and mining 20 percent, energy 24 percent, chemicals 15 percent, wood and paper 49 percent, automobiles 24 percent, aerospace 27 percent. In every case, Canada is more important to the United States than any other nation. In 2009, Canada exported $77.9 billion of energy products, 97 percent to the United States. Canada provided 21 percent of U.S. crude oil imports. A New Suitor Emerging Asia needs the same commodities. And they have the money to buy them. They are willing to help build the East-West infrastructure—pipelines, railways, roads and ports—to enable the Canadian export machine to redirect its trade. Obama’s pronouncement on jobs, only slightly modified, applies to Canadian-Chinese relations too: if pushed into a shotgun marriage by Green radicals and economic nationalists, the new Trans-Pacific partners will aim to optimize all natural resources, construct pathways to deliver electricity and fuel, remove obstacles that threaten the development of energy projects and create jobs to build a mutually profitable energy infrastructure. Cool-headed Canadians hope Obama's Keystone decision will not precipitate such a risky departure from U.S.-Canadian mutual economic interests.

#### Canadian economic decline causes Quebec secession

**Nuechterlein 99** (Donald E., Rockefeller Research Scholar – University of California, Berkeley, “Canada Debates a Variety of Domestic Issues”, http://donaldnuechterlein.com/1999/canada.html)

Current opinion polls in Quebec show that pro-independence forces are somewhat below the 50 percent margin that would trigger formal negotiations with the rest of Canada on the terms of separation. The current premier, Lucien Bouchard, is a crafty nationalist who will not put the question to another referendum unless he is convinced it will obtain a majority vote. My guess is that if Bouchard has doubts about reaching at least 50 percent in favor of independence, he will first call a provincial election and hope to increase the majority of his Parti Quebecois. That would give him more confidence about winning a referendum. An important factor influencing many Quebeckers will be their degree of satisfaction with the Canadian economy. At present, prosperity reigns in most parts of the country and many Quebec voters may worry that their province will suffer economically if it separates.

#### Quebec secession results in nuclear war.

New World Order Intelligence, May **2006** (http://www.survivalistskills.com/quebec.htm)

Lamont's forecasts, based upon all of this input? Canada will disintegrate shortly after Quebec separates via a Unilateral Declaration of Independence [Bouchard threatened to do this on April 28th, 1996]. Quebec will become a socialist, somewhat aberrant and unpredictable state which will ultimately be refused entry to NAFTA by the US and Canada. The Canadian provinces will seize more and more power from a weakened Federal government, become individual or regional "mini-states" themselves, and turn their eyes southward. BC and Alberta will withdraw into "Cascadia", a union of those two provinces with California, Oregon, Washington State, Idaho and Alaska, forming a bloc with the ninth-largest economy in the world. BC and Alberta will apply for admission into the US, and be accepted immediately. Manitoba will hook up with Minnesota around a Red River union. Saskatchewan will join with Montana, Colorado, and Wyoming in the Rocky Mountain Corridor. Manitoba and Saskatchewan would be given associate status with the US, depending - among other things - on how cooperative they are in facilitating the export of Canadian water to the United States. Ontario would sink into the embrace of the US Great Lakes states. Canada's Atlantic Provinces would form an "association" with New England. The US federal government, Lamont asserts, will not be "happy" with this turn of events - it will complicate security and defense arrangements, multiply the difficulties in observing and fulfilling a wide range of current bi-lateral agreements and treaties, etc. But it will be "persuaded" by the addition of vast water resources, wood, immense mineral troves, multi-billion barrel oil and tar-sand reserves, etc, to America's economic base and strategic reserves. The Russians, who have always regarded Canada as a less-belligerent "buffer" across the Arctic between the U.S. and themselves become increasingly resentful of Canada's absorbtion into a Continental Union. The hardline communist/nationalist faction having triumphed in Moscow, they begin armed "probing" flights across the Arctic divide in an attempt to test out the effectiveness of the NORAD radar early-warning system after Quebec's separation and Canada's slow collapse. Feeling even more threatened by the growing American colossus, the Russians become even more aggressive and "trigger happy". The same treaties that reduced US/USSR missile forces permitted the Russians to increase their terrain-hugging bomber-launched cruise-missile stockpiles, and they **take full advantage of this. Canada, the "international diplomatic buffer", has ceased to exist**.

### US/Canada Relations Low

#### Obama’s mishandling of Keystone XL has jeopardized US/Canada relations

**Mintz**, 1/25/**2012** (Jack – the Palmer Chair of Public Policy at the School of Public Policy at the University of Calgary, Canada downgraded, relations with U.S. at lowest point in 25 years, Financial Post, p. <http://opinion.financialpost.com/2012/01/25/jack-mintz-canada-downgraded-relations-with-the-u-s-at-lowest-point-in-25-years/>)

Canada’s relationship with the United States is facing recent strains unseen since the signing of the Canada-U.S. free trade agreement 25 years ago. Unlike early episodes of Canadian angst over nationalism, this stress is due to the U.S. taking Canada, its most important and reliable ally, far too much for granted. Even President Obama’s State of Union address mentioned a host of countries throughout the world with no reference to Canada, which he recently kicked in the teeth with his decision over the Keystone XL pipeline. If anything, Canada needs to think hard about how to reboot its ties with the United States. Historically, Canadians have understood that our most critical political and economic ties are with the world’s largest economy, with which we share a 8,891-kilometre border, the longest in the world. Trade is exceptional, with over $600-billion of bilateral trade. Family ties are strong, with many Canadians living in the United States and many Americans migrating here over the years. Security issues are shared since military and terrorist threats know no boundaries. We have signed many important agreements with the U.S., such as the North American Free Trade Agreement, the Canada-U.S. tax treaty and recently, a promising start to removing unnecessary regulatory impediments to Canadian-U.S. trade. These and other treaties have helped minimize policy confrontations but stronger treaties could have been negotiated in some cases. For example, the 2010 government procurement treaty lessens the effect of obnoxious Buy American rules under 2009 U.S. Recovery Act that would have hurt Canadian businesses bidding for construction infrastructure contracts. While NAFTA provides an exemption from such actions with respect to certain federal programs, it does not apply to sub-national governments. The procurement agreement exempts us from some discriminatory trade policies of state and local governments, although only temporary relief has been given for agriculture, energy, environment and housing projects, a logic that defies explanation. Why would a “friend” not jump to a permanent exemption? In the case of the Canada-U.S. softwood lumber agreement, just renewed this week for two years, Canada has had to accept an export charge on its $8.5-billion of lumber exports to avoid a tariff imposed by the United States. While U.S. complaints about provincial logging regulations are fair enough (as if there are no subsidies and tax preferences that support the U.S. forest industry), this historic dispute remains intractably unresolved after so many years. But it is the Keystone XL pipeline decision that illustrates best the Obama government’s downgrading of Canadian-U.S. relations. Even though the case for the pipeline is clear-cut in terms of energy security and jobs, President Obama’s decision to reject the project was officially based on the need to reroute the pipeline through Nebraska to avoid an aquifer, an issue that could be quickly resolved. But as everyone knows, the real reason for the rejection was to placate an environmental lobby that wants to trap Canadian oil sands production in Alberta. If the shoe were on the other foot, the U.S. would have applied considerable pressure on Canada to approve a Keystone XL pipeline. The whole mismanaged process was an insult to Canada, which is supposed to be a close ally.

### Link – Keystone Key to US/Canada Relations

#### Refusing to allow the construction of the Keystone XL pipeline undermines US/Canada relations --- the plan reverses that dangerous trend.

**Burwell**, 5/3/**2012** (David – director of the Energy and Climate Program at the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, Keystone XL pipeline, a post child for political posturing, CNN Opinion, p. <http://www.cnn.com/2012/05/30/opinion/burwell-keystone-pipeline/index.html>)

The Keystone XL pipeline has turned into a poster child for political posturing. While it is merely one of many pipelines crisscrossing North America, this project has become "red meat" that both sides of the congressional aisle are using to weaken each other in an election season. To make matters more complicated, Canadian public and private-sector officials have jumped into the fray by coming to town to extol the virtues of the pipeline. The battle has become so heated it's easy to lose sight of the main question on which the fate of the pipeline should rest -- whether the project is in America's national interest and what are the measurable benefits and costs. The pipeline, as originally proposed, would bring crude oil from the tar sands of northern Canada through the Great Plains to the oil refineries in Texas and Louisiana, primarily for export. Supporters tout that the project would bring much needed jobs. Opponents warn of environmental risks. Unfortunately, the fight over whether to greenlight Keystone XL is creating collateral damage that vastly outweighs the marginal benefit either side will gain from sticking to its current position. Three victims among many deserve special mention: the U.S. transportation bill, U.S.-Canadian relations and America's strategic interests. The transportation bill, now in its ninth extension, is a critical piece of infrastructure legislation that consolidates more than 100 separate programs into just five major investment categories (for efficiency) and establishes performance standards for these investments (no more "Bridges to Nowhere"). It is finally in the last stage of negotiations between the House of Representatives and Senate. While the Senate passed a bill in March in a bipartisan 72-24 vote, the House has only a shell bill to offer, plus its "non-negotiable" insistence on mandatory approval of Keystone XL. The Senate majority has its own bazooka: a presidential veto if Keystone XL is in the bill. There is a good possibility that a sound, bipartisan bill authorizing a program so important to our future economic growth -- infrastructure -- will be tossed aside for a 10th extension and kicked into a new Congress to start all over from scratch. If this happens, both parties must stand to account in November for the damage done to our economy. America, which in 10 years has fallen from fifth to 23rd place in the quality of its infrastructure compared with its global competitors, will be the loser if the transportation bill becomes a victim of Keystone XL. If the project can't be resolved soon, U.S.-Canadian relations could also be compromised. Canada is not only our largest trading partner but also a great friend. Today, Canada supplies the largest share of U.S. oil imports and buys our products with the money we pay them for it. Yet the Canadian government risks becoming a pawn in our domestic political catfight. Keystone XL is being egged on by the fossil fuel lobbyists on both sides of the border who have urged Canada to double down against the initial permit denial and "turn up the political heat." In a recent meeting with representatives of the Canadian government, a U.S. oil industry representative argued that Canada should have pulled its ambassador when the Keystone XL permit was initially denied. That's crazy talk. Yet the Canadians have pushed hard for Keystone approval, bringing in both Prime Minister Stephen Harper and Alberta Premier Alison Redford to praise the pipeline and hosting the Canadian Association of Petroleum Producers while in town to brief Congress on the merits of the pipeline. All the pressures aside, the United States needs to pause and think carefully about its national interest. Our future energy balance and supply chain should not be short-stopped by attaching Keystone XL as a nongermane rider to a transportation bill for temporary political gain. Politicians come and go; nations generally do not. The long-term strategic interests of both Canada and the United States are better served if all parties involved heed the analysis under way in the State Department rather than resort to legislative fiat or a presidential veto. Calmer heads are already working on the details of a better proposal: a new route, improved technology and perhaps cleaner oil. The Canadian government should vigorously and publicly embrace the existing State Department analysis and strongly oppose attaching Keystone XL as a rider to the transportation bill. Canada should not be complicit in rushed, political decisions -- it should play by the rules. Congress should resist the temptation to use Keystone XL as an opportunity for political brinkmanship. Both Democrats and Republicans need to make sure that the real issues aren't lost in the partisan noise of Washington and that we do our best to avoid all the collateral damage.

### US/Canada Relations Good – Middle East

#### Canada relations is key to Mid East stability

**Burney**, 1/19/**2009** (Derek – conference chair Carleton University Canada/US Project, From Correct to Inspired: A Blueprint for Canada-US Engagement, p. www.ctpl.ca/conferences/Canada-US-Project-2008.htm )

Engaging US leaders will require adroit management and inspired ideas. Given the range and extent of the problems that will confront President Obama and his colleagues on being sworn into office, it is critical that Canada be seen as a credible contributor to their solution rather than as an annoying diversion. The agenda, therefore, while attentive to bilateral issues, must be, and be seen to be, responsive to the broader economic and security challenges the new administration will need to tackle. As Si Taylor reminds us, on Inauguration Day “relations with Russia will still be problematic, Iranian intentions obscure, the Karzai government imperiled, the reconstruction of Iraq unfinished, the Palestinians divided, and the Israelis on the eve of an election.” In responding to these and other challenges, Mr. Obama will look to friends and allies to provide support. It is critical that Canada be one of these, ready to provide not only support, but also ideas and proposals that make sense and meet joint needs. Again, in Taylor’s words, “It is in our national interest to see the United States restored to economic health and strength and international leadership.”

#### Mideast conflict causes global nuclear war

**Gold 7** (Thomas J., Masters in Strategic Intelligence – Joint Military Intelligence College, Nuclear Conflict in the Middle East: An Analysis of Future Events, p. 53-55)

If the political, ethnic, and military policies, and future nuclear weapons development in the Middle East continue in their present directions, Iran or Iraq will eventually initiate a nuclear conflict, probably in the 2005-2015 time frame. Major focal events such as total arms control (resulting in a regional NWFZ), individual acceptance of the NPT, or changes in Middle East leadership will ultimately determine which future happens. FUTURE INDICATORS A constant watch is needed to assess the actions, intentions, and progress of the Middle East countries with their nuclear programs. As well as the status of each country’s nuclear program, its military capability and intentions must also be monitored to determine which future direction is most likely and if the first use of nuclear weapons is likely. ‘Future Indicators” verify the progress of each country toward the most likely “Alternate Future”. Future No. 23 (most likely,): Israel, Iran, and Iraq have developed nuclear weapons. Israel and Iran have kept their weapons as a deterrent. Iraq is the first to use nuclear weapons, probably for aggression. Depending on which Middle East country is attacked by Iraq, either Israel or Iran will retaliate with a secondary nuclear strike. Actions by the U.S., Russia, or other countries will have little effect in deterring this retaliation. This future scenario also carries the risk of **escalation into a** regional or global nuclear conflict **if the major nuclear powers become involved**. This scenario can only take place if Iran chooses to retain its nuclear weapons for deterrence rather than be aggressive. Note that Iran has developed weapons approximately three years earlier than Iraq. Israel must also be complacent about Iraq’s program and not destroy the Iraqi reactors as it did in 1981. Transposition to Future No. 20: Iran becomes democratic and does not develop nuclear weapons. However, without the appearance of having a potential nuclear capability, Iran will surely become the most probable target of Iraq’s attack. Transposition to Future No. 14: Israel or one of the major nuclear powers takes a major action which deters Iraq from nuclear aggression. This scenario would result in a very unstable situation when all three countries have nuclear weapons. The potential would then exist for a regional dispute to escalate into nuclear conflict. Transposition to Future No. I: Prior to any conflict, all Middle East countries have agreed to a NWFZ, abandoned their nuclear development programs, and destroyed all nuclear weapons and related materials. Indicators for Future Scenario No. 23: A tier the development and assembly of a nuclear device, Iraq may test the weapon within Iraqi territory to verify its design, or politically move Iraq into being a nuclear power: this action would be a major step toward regional hegemony. After testing this weapon, Iraq may also begin a buildup of its nuclear capability for future deterrence or aggression. Future No. 17 (second most likely): Israel and Iran have developed nuclear weapons. Iraq program is not complete, and Israel has kept its weapons as a deterrent. Iran is the first to use nuclear weapons, probably for aggression. As the status of the Iraqi program is uncertain, the most probable target for an Iranian first strike using nuclear weapons is Israel. A nuclear retaliation by Israel would be certain. The potential now exists for the involvement of the **major** **nuclear powers**, the U.S. siding with Israel, and Russia siding with Iran. **Escalation to** regional or **global nuclear war is** now **a possibility**.

### US/Canada Relations Good – Terrorism

#### US/Canada relations solves terrorism

**The Ottawa Sun**, March 18, **2004** (Lexis)

**Canada must stand with the United States to fight terrorism**, says U.S. Ambassador Paul Cellucci. Montreal, Toronto or Windsor, Ont., could be targeted like Madrid, Cellucci warned an audience of about 300 at the University of Western Ontario on Wednesday. The terrorist attack last week in Madrid, where train bombs killed 201 people, he said, ''is a sobering reminder ... no one is immune from these attacks and everyone should be vigilant and stand on guard.'' Cellucci said his country is ''in prevention mode. We are doing everything in our power to prevent the next attack ... We cannot defend ourselves without Canada's help.'' ''The probability of further attacks is real. We need a strong Canadian military to help us defend North America and **defeat terrorism around the globe.''** Cellucci said any use of powerful weapons against American cities could also spread death to Canadian cities near the border. He praised Canada for sending forces to Afghanistan, helping train Iraqi police and giving $300 million to help stabilize Iraq. But when it comes to terrorism, ordinary Canadians aren't as concerned as they should be, he said. The RCMP, CSIS and military ''get it'' about terrorism, but the Canadian public has been less concerned, Cellucci said. ''Defeating the terrorist threat'' is the biggest challenge in **Canada-U.S. relations.** Another attack on North America, he warned, would be ''catastrophic economically'' but also seriously undermine our ability to live and roam about freely.

#### Nuclear war

**Speice**, February **2006** (Patrick, William & Mary Law Review, p. 1437-38)

The potential consequences of the unchecked spread of nuclear knowledge and material to terrorist groups that seek to cause mass destruction in the United States are truly horrifying. A terrorist attack with a nuclear weapon would **be devastating** in terms of immediate human and economic losses. Moreover, there would be **immense political pressure** in the United States to discover the perpetrators and **retaliate with nuclear weapons**, massively increasing the number of casualties and potentially **triggering a full-scale nuclear conflict**. In addition to the threat posed by terrorists, leakage of nuclear knowledge and material from Russia will reduce the barriers that states with nuclear ambitions face and may trigger widespread proliferation of nuclear weapons. This proliferation will increase the risk of nuclear attacks against the United States or its allies by hostile states, as well as increase the likelihood that regional conflicts will draw in the United States and escalate to the use of nuclear weapons.

## Answers To: Negative Arguments

### AT: Tar Sand Will Be Exported

#### Keystone will not affect exportation

**Nocera**, 2/10/**2012** (Joe – business columnist for the New York Times, The Politics of Keystone, Take 2, The New York Times, p. <http://www.nytimes.com/2012/02/11/opinion/nocera-the-politics-of-keystone-take-2.html>)

The second argument is that the tar sands oil won’t help the United States because it is all headed for export. This is perhaps the silliest argument of all. Right now, most of the big refineries on the Gulf Coast export around 20 percent of their refined product. Why? Because every barrel of crude oil is converted partly to diesel and partly to gasoline — and the rest of the world is far more reliant on diesel fuel than we are. The gasoline remains in the United States. Keystone wouldn’t change that equation one bit. Normally, one wouldn’t have to point out that exporting high-value products is good for the country. But, of course, improving our trade balance is irrelevant when you’re facing the apocalypse.

### AT: Environment Turn

#### The EPA has cleared Keystone for environmental damage

**Meyer**, 1/8/**2012** (Ron-Journalist for The Revered Review, Like a Good Neighbor; The Keystone Pipeline and Oil Independence, The Revered Review, p. http://thereveredreview.com/2012/01/like-a-good-neighbor-the-keystone-pipeline-and-oil-independence/

As proposed refineries in Illinois and along the Gulf Coast in Texas, a distribution hub in Oklahoma would be directly connected to our friendliest of neighbor’s oil pipeline. This **benefits us as a country financially**, with many new and subsidiary [jobs](http://thereveredreview.com/2012/01/like-a-good-neighbor-the-keystone-pipeline-and-oil-independence/) being created, and a source of fossil fuel being sold to us by a friendly nation. This in case becomes a national security issue, lessening our dependence on oil from the Middle East, from nations with endless turmoil and questionable leaders. **The final EPA impact** [study](http://thereveredreview.com/2012/01/like-a-good-neighbor-the-keystone-pipeline-and-oil-independence/) **released on 8/6/11 would pose no significant impacts to most resources** if environmental protection measures are followed. The pipeline will provide economic growth and stability as shown in an independent study by the Perryman Group. The study concluded that once the pipeline is operational, states along the pipeline routes are expected to receive an additional 5.2 billion dollars in property taxes during the estimated operating life of the pipeline. The project is also expected to create more than 15,000 high-wage manufacturing jobs and construction jobs in 2011-2012 across the US. This then stimulates other supporting industries.

#### Keystone XL Pipeline will have minimal impact on the environment

**Loris** January 18, **2012** ( Nicolas, Policy Analyst at The Heritage Foundation's Roe Institute for Economic Policy Studies, ‘Obama’s “Forced” Keystone Decision Rejects Jobs, Energy, and Logic’, The Foundry, p. http://blog.heritage.org/2012/01/18/obama’s-forced-keystone-decision-rejects-jobs-energy-and-logic/)

This is a stunning (though not unexpected) decision. At a time when unemployment remains unacceptably high, Iran is threatening the Strait of Hormuz, and Canada is looking to take this oil elsewhere, it is difficult to understand how the President could say no to thousands of jobs and an increase in energy supply from our ally.

Environmentalists and opponents of the pipeline are blaming Republicans for forcing the President to make a decision that he was not ready to make (purportedly because additional environmental review was necessary), but this accusation is laughable. DOS has already conducted a thorough, three-year environmental review with multiple comment periods.

DOS studied and addressed risk to soil, wetlands, water resources, vegetation, fish, wildlife, and endangered species. They concluded that the construction of the pipeline would pose minimal environmental risk. Keystone XL also met 57 specific pipeline safety standard requirements created by DOS and the Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration (PHMSA). The pipeline would be equipped with 16,000 sensors connected to satellite that would monitor the pressure of the pipeline.

Much of the concern of environmentalists and Nebraska residents has focused on the original route of the pipeline, particularly the area where the pipeline would cross the Ogallala Aquifer—despite the fact that thousands of miles of pipeline already cross the aquifer today and DOS’s impact statement rated the potential for water contamination as minimal. Oil contamination of drinking water would not be likely in many instances because the soil composition prevents or mitigates the downward migration of oil. Simply put, this pipeline is environmentally sound, and even DOS has said so. Making excuses that we need additional environmental review is catering to special interests.

But it’s a narrow group of special interests that the President is accommodating. Plenty of Obama supporters actually support the construction of the pipeline. The most glaringly obvious is the labor unions that stand to benefit from the job creation.

Nor is this a strictly partisan project. Democratic policymakers have also voiced their support. On October 19, 2011, 22 House Democrats sent a letter to President Obama pleading that “America needs the Keystone XL Pipeline. It is in our national interest to have a Presidential Permit issued for Keystone XL as soon as possible.” The letter mentioned that “the Department of State’s Final Environmental Impact Statement reaffirmed the findings of the two previous environmental impact statements, namely, that the Keystone XL Pipeline will have no significant impact on the environment.”

### AT: Environment Turn – Emissions

#### No impact to emission from tar sands – its negligible compared to other oils

**Nocera**, 2/10/**2012** (Joe – business columnist for the New York Times, The Politics of Keystone, Take 2, The New York Times, p. <http://www.nytimes.com/2012/02/11/opinion/nocera-the-politics-of-keystone-take-2.html>)

There is no question that oil from the tar sands will increase greenhouse gases. But by how much? According to a study by IHS Cera, a leading energy research firm, the oil from the tar sands emits only 6 percent more greenhouse gases than other, lighter forms of oil. (Environmental groups have tried to poke holes in the study, but even they don’t come up with the kind of increase that would doom the planet.) What’s more, there is plenty of oil being produced today with the same greenhouse gas consequences as the oil from the tar sands. As Michael Levi, an energy expert at the Council on Foreign Relations, says, “The argument you hear is that because it increases greenhouse gas emissions, we shouldn’t tolerate it. Well, so do the lights in my house. You have to be discriminating.”

### AT: Environment Turn – China Shift

#### Rejecting Keystone will shift production to China --- worse for the environment

**Loris**, 12/19/**2011** (Nicolas – policy analyst in the Roe Institute for Economic Policy Studies at the Heritage Foundation, Unnecessary Keystone XL Pipeline Delay Obstructs Energy, Jobs, The Cutting Edge, p. <http://www.thecuttingedgenews.com/index.php?article=53424&pageid=16&pagename=Opinion>)

Delaying or even rejecting the construction of the Keystone XL pipeline will not achieve the environmentalists’ goal—to shut down Canadian tar sands production itself. Whether the pipeline crosses through the U.S. or not, the oil from Canadian tar sands is not staying in the ground. Canadian Prime Minister Stephen Harper told President Obama that while the U.S. delays it decision, Canada will begin diversifying by shipping its oil to Asian markets. Harper said of the delay: “This highlights why Canada must increase its efforts to ensure it can supply its energy outside the U.S. and into Asia in particular. Canada will step up its efforts in that regard and I communicated that clearly to the President.” With China’s rapid economic growth, it is no surprise that that country would welcome the opportunity to import more oil from Canada. In fact, Canadian Natural Resource Minister Joe Oliver said that China was “very eager” to import oil from Canada. In addition, Enbridge, another Canadian company, is proposing to build a pipeline from Alberta to British Columbia to ship the oil to refineries in China. From an environmental standpoint, this means that Canada will ship the oil overseas in tankers, a much less efficient method of transporting oil. It also means that China will refine the oil in refineries that are subject to fewer regulations than those in the United States—causing more, not less, environmental harm than if the pipeline were built in the U.S. Furthermore, the U.S. will have to import more oil via tankers from overseas, or carry crude oil from Canada in trucks or rails. The pipeline would also support the dramatic increase in oil production in North Dakota, where pipeline infrastructure is lacking.[8] Shutting down the Keystone XL pipeline project means that the environment—and Americans who would benefit from jobs and economic growth—lose out.

#### Oil will be shipped to China --- it’s safe here but worse in China

**Hoeven**, 2/24/**2012** (John – Republican senator from North Dakota and former governor of North Dakota, Why we need the Keystone oil pipeline, CNN, p. <http://www.cnn.com/2012/02/23/opinion/hoeven-keystone-pipeline-defense/index.html>)

If the Keystone XL pipeline isn't built, Canadian oil will still be produced -- 700,000 barrels a day of it -- but instead of coming down to our refineries in the United States, instead of creating jobs for American workers, instead of reducing our dependence on a turbulent part of the world, **that oil will be shipped to China**. It will have to be carried there on large oil tankers, creating more carbon emissions, and it will be processed at facilities with weaker environmental safeguards. Finally, it's important to point out that the Keystone XL pipeline is nothing new. Thousands of pipelines crisscross our nation, delivering refined products to fuel our cars, heat our homes and power our industries. In fact, the original Keystone pipeline, which became operational in 2010, runs from Alberta through my state of North Dakota. Contrary to claims by critics, the pipeline itself has never leaked. The leaks happened at fittings and seals at above-ground pumping stations, which were properly and promptly fixed.

### AT: Environment Turn – Oil Spills

#### Spills and leaks have only a small chance of occurring

Hamilton 12/18/2011 (James- UC San Diego Professor, Costs and benefits of the Keystone XL pipeline, Econbrowser p. http://www.econbrowser.com/archives/2011/12/costs\_and\_benef.html)

One issue that received a good deal of attention was the possibility that oil would spill from the new pipeline and contaminate water supplies in Nebraska and elsewhere. Let me begin with the report from the U.S. State Department: Keystone has agreed to incorporate the 57 Project-specific Special Conditions developed by PMSA [the Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration] into the proposed Project.... In consultation with PHMSA, DOS determined that incorporation of the Special Conditions would result in a Project that would have a degree of safety greater than any typically constructed domestic oil pipeline system under current regulations and a degree of safety along the entire length of the pipeline system that would be similar to that required in high consequence areas as defined in the regulations.... DOS calculated that there could be from 1.18 to 1.83 spills greater than 2,100 gallons per year for the entire Project. Although small spills will still occur, pipelines are by far the most efficient way to transport petroleum, and we could hardly do without them. The United States already has over a quarter million miles of oil and natural gas transmission lines, and millions more in gas distribution lines. TransCanada, the company that proposes to build the Keystone extension, claims: There are currently 21,000 miles of pipelines crossing Nebraska, including 3,000 miles of hazardous liquid pipelines. Many of these pipelines co-exist within the Ogallala aquifer.

### AT: Renewables Transition Turn

#### Blocking Keystone will not cause a renewable shift --- consumerism is too engrained

**Nocera**, 2/10/**2012** (Joe – business columnist for the New York Times, The Politics of Keystone, Take 2, The New York Times, p. <http://www.nytimes.com/2012/02/11/opinion/nocera-the-politics-of-keystone-take-2.html>)

Somewhat to my surprise, the most reasoned Keystone opponent I spoke to this week was Bill McKibben, who led the protests against it. Although the tar sands ranks as “the second biggest pool of carbon in the world,” he told me, “Keystone, by itself, won’t make or break the environment.” Rather, he said, he and other environmentalists had decided to draw this particular line in the sand because stopping Keystone would help accelerate what he described as the difficult transition from a fossil fuel economy to a new, brighter world based on renewable sources of energy. “The most sensible way to go about dealing with global warming is one pipeline at a time,” he said. “These kinds of fights are extremely important because they are the way the message gets out that we need to change.” Maybe — just maybe — stopping the Keystone pipeline would be worth it if it really was going to change our behavior and help usher in the age of renewable energy. It would, indeed, be worth turning our backs on oil that we badly need and that is already making our country more secure and prosperous. But let’s be honest. It’s not going to change anyone’s behavior. If Keystone is ultimately blocked, the far more likely result is that everyone who opposed it will get to feel good about themselves while still commuting to work, alone, in their S.U.V.’s.

### AT: Ogallala Aquifer Turn

#### Spills will not affect the Ogallala Aquifer

**USA Today**, 10/26/**2011** (Editorial: Say yes to building the Keystone oil pipeline, p. <http://www.usatoday.com/news/opinion/editorials/story/2011-10-26/Keystone-oil-pipeline-build/50941230/1>)

The decision isn't just one of necessity. Criticism of the 1,700-mile pipeline is overblown. For example, opponents assert that its route across the Ogallala Aquifer in Nebraska is risky because a spill could do catastrophic damage to that water supply. But critics ignore the fact that 2,000 miles of oil pipeline already cross the aquifer there. A Nebraska hydrogeologist who has studied the subsurface water formation for 40 years says even if there were a spill, the impact would be modest and containable. For a 35-mile stretch where the water table is close to the surface, the pipeline builder has offered to surround the line with concrete.

#### State Department impact statements prove that Keystone will not harm the aquifer

**Loris**, 12/19/**2011** (Nicolas – policy analyst in the Roe Institute for Economic Policy Studies at the Heritage Foundation, Unnecessary Keystone XL Pipeline Delay Obstructs Energy, Jobs, The Cutting Edge, p. <http://www.thecuttingedgenews.com/index.php?article=53424&pageid=16&pagename=Opinion>)

Much of the concern of environmentalists and Nebraskan residents has focused on the original route of the pipeline, particularly the area where the pipeline crosses the Ogallala Aquifer—despite the fact that **thousands of miles of pipeline already cross the aquifer**. In its “Final Environmental Impact Statement,” the State Department studied the pipeline’s potential for contaminating groundwater in the entire aquifer system, as well as for 200 public water-supply wells within one mile of the centerline of the pipeline, and for 40 private wells within 100 feet of the centerline of the pipeline, none of which is a sole or principal source of drinking water. The impact statement rated the potential for water contamination as minimal and contained in a limited area. Oil contamination of drinking water would not be likely in many instances **because the soil composition prevents or mitigates the downward migration of oil**. The Keystone XL pipeline will be equipped with thousands of sensors to monitor pressure and detect leaks, and will have additional safety systems to prevent a major oil spill. Additionally, in areas where a water table is near land surface, TransCanada will add a waterproof coating and cement casing to the piping. The State Department also notes that “In no spill incident scenario would the entire Northern High Plains Aquifer system [of which the Ogallala Aquifer is a part] be adversely affected.” The State Department has already worked with the Bureau of Land Management and state agencies to negotiate more than 340 minor route variations to address environmental concerns.

## Topicality Answers

### Transportation 2AC

#### 1. We meet – pipelines are used to transport goods

**Inspecta**, 4/27/**2011** (Testing of Pipelines, p. http://www.inspecta.com/en/Our-Services/Testing/Testing-of-pipelines/)

Pipelines have a simple purpose; to transport goods. However, keeping pipelines in good condition throughout the years is not that simple.

#### 2. Their evidence is not exclusive – just because pipelines are energy infrastructure it doesn’t preclude it from also being part of the transportation infrastructure

#### 3. Counter-interpretation – transportation infrastructure includes pipelines

**Goodchild et. al**, **2002** (Michael – director of University of California, Santa Barbara’s Center for Spatial Studies, Richard L. Church, and Val Noronha, Spatial Information Technologies in Critical Infrastructure Protection, National Consortium on Remote Sensing in Transportation, p. 2)

Examples of Critical Transportation Infrastructure (CTI)

1. Major arterial highways and bridges comprising the National Highway System (NHS), including the Strategic Highway Network (STRAHNET) and National Intermodal Connectors.

2. International marine harbors, ports and airports.

3. Major railroads, including depots, terminals and stations.

4. Oil and natural gas pipelines.

5. Transportation Control Systems (e.g., air traffic control centers, national rail control centers) [Everett].

#### 4. Our interpretation is best –

#### A) Aff predictability – contextual ev proves pipelines are part of the topic

Department of Transportation **2011** (U.S. Department of Transportation Call to Action to Improve the Safety of the Nation’s Energy Pipeline System, p. <http://www.phmsa.dot.gov/staticfiles/PHMSA/DownloadableFiles/110404%20Action%20Plan%20Executive%20Version%20_2.pdf>)

In the wake of several recent serious pipeline incidents, U.S. DOT/PHMSA is taking a hard look at the safety of the nation’s pipeline system. Over the last three years, annual fatalities have risen from nine in 2008, to 13 in 2009 to 22 in 2010. Like other aspects of America’s transportation infrastructure, the pipeline system is aging and needs a comprehensive evaluation of its fitness for service. Investments that are made now will ensure the safety of the American people and the integrity of the pipeline infrastructure for future generations.

#### B) Neg overlimits – constraining the topic to highways, ports and airports will lead to a stagnant topic. Our interp is critical to provide a reasonably limited topic.

#### 5. No ground loss – the neg only has to prepare for one additional area --- it’s the neg’s burden to prove this would be an overwhelming vision of the topic.

#### 6. Err on reasonability – competing interpretations leads a race for the most limiting interpretations which privileges techy T debates over topic substance.

### Transportation Infrastructure – Oil Pipelines

#### Transportation infrastructure includes highways, bridges, ports, airports, railroads, and pipelines.

**Goodchild et. al**, **2002** (Michael – director of University of California, Santa Barbara’s Center for Spatial Studies, Richard L. Church, and Val Noronha, Spatial Information Technologies in Critical Infrastructure Protection, National Consortium on Remote Sensing in Transportation, p. 2)

Examples of Critical Transportation Infrastructure (CTI)

1. Major arterial highways and bridges comprising the National Highway System (NHS), including the Strategic Highway Network (STRAHNET) and National Intermodal Connectors.

2. International marine harbors, ports and airports.

3. Major railroads, including depots, terminals and stations.

4. Oil and natural gas pipelines.

5. Transportation Control Systems (e.g., air traffic control centers, national rail control centers) [Everett].

#### Contextual definitions include oil and gas pipelines.

**Borisocheva**, November **2007** (Ksenia, Analysis of the Oil- and Gas-Pipeline-Links between EU and Russia: An account of intrinsic interests, Centre for Russia and Eurasia, Athens, Greece, p. 3)

The transportation infrastructure, i.e. oil- and gas-pipelines, plays a vital role in this relationship of interdependence. The existing and projected routes offer the possibility of uninterrupted, secure supply energy. However, they are also a subject of a great deal of political and economic power-play, which, in turn, potentially undermines or endangers their efficiency. This work intends to bring to light the current state of affairs regarding the energy supply transportation infrastructure between the EU member states and Russia. Part One presents an overview of the existing transport infrastructure, both overland and sea routes, between the EU and Russia. Part Two introduces the concept of ‘Diversification’ and its divergent meanings for the producer and supplier states. Projected new routes and the rationale behind them, including their economic viability and political motivations, are presented in Part Three. Part Four attempts to make policy recommendations that could be useful in the attempt to improve the levels of trust between EU and Russia, or in other words, which could lead to an advancement of ‘energy security’ between the regions. Conclusion offers a summary.

#### Transportation infrastructure includes modes to carry energy.

National Energy Policy Development **Group** **2001** (Reliable, Affordable, and Environmentally Sound Energy for America’s Future, Chapter Seven: America’s Energy Infrastructure, p. 15)

Energy Transportation Infrastructure

The infrastructure used to transport energy products includes ocean tankers; inland barges; specialized trucks for oil and refined products, such as gasoline and heating oil; railroad tank cars and coal cars; and the waterways, highways, and railroads upon which they travel. There is also a substantial inventory of river and oceanside port facilities that are used for moving energy materials.

#### More contextual evidence

Department of Transportation **2011** (U.S. Department of Transportation Call to Action to Improve the Safety of the Nation’s Energy Pipeline System, p. <http://www.phmsa.dot.gov/staticfiles/PHMSA/DownloadableFiles/110404%20Action%20Plan%20Executive%20Version%20_2.pdf>)

In the wake of several recent serious pipeline incidents, U.S. DOT/PHMSA is taking a hard look at the safety of the nation’s pipeline system. Over the last three years, annual fatalities have risen from nine in 2008, to 13 in 2009 to 22 in 2010. Like other aspects of America’s transportation infrastructure, the pipeline system is aging and needs a comprehensive evaluation of its fitness for service. Investments that are made now will ensure the safety of the American people and the integrity of the pipeline infrastructure for future generations.

### Transportation – Pipelines Transport Goods

#### Pipelines are a means to transport products.

Department of Transportation, 8/29/**2007** (Safe Pipelines FAQs, Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration, p. http://phmsa.dot.gov/portal/site/PHMSA/menuitem.ebdc7a8a7e39f2e55cf2031050248a0c/?vgnextoid=2c6924cc45ea4110VgnVCM1000009ed07898RCRD&vgnextchannel=f7280665b91ac010VgnVCM1000008049a8c0RCRD&vgnextfmt=print)

Pipelines are the safest and most cost-effective means to transport the extraordinary volumes of natural gas and hazardous liquid products that fuel our economy. To move the volume of even a modest pipeline, it would take a constant line of tanker trucks, about 750 per day, loading up and moving out every two minutes, 24 hours a day, seven days a week. The railroad-equivalent of this single pipeline would be a train of seventy-five 2,000-barrel tank rail cars everyday. These alternatives would require many times the people, clog the air with engine pollutants, be prohibitively expensive and -- with many more vehicles on roads and rails carrying hazardous materials -- unacceptably dangerous.

#### The purpose of pipelines is to transport goods

**Inspecta**, 4/27/**2011** (Testing of Pipelines, p. http://www.inspecta.com/en/Our-Services/Testing/Testing-of-pipelines/)

Pipelines have a simple purpose; to transport goods. However, keeping pipelines in good condition throughout the years is not that simple.

### Transportation – Includes Pipelines

#### Transportation includes roads, railways, pipelines, maritime, air and intermodal transportation.

**Slack, Rodrigue, and Comtois 2009** (Brian – professor emeritus in the Department of Geography at Concordia University, Jean-Paul – professor of global studies and geography at Hofstra University, and Claude – professor of geography at the Université de Montréal, The Geography of Transport Systems, Chapter 3, p. <http://people.hofstra.edu/geotrans/eng/ch3en/conc3en/ch3c1en.html>)

Transport modes are the means by which people and freight achieve mobility. They fall into one of three basic types, depending on over what surface they travel – land (road, rail and pipelines), water (shipping), and air. Each mode is characterized by a set of technical, operational and commercial characteristics:

• Road transportation (Concept 2). Road infrastructures are large consumers of space with the lowest level of physical constraints among transportation modes. However, physiographical constraints are significant in road construction with substantial additional costs to overcome features such as rivers or rugged terrain. Road transportation has an average operational flexibility as vehicles can serve several purposes but are rarely able to move outside roads. Road transport systems have high maintenance costs, both for the vehicles and infrastructures. They are mainly linked to light industries where rapid movements of freight in small batches are the norm. Yet, with containerization, road transportation has become a crucial link in freight distribution.

• Rail transportation (Concept 3). Railways are composed of a traced path on which are bound vehicles. They have an average level of physical constrains linked to the types of locomotives and a low gradient is required, particularly for freight. Heavy industries are traditionally linked with rail transport systems, although containerization has improved the flexibility of rail transportation by linking it with road and maritime modes. Rail is by far the land transportation mode offering the highest capacity with a 23,000 tons fully loaded coal unit train being the heaviest load ever carried. Gauges, however, vary around the world, often complicating the integration of rail systems.

• Pipelines (Concept 3). Pipeline routes are practically unlimited as they can be laid on land or under water. The longest gas pipeline links Alberta to Sarnia (Canada), which is 2,911 km in length. The longest oil pipeline is the Transiberian, extending over 9,344 km from the Russian arctic oilfields in eastern Siberia to Western Europe. Physical constraints are low and include the landscape and pergelisol in arctic or subarctic environments. Pipeline construction costs vary according to the diameter and increase proportionally with the distance and with the viscosity of fluids (from gas, low viscosity, to oil, high viscosity). The Trans Alaskan pipeline, which is 1,300 km long, was built under difficult conditions and has to be above ground for most of its path. Pipeline terminals are very important since they correspond to refineries and harbors.

• Maritime transportation (Concept 4). Because of the physical properties of water conferring buoyancy and limited friction, maritime transportation is the most effective mode to move large quantities of cargo over long distances. Main maritime routes are composed of oceans, coasts, seas, lakes, rivers and channels. However, due to the location of economic activities maritime circulation takes place on specific parts of the maritime space, particularly over the North Atlantic and the North Pacific. The construction of channels, locks and dredging are attempts to facilitate maritime circulation by reducing discontinuity. Comprehensive inland waterway systems include Western Europe, the Volga / Don system, St. Lawrence / Great Lakes system, the Mississippi and its tributaries, the Amazon, the Panama / Paraguay and the interior of China. Maritime transportation has high terminal costs, since port infrastructures are among the most expensive to build, maintain and improve. High inventory costs also characterize maritime transportation. More than any other mode, maritime transportation is linked to heavy industries, such as steel and petrochemical facilities adjacent to port sites.

• Air transportation (Concept 5). Air routes are practically unlimited, but they are denser over the North Atlantic, inside North America and Europe and over the North Pacific. Air transport constraints are multidimensional and include the site (a commercial plane needs about 3,300 meters of runway for landing and take off), the climate, fog and aerial currents. Air activities are linked to the tertiary and quaternary sectors, notably finance and tourism, which lean on the long distance mobility of people. More recently, air transportation has been accommodating growing quantities of high value freight and is playing a growing role in global logistics.

• Intermodal transportation (Concept 6). Concerns a variety of modes used in combination so that the respective advantages of each mode are better exploited. Although intermodal transportation applies for passenger movements, such as the usage of the different, but interconnected modes of a public transit system, it is over freight transportation that the most significant impacts have been observed. Containerization has been a powerful vector of intermodal integration, enabling maritime and land transportation modes to more effectively interconnect.

• Telecommunications. Cover a grey area in terms of if they can be considered as a transport mode since unlike true transportation, **telecommunications often does not have a physicality**. Yet, they are structured as networks with a practically unlimited capacity with very low constraints, which may include the physiography and oceanic masses that may impair the setting of cables. They provide for the instantaneous movement of information (speed of light in theory). Wave transmissions, because of their limited coverage, often require substations, such as for cellular phone networks. Satellites are often using a geostationary orbit which is getting crowded. High network costs and low distribution costs characterize many telecommunication networks, which are linked to the tertiary and quaternary sectors (stock markets, business to business information networks, etc). Telecommunications can provide a substitution for personal movements in some economic sectors.

### Infrastructure Investment 2AC

#### 1. We meet – approving Keystone construction is infrastructure investment – that’s the 1AC Perryman Group evidence.

#### 2. We meet – reduced property taxes are directed at the pipeline

**Oil Change International**, 2/17/**2012** (Refinery subsidies linked to the Keystone XL tar sands pipeline, p. <http://priceofoil.org/wp-content/uploads/2012/02/Refinery-Expensing_OCI.ET_.pdf>)

The Keystone XL tar sands pipeline project, like all oil industry projects, benefits from substantial taxpayer subsidies. Some, like reduced property taxes, are directed at the pipeline itself. Others increase the viability of the pipeline by reducing the cost of the oil going into it or the cost of processing it at the other end.

#### 3. Hamstrings the aff – their interpretation forces the aff to be straight cash homey. Money is fungible and allows the aff to be vulnerable to private and state funding CPs. This prevents aff diversity and flexibility.

#### 4. Counter-interpretation – infrastructure investment includes both direct expenditures and indirect tax incentives.

Congressional Budget Office/Joint Committee on Taxation, October **2009** (Subsidizing Infrastructure Investment with Tax-Preferred Bonds, p. [1](http://www.cbo.gov/sites/default/files/cbofiles/ftpdocs/106xx/doc10667/10-26-taxpreferredbonds.pdf))

Investment in the nation’s infrastructure each year amounts to roughly a half-trillion dollars. Both government and the private sector fund that investment, which covers the costs of constructing and renovating such facilities as highways and airports, water and energy utilities, dams, waste-disposal and other environmental sites, schools, and hospitals. The federal government makes a significant contribution to that investment through its direct expenditures and the subsidies it provides indirectly through the tax system. Direct expenditures comprise what the federal government **spends on infrastructure** (for example, by funding construction of dams and other water resources by the Army Corps of Engineers) and what it provides as grants and loan subsidies to states and localities (primarily for transportation projects). Because infrastructure facilities typically provide a stream of benefits (and revenues for repayment) well into the future, their construction is often financed by borrowing. States and localities issue debt to finance projects undertaken by government and, in some cases, by the private sector (bonds issued by states and localities to finance either government operations or certain private-sector activities are known as municipal bonds). The federal government **subsidizes the issuance of municipal bonds** by offering tax preferences that lower the cost of debt incurred for those projects.

#### 5. Our interpretation is best –

#### A) Precision – our interpretation is based on the federal government’s conception of investment. This makes it the most predictable and connected to the literature.

#### B) Neg ground – our interp ensures action to the direction of infrastructure investment. The aff must contribute to construction and will be budget related.

#### 6. Err on reasonability – competing interpretations leads a race for the most limiting interpretations which privileges techy T debates over topic substance.

### Ext – Contextual Evidence

#### Construction of Keystone is infrastructure investment

**Perryman Group**, June **2010** (The Impact of Developing the Keystone XL Pipeline Project on Business Activity in the US: An Analysis Including State-by-State Construction Effects and an Assessment of the Potential Benefits of a More Stable Source of Domestic Supply, p. 5-6)

• Beyond the construction and development of the pipeline, the US economy would see permanent benefits because of the savings stemming from a more reliable supply of oil to meet future needs. Various sectors would essentially be paying less for the same input than would be the case in the absence of the Keystone XL Project, and these savings represent a net pool of funds that would be added to the production complex. o Under “normal” oil price assumptions equivalent to the average for all of 2007, The Perryman Group found the gains in US business activity stemming from a permanent increase in stable oil supplies to include $100.144 billion in total spending, $29.048 billion in output, and 250,348 permanent jobs. o In the high-price case in which costs per barrel reach the peak levels observed in the summer of 2008, The Perryman Group measured the annual impact of an increase in stable oil supplies associated with the Keystone XL Pipeline Project to include $221.305 billion in spending, $64.193 billion in output, and 553,235 jobs. • Thus, this infrastructure investment would have substantial positive outcomes both during its construction and for decades to come.

## Disadvantage Answers

### Politics Agenda 2AC

#### Massive support for Keystone

**Loris**, 1/27/**2012** (Nicolas, On Keystone, Congress Steps Up, The Foundry, p. http://blog.heritage.org/2012/01/27/on-keystone-congress-steps-up/)

Keystone is an environmentally safe, jobs-creating project that has broad support. President Obama dropped the ball in rejecting TransCanada’s permit application. If Congress acts, the ball would end up back in the President’s court, but it would certainly send a strong bipartisan message if it returns to him.

#### Turn – popularity

#### A) Keystone is popular with the American public

**The Hill**, 1/31/**2012** (Poll: Strong support for ‘Buffett Rule’ and Keystone XL pipeline,” p. http://thehill.com/blogs/blog-briefing-room/news/207645-poll-shows-strong-support-for-buffet-rule-and-keystone-pipeline)

Americans are unified in their support of two of the most divisive issues before Congress — the Keystone pipeline, which is supported by Republicans, and the “Buffett Rule” calling for higher taxes on millionaires, backed by Democrats. According to a United Technologies-National Journal Congressional Connection poll, 76 percent of Americans support the Buffett rule, versus only 19 percent who are against it. The rule would require individuals who make more than $1 million a year to pay a tax rate of at least 30 percent. The idea, named for the billionaire investor Warren Buffett, is central to President Obama’s 2012 platform to “level the playing field” for workers. Obama renewed his push for the Buffett rule in last Tuesday’s State of the Union address. Debbie Bosanek, Buffett’s secretary, was in the audience as the president argued that her salary should not be taxed at a higher rate than her boss, whose primary source of income is from long-term capital gains. Capital gains are taxed at a rate of 15 percent, but critics of the Buffett Rule note that the income has been taxed at the corporate level as well. Sen. Sheldon Whitehouse (D-R.I.) said he’s close to finalizing legislation, the “Paying a Fair Share Act,” that would codify the Buffett rule, although it’s expected to be met by broad opposition from House Republicans, who generally oppose tax increases of any kind. On another issue, however, most Americans side with Republicans, backing efforts to move forward with the Keystone XL oil sands pipeline. Sixty-four percent say they are in favor of the project, against only 22 percent who are opposed.

#### B) That’s key to the agenda

**Roy Behr**, et al, Office of the Lieutenant Governor of California Behr, et al, Stephen Ansolabehere and Shanto Iyengar, Political Science Professors at UCLA, **1993**, The Media Game: American Politics in the Television Age, p. 190

Public opinion, however, is more than a predictor of politicians’ reelection chances. Chief executives such as governors and presidents must build coalitions with legislators and cultivate support with leaders of interest groups in order to implement their policy proposals. Legislators, in turn, must consider how their support or opposition to the chief executive’s proposals will play with their constituents. If the governor is unpopular, a state legislator knows that he can vote against gubernatorial proposals without risking his own career prospects. On the other hand, if the governor is widely admired, a legislator will be more cautious about registering dissent. In short, personal popularity boosts the policy-making influence of governors (and presidents).

#### The plan has bipartisan support in Congress

**Cornilles**, 1/10/**2012** (Rob – president and founder of Game Face Inc., The proposed Keystone XL oil pipeline is a bipartisan proposal, PolitiFact at The Oregonian, p. http://www.politifact.com/oregon/statements/2012/jan/14/rob-cornilles/how-bipartisan-support-keystone-xl-oil-pipeline/)

Does the pipeline have bipartisan support? Much of the really vocal support for this project comes from Republicans. Democrats, not so much, although there are some who want the project. Environmentalists are opposed while labor’s AFL-CIO has decided not to take a formal position. Senate Democrats who like the project are Max Baucus D-Mont., Jon Tester D-Mont., Mary Landrieu D-La., Mark Pryor, D-Ark., and Mark Begich, D-Alaska, Claire McCaskill, D-Mo., and Kent Conrad, D-N.D. We queried our delegation. Sens. Ron Wyden and Jeff Merkley are opposed. Rep. Earl Blumenauer was among 32 House Democrats who sent a letter urging the State Department to reject the route. Schrader is opposed to the expedited process, but not necessarily against — or for — the project. We don’t think the support of one Democrat or one Republican makes a proposal bipartisan, but it’s clear some Democrats are on board with the project. If we had to picture a bipartisan meter, the needle probably would surpass the halfway mark but fall short of 75 percent.

### Ext – Keystone is Bipartisan

#### Massive bipartisan support for the plan

New York Times, 4/19/**2012** (Democrats Joining G.O.P. on Pipeline, p. http://www.nytimes.com/2012/04/20/us/politics/democrats-join-gop-on-pipeline-vote.html)

President Obama is finding himself increasingly boxed in on the Keystone pipeline fight as more Congressional Democrats are joining Republicans in backing the project, which has strong labor support and could generate significant numbers of jobs in economically hard-hit states. On Wednesday, the House passed a short-term transportation bill that included a provision that would pave the way for the construction of the next stage of the oil pipeline, a measure that Mr. Obama has said he would veto. The bill passed 293 to 127, with 69 Democrats supporting it. It is the fourth time the House has passed a measure to expedite the project; one failed narrowly in the Senate only after Mr. Obama personally lobbied some Democrats to vote no. With the House vote, Mr. Obama finds himself, for the first time in his presidency, threatening a veto on a significant piece of legislation that enjoys the support of an increasing number of Democrats, as well as the vast majority of Republicans in Congress.

#### Bipartisan support for the plan

**Loris**, 12/19/**2011** (Nicolas – policy analyst in the Roe Institute for Economic Policy Studies at the Heritage Foundation, Unnecessary Keystone XL Pipeline Delay Obstructs Energy, Jobs, The Cutting Edge, p. <http://www.thecuttingedgenews.com/index.php?article=53424&pageid=16&pagename=Opinion>)

Recognizing the need for more energy supply and more jobs, both Democrats and Republicans expressed support for the Keystone XL pipeline, a $20 billion private-infrastructure investment in the United States. The states through which the pipeline would pass—Montana, South Dakota, Nebraska, Kansas, Oklahoma, and Texas—would benefit greatly. The six states are collectively projected to receive $5.2 billion in property taxes from TransCanada in the course of the 100-year operating life of the pipeline.

#### Widespread support for Keystone

**ABC News**, 1/18/**2012** (President Obama Rejects Keystone XL Pipeline, p. <http://abcnews.go.com/Politics/OTUS/president-obama-rejects-keystone-xl-pipeline/story?id=15387980#.T-tCIbVYt2A>)

Labor unions, oil industry groups -- even the president's jobs council -- have signaled support for the plan, which also has bipartisan backing on Capitol Hill. But environmental groups warned it would have a dangerous effect on ecosystems and human health, ratcheting up pressure on Obama to defer to his progressive base in an election year.

### Ext – GOP Likes Keystone

#### GOP supports Keystone

New York Times, 2/1/**2012** (For G.O.P., Pipeline is Central to Agenda, p. http://www.nytimes.com/2012/02/02/us/politics/for-gop-pipeline-is-central-to-agenda.html)

On the airwaves, on the campaign trail and in both chambers of Congress, Republicans are relentlessly pushing for an expansion of the pipeline known as Keystone XL and criticizing Mr. Obama’s decision to reject the project for now, forgoing thousands of pipeline jobs. Democrats, increasingly worried that the pounding on the issue will detract from their own message against income inequality, are looking for ways to defuse it. Republicans are framing Keystone as an urgent jobs and energy project at a time of high unemployment and creeping gasoline prices, and trying to portray Mr. Obama as giving in to hard-left environmentalists in an election year at the expense of addressing both.

#### GOP loves Keystone

**Tu**, 2/10/**2012** (Kevin Jianjun – senior associate in the Carnegie Energy and Climate Program, China should be cautious about the Canadian Oil Sands, Phoenix News Group, p. <http://carnegieendowment.org/2012/02/10/china-should-be-cautious-about-canadian-oil-sands>)

First, Canadian oil sands exports to China could further strain the already turbulent Sino-U.S. relationship. In 2012, a presidential election year, the Obama administration rejected TransCanada’s application to build the Keystone XL pipeline. The move stemmed from strong Democratic and environmentalist opposition to the deal—Obama would have risked losing the pro-environment electorate if he approved the plan. Yet, the Democratic Party has been unable to reach a consensus on this contentious issue, and the U.S. State Department has agreed to allow TransCanada to reapply for a Keystone XL permit once an alternative route that avoids particularly environmentally sensitive sites is selected. By comparison, almost all congressional Republicans strongly support the Keystone XL pipeline. Arguing that turning down the pipeline will harm U.S. energy security, kill U.S. jobs, and unnecessarily benefit China, they have vigorously attacked Obama’s decision. Any renewed support for the Northern Gateway pipeline by Chinese national oil companies would shift the focus of the Keystone XL debate within the United States from the environment to national security—a prevailing fear, especially among congressional Republicans, is that without Keystone, China will beat the United States to Canada’s rich oil reserves. A desire to shift the debate to national security in the United States may even be driving the Canadian government’s public support of the Northern Gateway pipeline.

### Election 2AC

#### Approving Keystone will gain key labor support and weaken GOP attacks

Christian Science Monitor, 6/21/**2012** (Four gambits Obama could try to boost his election prospects, p. <http://www.csmonitor.com/USA/Elections/2012/0621/Four-gambits-Obama-could-try-to-boost-election-prospects/Approve-the-Keystone-XL-pipeline>)

1. Approve the Keystone XL pipeline In January, President Obama rejected the controversial Keystone XL pipeline, which was to run from the tar sands of Alberta, Canada, to refineries on the Texas coast. Environmentalists cheered, but labor, another key Obama constituency, was disappointed, given the thousands of jobs at stake. Republicans blasted Mr. Obama not only over the jobs but also because of the energy that could eventually come onstream for American consumers at a time of high gas prices. Obama said he rejected the pipeline because a congressional deadline "prevented a full assessment of the pipeline's impact.” The proposed route would have gone through environmentally sensitive parts of Nebraska. On June 15, the State Department announced an environmental review of the new proposed route, with a goal of reaching a decision by next year. But perhaps Obama could expedite the decision, if he wants to grab headlines by approving the new Keystone route in time for the Nov. 6 election. Approval of Keystone would take away a GOP talking point on energy and jobs. It would also please the labor movement. Environmentalists would be angry, but Obama may be willing to take that gamble.

#### Keystone will win independent voters --- gas prices are their issue

**Goodman**, 2/28/**2012** (Alana, Obama’s Keystone Retreat a Matter of Time, Commentary Magazine, p. <http://www.commentarymagazine.com/2012/02/28/obama-keystone-retreat/>)

Republicans already see this issue causing problems for Obama in the general election. “I think the president is in an untenable position on the pipeline, and I’ll be surprised to see if they don’t figure out a way to retreat in the face of public [opposition] on this issue,” said Sen. Jeff Sessions on a conference call with reporters this afternoon. With the price of gas rising, Obama has had to rework his initial political calculation on the pipeline. Previously, the issue pitted together two of his key support groups: the environmental left (which opposed the pipeline) versus the labor unions (which supported it). Rather than risk losing either side in the upcoming election, Obama punted the Keystone XL construction decision until 2013. But now that rising gas prices are likely to become an election issue for independent voters, Obama can’t risk being seen as responsible for the pipeline’s delay. His public support for the partial construction was a nod to that shifting political reality.

#### Keystone XL is popular

**Geman** 2-23-**12** (Bill- Writer for The Hill) <http://thehill.com/blogs/e2-wire/e2-wire/212375-poll-shows-support-for-keystone-pipeline-environmental-regulations>

**New polling data shows strong support** for approving **the Keystone XL** oil sands **pipeline** that the Obama administration rejected in January, a decision that unleashed a torrent of GOP attacks against President Obama. **The Pew Research Center poll released** Thursday **finds 66 percent who have heard about the issue say the proposed pipeline** to bring oil sands from Alberta, Canada, to Gulf Coast refineries **should be approved**, while 23 percent say it shouldn’t. The data reveals a partisan split but substantial Democratic support as well. **Among Republicans who have heard about the pipeline issue, 84 percent back it, compared to 49 percent of Democrats**. The poll also shows that fewer Democrats than Republicans are familiar with Keystone. Sixty-six percent of independent voters back approval of Keystone, but the number drops to 46 percent among those independents that “lean Democratic,” according to Pew.

#### Keystone is popular with the American public

**The Hill**, 1/31/**2012** (Poll: Strong support for ‘Buffett Rule’ and Keystone XL pipeline,” p. http://thehill.com/blogs/blog-briefing-room/news/207645-poll-shows-strong-support-for-buffet-rule-and-keystone-pipeline)

Americans are unified in their support of two of the most divisive issues before Congress — the Keystone pipeline, which is supported by Republicans, and the “Buffett Rule” calling for higher taxes on millionaires, backed by Democrats. According to a United Technologies-National Journal Congressional Connection poll, 76 percent of Americans support the Buffett rule, versus only 19 percent who are against it. The rule would require individuals who make more than $1 million a year to pay a tax rate of at least 30 percent. The idea, named for the billionaire investor Warren Buffett, is central to President Obama’s 2012 platform to “level the playing field” for workers. Obama renewed his push for the Buffett rule in last Tuesday’s State of the Union address. Debbie Bosanek, Buffett’s secretary, was in the audience as the president argued that her salary should not be taxed at a higher rate than her boss, whose primary source of income is from long-term capital gains. Capital gains are taxed at a rate of 15 percent, but critics of the Buffett Rule note that the income has been taxed at the corporate level as well. Sen. Sheldon Whitehouse (D-R.I.) said he’s close to finalizing legislation, the “Paying a Fair Share Act,” that would codify the Buffett rule, although it’s expected to be met by broad opposition from House Republicans, who generally oppose tax increases of any kind. On another issue, however, most Americans side with Republicans, backing efforts to move forward with the Keystone XL oil sands pipeline. Sixty-four percent say they are in favor of the project, against only 22 percent who are opposed.

### Spending 2AC

#### No link – the plan increases indirect spending through tax exemptions not deficit spending – that’s the 1AC Paulman evidence

#### No direct spending on Keystone

**Ayers**, 11/3/**2011** (Mark – president of Buildings and Trade Construction, For the 99% of Americans, Keystone = Jobs, Huffington Post, p. http://www.huffingtonpost.com/mark-h-ayers/for-the-99-of-americans-k\_b\_1073705.html)

**The privately-financed Keystone XL pipeline project is projected to create tens of thousands of U.S. jobs in construction and manufacturing, and** without one single dollar of government assistance**.** There is also an economic multiplier effect associated with this project, as the economic impact spreads to other industries where demand and expenditures for goods and services within and around the vicinity of the pipeline's construction are expected to increase significantly. In the end, this projected rise in the demand for local goods and services will result in more tax revenue for the surrounding local governments. In fact, it has been estimated that the pipeline's corridor states would realize an additional $5.2 billion in tax revenue during the course of construction.

#### Federal infrastructure funding not zero sum

PRI, 12 (Public Radio International, “Obama's vision for a transportation makeover struggling to leave the station”, Jan 24, http://www.pri.org/stories/politics-society/government/obama-s-vision-for-a-transportation-makeover-struggling-to-leave-the-station-8099.html)

That's been the fault line for the Obama administration, Goldmark said. On the other hand, though, **it's likely not a zero-sum game.** America will need to develop a multimodal transportation infrastructure to move forward, but including roads and planes as well as rails.